

**Topic: International Relation Theory**

**Paper Type: Essay**

**Word Count: 1800 words**

**Pages: 7 pages**

**Referencing Style: Harvard**

**Education Level: Graduation**

[Title]

[Name]

[Professor]

[Section]

[Date]

## Introduction

The historical relationship between capital and power in shaping the state is still present today in the context of globalisation, which jeopardises the sovereignty of States as legally determined capacity. In this respect, the theory of globalisation can be raised as a witnessing phase out of the sovereign power of the State, or the establishment of a minimum sovereignty. Therefore, the challenge for the theory of the state is a critical review of the current concept of sovereignty in the context of globalisation theory. Historically the state has raised the crucial relationship between capital and power settings for nation - states. Relationship is now in the context of globalisation that continues to act and shape, not only the state but also and decisively to the traditional concept of sovereignty. Thus, sovereignty, understood from the idea of an exclusive political power and exclusive of other powers capable of self-regulation, receives major modifications that raise the need for a substantial change in the traditional theory of the state. This paper presents a detail analysis of the relationship between globalisation and sovereignty.

The modern nation-state is guided by the following four principles: territorial sovereignty, official equality of States, non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and consent of the new states as the basis of international legal obligations. National sovereignty thus implies the right to rule over a limited territory and exercising political authority within a community that has the right to determine the structure of the legal system, its rules and policies, as well as to rule pursuant thereto. Under this view, known as "liberal legal monism", the formation of law is central in the state as sole author of law. Nevertheless, the traditional concept of nation-state and the principles that guide their actions have been challenged by the set of economic, political, cultural and social we call globalisation. The sovereignty of states has been

transformed and sources with capacity and legitimacy to create the right have multiplied. The nation-state no longer seems to be the only entity that concentrates political power in a country and legal (Kaldor, 2003).

### Discussion

"The relationship between globalisation and the state has become a matter for intense debate over the past two decades. The first notice of this relationship, which to some extent remain dominant view that globalisation undermines the autonomy of the state. According to this perception, the state would become totally helpless and completely enslaved to the capitalist world economy. Not only the global economy work without any state control, but resistance to globalisation is also considered futile and even harmful to the economic well-being and social development of the nation. To thrive or even survive, States should accept this reality and position themselves accordingly. According to Kenichi Ohmae (1995) says as the nation states continue to see themselves as key drivers of economic affairs, and they resist - in the name of national interest - to any erosion of central government considered a threat to sovereignty - neither they nor the public can fully benefit from the resources of the global economy. This is not the road to prosperity and a better quality of life.

This perspective reduces the globalisation phenomenon mainly economic, loosely controlled by capital, including investments supporting transnational production as well as numerous financial flows. But globalisation is much more than just economic strength. It is multidimensional in its economic, political, security, cultural and environmental. This broader concept of globalisation refers to the idea that there is an international order in which the all-powerful state autonomy is greatly reduced. According to David Held (N.A), globalisation

means at the same time the emergence of a global economic system beyond the control of a single state (even dominant states), the expansion of transnational links and networks of communication which individual states have little influence, the enormous growth of the international organisation may limit the range of the most commanding states, the growth of a global military, many processes may reduce the range of policies available to governments and their citizens.

According to this perspective, the main attribute of the nation state: sovereignty becomes the major casualty of globalisation. It is known that the modern concept of "state sovereignty" back to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) and it includes aspects of both internal and external (Wolf, 2001). On the one hand, it implies the autonomy of the state, especially the right not to recognise an authority that transcends, and the other, it is recognised by other states precisely as an actor independently. In general, the concept of sovereignty means the right of the state to do what he wants on its territory, without outside interference. And it is precisely this idea of the nation-state - sovereign political authority, territorial structure clearly defined and able to exist and act without the intervention of other states - which is supposed to have been rendered obsolete by globalisation. The end of the nation-state, however, is problematic for at least three reasons (Panitch, 1996).

First, sovereignty cannot be confused with territorial exclusivity. The perception of globalisation has been popularised by a number of intellectuals, among them Ohmae. However, it mainly deals with the erosion of territorial exclusivity, rather than the sovereignty of the nation-state, since states are more willing to concede the former rather than the latter of the two powers, especially if the economic gains loss of territorial exclusivity is substantial. The state remains the dominant player in the creation of these entities; it maintains ultimate authority over

management. None of these experiments has led to a dilution of sovereignty, and the process of their creation has not exceeded the state control the role of middle man of the nation -states.

Moreover, experience shows that these entities resulted in no reduction of sovereignty on the part of those who are involved (Wang, 2004).

