

© 2020 Harry Cephass Charsmar

This is an open access article distributed under the CC-BY 3.0 License.

Sovereignty vs Globalization: Indispensable Discourse due to Relationship

Harry Cephass Charsmar
Stockholm University

ABSTRACT

Over the decades, scholarly discourses on sovereignty and globalization have been produced following various theories and numerous debates about the strength and weakness of the sovereign nation-state and globalization. In this paper, the various theories on the discourse of sovereignty and globalization are traced and placed into four categories as: contending paradigm, globalization paradigm, transformation paradigm and complementary paradigm. Both concepts, sovereignty and globalization, are explored by adopting the methodological framework, sources of explanation. The argument is that there is an intricate relationship between these concepts. To determine the relationship between sovereignty and globalization, three world systems were examined and it revealed that, globalization is born of the sovereign nation-state and that globalization can only be asserted in the current sovereign world system and not the ones preceding it. The overall conclusion is that globalization emerged as a result of sovereignty and since the discourse of sovereignty and globalization is about the same space and its inhabitants, they are bound to be discursively set against each other if the discourse focusses solely on the phenomena seen as globalization. The forces of globalization and sovereignty need to be further researched into to be able to tell where they are leading us.

Keywords: Sovereignty, globalization, sovereign nation-state, relationship, suzerain world, world without borders.

Harry Cephass Charsmar, Department of Education, Stockholm University. Email: cheerfully@zoho.com.

Introduction and Background

The question, what a sovereign nation-state is, remains a dispute in political discourse, however, the debate regarding the strength and weakness of the sovereign nation-state in relation to globalization continues unabated. Numerous books, papers and articles have been produced over the past decades on the sovereign nation-state's position and strength in an age that is deemed unprecedentedly globalizing. In this paper, the various debates about the sovereign nation-state and globalization are traced and categorised into four paradigms as: **Globalization paradigm**: which claims the demise of the sovereign nation-state due to globalization. **Contending paradigm**: this contends that the sovereign nation-state remains as strong as before. **Transformation paradigm**: this argues that globalisation is transforming the current world political order. **Complementary paradigm**: which maintains that globalization is a complement to the sovereign nation-state.

The discourse of sovereignty and globalisation has become very important in international relations (IR) studies over the past decades due to the growing anxiety of a contingent “post new world order” – a transformation that may furnish “the citizen” with multiple sources of authority or as some anticipate, a shift of authority. Nonetheless, a close look at the sovereignty and globalization discourse shows that very important aspects that generate better understanding of the discourse have gained little or no attention. One of these aspects is the relationship between sovereignty and globalization. While the debates on sovereignty and globalization are centred on the normative – general acceptance and practice of the phenomena – little attention has been given to the relationship between sovereignty and globalization. Overlooking the relationship between sovereignty and globalization has led to the aggravation of the debate and the resultant diverse paths over the past decades. Hence it is imperative to generate a different understanding of the sovereignty and globalization discourse. Thus, the aim of this paper is to generate a different understanding of how the sovereign nation-state and globalization are related to each other and as such contribute to the ongoing discourse on sovereignty and globalization in international relations and politics. This different understanding is how sovereignty and globalization are related. By giving careful attention to this aspect, a better understanding is generated in the discourse and useful results reached, paving the way forward for the discourse of sovereignty and globalization.

For the analysis, the following hypotheses will lead and guide the discussion.

1. The relationship between the sovereign nation-state and globalization is that, globalization is intricately encapsulated in the very composition of the sovereign nation-state.
2. Sovereignty and globalization emerged as indispensable discourse due to the relationship between them.

Globalization

Numerous theories exist on state sovereignty and globalization. However, as introduced above, the prevailing theories classified into four major categories as paradigms are vital to this paper. The first is the *globalisation* paradigm, which claims the demise of sovereignty of the nation-

state by globalisation due to the state's inability to control its own economy. According to the globalization paradigm, this implies, lost of ownership over vital national sources of the economy like, national companies transforming into multi-national companies and further into transnational companies (Reich 1991). The revolution in communication, the so-called global culture, the homogeneity among world societies – that is, differences between the various world societies are reducing, hence shrinking the space between them through the speed of technology and as such giving way to a cosmopolitan society, and the globalization of politics. Regarding the control of the national economy, this paradigm claims that, governments are at the mercy of Multinational corporations (MNCs) and Transnational Corporations (TNCs) since they play a critical role in the economy through the decision they make about investment, employment and trade. (Beck 1999; Ohmae 1995; Castells 1996, 1998; Scholte 2000). Globalization has been enhanced by borders (Carpenter 2019)

The second is the *contending* paradigm, this contends that; the sovereign nation-state remains the main actor in world politics and that the present international economy is not unprecedented but rather it is a long historical process. This paradigm also argues that, international economy was more opened in the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century than in the globalizing age. Globalization effects are very concentrated within the developed world and the flow of finance from the developed to the undeveloped world is not really taking place but instead, direct investment is mainly among the developed world. The contending theory claims that, national economies have not been lost due to globalization, since most companies remain multinational and that the transition from multinational to transnational companies is not the greatest interest of existing companies. Accordingly, world economy is not global, if global entails the whole world. Thus, the state is as powerful as before (Hirts and Thompson 1996, Hilleiner 1996, 1999).

The third is *transformation* paradigm. This paradigm deems globalization as a challenge to the nation-state. Though it conceives globalization as a reality of the contemporary world, it does not claim demise of sovereignty by the nation-state, but rather globalization of politics where the distinction between domestic and foreign affairs loses its value. The transformation paradigm is rather new compare to the first two but challenges both of them by postulating that, both the globalization and contending paradigms misconstrue the contemporary world through their reading of the phenomena of globalization. According to the transformation paradigm, globalisation can be placed on a continuum of local, national and regional. On one end of the continuum, the social and economic relations and networks organized on local and/or national bases are located and on the other end, social and economic relations and networks, which are organized on the wider scale of regional and global, interact.

In an attempt to make sense of global phenomena, the transformation paradigm introduced the terminology; “spacio-temporal” as the means by which globalization is to be understood. Spacio-temporal implies four things, first: *stretching* of social, political and economic activities across frontiers in a manner that they would have significant effect on individuals and communities in distance places. Second: it means *intensification* or growing magnitude of interconnectedness in

almost every sphere of social existence from the economic to the ecological. Third: it means, *accelerating pace* of global interactions and processes as the evolution of worldwide system of transport and communication increases the velocity with which specific phenomena move. Forth: it means, the *growing extensity, intensity, and velocity* of global interactions are associated with a deepening of the local and global enmeshment. According to the transformation paradigm, these are the four ways globalization can be viewed and any historical measurement of the phenomena must involve extensity, intensity, velocity and impact.

In the view of this paradigm, globalization of politics has deflated the cushions that protect the internal against the external rendering the formal distinction of the two rather void, thus global politics needs to be reread. In this respect contemporary globalization sets the condition and determines the open doors for governing the nation-state. Leaning towards a more liberal position, this paradigm argues that the contending paradigm's reading of *globalization* as *universal* is misconception, since the phenomena are rather asymmetrical¹ and implies inclusion and exclusion (Held and McGrew 2000, McGraw 2005).

The fourth, *complementary* paradigm presents globalization as a complement rather than a contending force to the sovereign state. According to this paradigm, the global and national are interdependent principles of organization and not antinomies and the two strengthen each other through national and international institutions (Weiss 1999, Sassen 1999, Hobson and Ramesh 2002). This paradigm came from two separate theories. The first is that of Hobson and Ramesh, which is partly built on Wendt's view² of the relationship between state and social organization of any given society. Hobson and Ramesh place the emphasis on the content of global society, which they express as a complement to the state. As they put it, "States are purposeful agents that shape and determine the global system in which they reside and, conversely, that the global system shapes states" (Hobson and Ramesh 2002). Accordingly, the global realm is not just a realm of constrain but also a realm of resources which the nation-state as agent exploits or be constrained by.