Then, it is easy to exaggerate the impact of globalisation, especially in its economic form, in relation to the erosion of sovereignty at a time when it is under attack from a variety of sources including Initially, the tradition of the "just war" which argues, among other things, for the right of the international community to intervene in the internal affairs of states whose leaders are incapable of protecting the rights of their citizens or accused an abuse of power. The end of the Cold War has seen the proliferation of ideas and instruments in this field, including the concept of humanitarian interposition at the base of the protection of the UN, led by the United States, to against Kurds in northern Iraq. In fact, today, the most important discussions on the relevance of sovereignty focus on the issue of interposition multilateral rather than economic globalisation. Finally, and perhaps most important is that the perception of the "end of the nation-state" ignores the role played by the states themselves in the process of globalisation and adaptation needs and their demands (Garland, 1996).

The ideal of sovereignty was fixed in the public imagination of the people because it is the fruit of the struggle of individual men and women for freedom, national independence and dignity of the person. The history of capitalist globalisation has largely been the history of the defence of the sovereignty of the oppressed nations. That globalisation has elapsed governed by an insurmountable contradiction between the objective tendency of convergence and unity of national economies into an international system and a forced, violent and rapacious that it has

been accomplished. This process has been inherent political colonisation and domination of weaker nations by stronger and the division of the world, by different imperialist blocs.

Neoliberal globalisation disarms the people of the capitalist periphery, and passing to her and turns into a mirage sovereignty. In practice, they subvert its most cherished values and humanity is reduced to the level of customer and supplier cheap neoliberal market. The New World Order is advocating a massive re-colonisation of the planet, which lies in the consolidation of economic dependence structure in order to strip the nation-states of the direction of their economies and control of their resources. An inherent to this new order is constituted annexation strategies, such as the FTAA, which apply different hegemonic blocs to "protect" their areas of influence (Kranser, 2001). A reinforcement of this policy is found in the theory of "limited sovereignty" is not simply the negation of the other's power and the imposition of imperialist domination. The restriction of the attributes of sovereignty occurs not only in the economic field, but also in other vital areas of functioning of the state as are the political and legal. Under the cloak of limited sovereignty spreads and executes the idea of "humanitarian" intervention in defence of human rights, and the adoption of extraterritorial laws that allow jailing and prosecuting political figures, qualified by the rulers of rule of tyrants and human rights abusers (Kaldor, 2003).

Another significant dimension to consider in the analysis of globalisation-sovereignty relationship in the world today is that of culture. What about imposing neoliberal globalisation is the cultural levelling of peoples, based on the American way of life, alter and subvert the national values of the subject of spirituality, their internal order, fostering egalitarian patterns of production and consumption of the arts, literature, science, etc. This trend puts the nation in a state of cultural impoverishment, which is further exacerbated by cuts in funding for education

and development of national art industries (film, television, literature), all of which is a way of violating the sovereignty of people (Wang, 2004).

## Conclusion

Globalisation can probably contribute to the deterioration of the sovereignty of Asian States, although the extent of this erosion can be exaggerated and that a distinction should be made between the erosion of the sovereignty and territorial exclusivity dilution which forms the real basis "of the theory of the end of" nation-states ". Furthermore, despite the risk of loss of sovereignty, the state in Asia has not been reluctant actor in the scenario of globalisation. Rather, it was an active participant seeking to take advantage of globalisation, despite mixed results, to extend its power and influence. Strategic benefits of globalisation are well understood in the region, as its implications for the survival of regimes. As long as the two are not in conflict, the attraction of globalisation continue to be top concerns resulting from actual or alleged loss of sovereignty.

In summary it can be said that the concepts most affected by the conflicts generated by the processes of integration and disintegration within the framework of neoliberal globalisation are the nation-state and national sovereignty. In fact it is producing a redefinition of the traditional notion of sovereignty, until recently focused on the power of the state and the defence of a specific territory.

### References

- D. Held (N.A.). "Democracy: From City to State a Cosmopolitan Order?", *Political Studies*, vol. 40 (Special Issues): 32-34
- Garland, David (1996). "The limits of the Sovereign state: strategies of crime in contemporary society." *The British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 36(4): 448-449.
- K. Ohmae (1995), *The End of the Nation State*, New York, The Free Press:136.
- Kaldor, Mary (2003). "The idea of global civil society." *International Affairs*, 79(3): 583-593.
- Kranser, Stephen D. (2001). "Sovereignty." *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 122: 20-29.
- L. Panitch (1996), "Rethinking the Role of the State", in JH Mittleman (ed .), *Globalisation: Critical Reflections , The International Political Economy Yearbook* , vol. 9: 84-85
- Wang, Guigo (2004). "The impact of Globalisation on State Sovereignty." *Chinese Journal of International Law*, Vol. 3(2): 473-483.
- Wolf, martin (2001): "Will the nation state survive globalisation?." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 80(1): 187-190.