The second is by Weiss and Sassen who share a similar view but from different angles. They conclude that, global networks have been strengthened on the bases of national and international institutions rather than they weakening or displacing national and international institutions and that, global networks and national and international institutions sustain each other as they coexist. For example, the strategic space in which global processes are embedded and the mechanism through which new legal forms viable for implementation of globalisation are often national or part of the national state institution. According to them, globalization is a partial and limited process and does not so much undermine national capacity of wealth creation than has increased the need for it. In this, Weiss and Sassen mean, the infrastructure that makes possible hypermobility of financial capital at the global scale is embedded in various national territories. Admitting that political interdependence is growing, they deem it not as elimination of the territorial principle but rather the taming of territorial organization. In a similar vein, they argue that global dynamics are partially embedded in national territories in the context of exclusive territorial authority. Diversity has increased they claim, during the Cold War regime as a result of

countries and regions accepting and strengthening one another and as such, international cooperation has flourished at the expense of homogeneity and imposing uniformity. Their conclusion is thus, globalisation and the sovereign nation-state cannot be conceptualised as antinomies but rather as complement to each other.

Sovereignty, State and Nation

These concepts, Sovereignty, State and Nation are part of the core discussion of this paper. Hence, an overview of them is warranted in order for the reader to follow and comprehend the analysis and discussion of this work. Given that sovereignty is the concept that gives meaning to nation and state in the discourse of political theory as well as legal and political philosophy, and further that sovereignty as a concept has evolved and has been defined differently, a thorough presentation of the concept and its use over time is warranted. After this State and Nation are presented.

Sovereignty

Tracing the concept sovereignty back to its origin, Christendom, the rudimentary meaning of sovereignty is to have absolute right, control, rule, authority, and power to do as pleased. In Christendom God is sovereign for He is the creator of all things. He decides the times and the seasons, He has the destiny of all things in His hand, and He determines the beginning and the end when He chooses. He takes council with no one. He has absolute rule over all creation. He seeks not and needs not recognition from anyone to confirm His sovereignty since He has no coequal. The degree of His sovereignty is immutable. Finally, God is sovereign *over* all and not *among* other Powers and principalities. In a work “*Genealogy of Sovereignty*”³ Bartelson (1993), traces in a chronological series the source and locus of sovereign authority ranging from God to king and from king to man. He further notes, “The very term sovereignty was not present within political discourse until Beaumanoir introduced it in the thirteenth century”.⁴ Thus, the root of sovereignty as a concept introduced and adopted into political and legal philosophy stems from Christendom, the prevailing knowledge during the middle ages. As Bartelson notes,

The ultimate source of medieval authority was laid down in the Petrine commission, according to which Christ had instituted the universal body of the faithful and handed it over to St Peter and his successors, who-according to the doctrine- were designated to rule over as well as to represent and personalize this mystical reality. The source of all authority, were in term of papal *plenitudo potestatis* or lay *imperium, gubernaculum* or *majestas*, was divine; all legitimate power descended from God downwards. According to Matthew⁵,

Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church...And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatever thou shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.⁶

In an earlier work by Ernst Kantorowicz *The King's Two Bodies*, (1957) a description of a profound transformation in the concept of political authority over the course of the Middle Ages is made. In this, the concept of the body of Christ evolved into a notion of two bodies, where one is the *corpus naturale*, the consecrated host of the altar and the other, the *corpus mysticum*, the

social body of the church with its attendant administrative structure. This latter notion about collective social organization is that which has transformed political entities and the body of politic.⁷

Historically, the term *sovereignty* and similar terms were used in ancient times by Aristotle to identify the supreme authority within a community. During the late middle ages, the term became a political slogan used by territorial princes as an attempt to free themselves from the bondage of universal and temporal overlapping jurisdictions made by the Pope or emperor. The term became a tool to reduce overlapping personal jurisdiction and exclusive territorial jurisdiction, dispensing rivalling powers of nobility and estates with a relationship of immediate obedience between ruler and individual subjects.⁸

During the middle ages, sovereignty became a dominant concept whereby ideologies by Bodin and Hobbes acknowledge one supreme authority regardless of the existence of divine authority and natural law. However, Bodin sees the sovereign bound by the *law of God, the law of nature, and custom*, since natural law demands that promises ought to be kept and the sovereign must honour treaties. Hobbes on the other hand, put the sovereign above the law in that he is the only one who can interpret the law of God and the law of nature. Thus, at the very beginning of theorising sovereignty outside Christendom, the fathers of the theory that form the bases for the various definitions in political and legal philosophy view the practicality or empirical function of the concept differently. With time, the theory evolved from supreme and law of nature perspectives to the theory of the state of nature in order to transfer it from the hands of the sovereign kings and Pope into that of the **State** or **Nation**. Austin J. for example, postulates that the law properly understood emanated from one single source of authority untrammelled by any constraints. Bentham argues that natural law was a nonsensical concept. Thus, in Britain, the strife of the 17th century led to a political system in which authority was divided between king and parliament.⁹

Current use and definition of the concept sovereignty in political and legal philosophy stems from the theories of Bodin and Hobbes, deduced from the Christendom definition as can be seen above. It is vital however to note that all of the attributes ascribe to the “Sovereign God” are impossible to ascribe to a state, nation, powers and authorities or any other principality. Hence, the varying definitions and the contending discourse of sovereignty. In the encyclopaedia of philosophy for example, sovereignty is defined within the framework of legal and political philosophy as the attribute by which a person or institution exercises ultimate authority over every other person or institution in its domain.¹⁰ Very important to note in this definition is “**ultimate**”, and not absolute as ascribe to the Sovereign God in Christendom. Hence, the sovereign nation-state lacks all the attributes of sovereignty. The attributes that lay the foundation for sovereignty are very vital for the discussions of the concept, given that all of the Christendom’s attributes of sovereignty are not realizable in political or any human society or context. However, the notion of the presence of all of these attributes in the discourse of sovereignty is vivid implicitly. For example, the attribute, “no equal” may apply to political organs, e.g. “a state, nation” only internally, given that a state has no other higher authority over

its own realms, but it is externally equal with other states. “Absolute” is another attribute that perplexes the discourse of sovereignty in political and legal philosophy. Note that in Christendom, God’s absolute sovereignty is in every way and manner, since the realm has no internal or external and as such no equal. States or nations have definitely no external absolute power and even total internal absoluteness of states and nations is debatable and this debate rests at the heart of the “sovereignty globalization” discourse. The overwhelming perplexity of the concept sovereignty has led some researchers to raise the question if the concept should continue to have a place in political vocabulary and if the concept is still suitable for classifying and describing political and legal developments and making them understandable (Volk 2019). Others have called it Organized Hypocrisy¹¹

Nonetheless, modern states or nation-states have been enshrined with sovereignty since Westphalia and they operate within the realms of the various definitions. The new question that the concept sovereignty encounters in current political and IR theories is; how to define it in the era of globalization when applied to the nation-state. New attempts to define sovereignty in the era of globalization have led to concepts such as, “post-Westphalian sovereignty,” “late sovereignty,” “pooled sovereignty,” “divisible sovereignty” “multiple sovereignty” and “disaggregated sovereignty” (Volk 2019).

State

State as a concept ranges back to antiquity and the formation of states – though historical narratives slightly differ from one another like, the shift from scattered society to gathered society – can be viewed as have followed a *natural*¹² cause being it rough or smooth (Spruyt 1996, Buzan and Little 2000). As far back as Plato’s time, “state” was advocated maybe with a different conception or perhaps a notion meant for the Greek communities. "State" etymologically originates from the medieval “state” or (regal chair) upon which the head of state (usually a monarch) would seat. In modern usage state, as a concept, also denotes the government, the ruling body of a country, e.g. state apparatus or matters of state as terminologies (Willets 2005:428).

States as geographical entities were associated with cities or what is normally call city-states. City-states as a new unit of world social structure emerged as a result of societies settling down at specific areas. In this, a dominant structure of human society, based on kinship was ceded by a new development whereby people broke kinship ties and moved to urban areas and as a result, centralized societies that could be considered as states emerged (Buzan and Little 2000: Ch. 8). City-states could stand as autonomous units or be the centre from which broader spectrums of units are managed. The problem city-states had faced in the course of world history is that they suffered lost to empires from time to time but at the collapse of empires city-states revive again. They had the tendency to survive even during the rise and reign of larger units. Spurred on by the political structure they form, city-states prevailed even in an era dominated by empires. Mann’s estimation of the early city-states of Sumeria is a population of about 10,000 – 20,000 controlling a zone of about 10 – 3 km in diameter.¹³ Continuous warfare was a common

experience of city-state and they had the capacity to take on empires as was in the case of the Greek city-states against the Persians.

The structure and nature of city-states is that they were politically autonomous, not isolated as single units but were part of a system of states and mostly found in a civilization area. The best-known city-state systems are those of the classical Greece while those of the urban cities of Africa during the period 1500 AD are less known (Buzan and Little 2000:174). However, there are features that distinguish states and their relationship with one another over time. A classical work on state systems identifies two types of relationships: first, the Suzerain state system, which is marked by permanent relationship and more or less autonomy to some degree in terms of unique claims. Notwithstanding, there is a hegemonic authority among them which asserts unique and overall claim that the others formally or tacitly accept. The early Chinese states of about 335 B.C. and even the Roman Empire with its universal claim of authority and the duty to protect and disseminate the universal religion of Christianity are some examples. Second, the international state system characterised by full autonomy with no external authority or hegemon. The relationship among the states here is based on full assertion of sovereignty and recognition of each other. It is only the modern state system that falls within the second category (Wight 1977. ch.1).

Nation

Like state, nation is a controversial concept as well. Researchers on nation have not come to any common agreement as to what a nation is. The etymology shows that, the term “nation”, derived from the Latin word *natio* and originally describes the colleagues in a college or students, for example students at the University of Paris who were all born within a pays, spoke the same language and expected to be ruled by their own familiar law. Thus, the notion of ethnic groups as a term is also synonymously used in association with the original word. As far as records are concerned, the concept was first used in 968 to refer to a “Land” by Liutprand, bishop of Cremona, stated as follows: "The Land": I answered, "which you say belongs to your empire belongs, as the nationality and language of the people proves, to the kingdom of Italy"(Mayr-Harting 2001). With time nation became a synonym for states, as can be seen in most of the social science literature.

Since the dawn of modernity state and nation has been normatively conceptualised as sovereign – land of people with a particular origin – albeit the disagreement in the discourse. Yet, the concept nation has attained stronger forces as a political identity through *ism* – that is, nationalism. Nationalism as a political identity is perhaps the strongest political force in the world today. Even in its state of the *ism*, the notion of sovereignty is not devoid but rather articulated as the backbone of the true identity of the people. However, a colloquial European expression cognises the concept as follows:

“A Nation”, so goes a rueful European saying, “is a group of people united by a common error about their ancestry and a common dislike of their neighbours” (Deutsch 1969:3).

This section presents the analytical tools for the analysis and in the analysis, exploration and critical analysis are employed. A basic concept of analysis in IR theory: **sources of explanation** is adopted as a guide for the exploration. The basic idea is by Buzan and Little (2000 Ch. 4), but used in a different perspective in this work. Buzan and Little used sources of explanation as a framework to link IR theory to world history, but these are used in this work to link sovereignty to globalization. The notion behind this approach is to be able to create a vivid picture of how the main concepts of this paper – sovereignty and globalization – relate to each other, and to pave a way for overarching the two concepts. As will be discussed later, finding the relationship and overarching both concepts is the key to understanding how sovereignty and globalization are related. **Sources of explanation** encompass variables that explain behaviour and in IR study, **process, interaction capacity** and **structure** are the three sources of explanation commonly found in the discourse. Process, interaction capacity and structure form the key to theory on any level of analysis. Globalization theories mostly operate at the system level using process and interaction capacity to explain the effects of global phenomena (Buzan and Little 2000: 77-8).

Process: In a system the dynamics of interactions – that is, the interaction capacity among units produces evidence of the pattern of processes. Processes provide the archetype of action and reactions that can be observed among units that form the system. Those observable in the international system range from: fighting, political recognition, organizing, identity formation, trading, negotiating, signalling and cooperating. Processes are applicable at all levels of analysis as a source of explanation. An aspect positive in process formation is the work of units to try to overcome the negative effects of anarchy through international arrangements that enable them to seek joint gains by means of political stability and peace or trade, resource management and welfare (Buzan and Little 2000: 79). **Interaction capacity:** In general, it involves organization capabilities, transportation and communication – that is, the amount of goods and information that can be sent over any distance, innovation, technology and institutions governed by rule and norms between units and within a system. The speed at which these can be done is a determining factor especially when discussing globalization. For example, the core argument of globalization theory against the notion that globalization is nothing new is that; the rate and intensity of global phenomena are currently unprecedented. Interaction capacity captures both the physical and social aspects of capabilities that are system or unit-wide. (Buzan and Little 2000:80). **Structure:** Structure in this sense follows the IR wider spectrum from the understanding that, systems are more than the sum of their parts. To a high degree, structure shows that, units are not only formed by their internal processes and interactions, but also by the shape of their environment. The focal point of structure is on units and it involves how they stand in relation to each other, how they are arranged in a system and thus different from each other (Waltz 1997). Buzan and Little argue that a high degree of understanding is gained by considering structure in the economic and social sector when studying international systems (Buzan and Little 2000: 84).

Reasons for the Sovereignty Globalisation Discourse

Possible reasons that call for the discourse of globalization and sovereignty are analysed in order to generate understanding of the contention about these concepts. **Sources of explanation**, as explained above, specifically: **interaction capacity, process** and **structure** will be employed to

guide the analysis. Both the theoretical and empirical aspects will be discussed. The empirical discusses how the forces of globalization are manifested in diverse ways. The theoretical departs from the hypotheses of this paper as:

The relationship between the sovereign nation-state and globalization is that, globalization is intricately encapsulated in the very composition of the sovereign nation-state.

Sovereignty and globalization emerged as indispensable discourse due to the relationship between them.

These Hypotheses are based on the notions that can be deduced from the discourse of sovereignty and globalization this far. For the concern of this paper, the concentration is on the four paradigms introduced above.

To say that globalization is encapsulated in the sovereign nation-state, means, it is intricately embedded in the sovereign nation-state. As an active force, globalization is manifested in the sovereign nation-state, depending on the position and nature of the sovereign nation-state at a specific time. In order to paint a clear picture throughout this analysis, the theoretical part explores three different worlds over time in human history.

Three Worlds

As can be seen from the short overview of both **State** and **Nation**, both concepts came into use as the world develops and take different forms and structures. Going back to the hypotheses above, the question now is; how did globalization come into the picture? To test the hypotheses and answer this question, let us look at three different worlds. First: a world without borders; second: a world with borders but without sovereign rights – the **suzerain** state system. Third: a world with borders and sovereign rights – the sovereign state system.

The World without Borders

According to the theory of state formation, before the emergence of states, the world was without fixed borders and movement was without human hindrances (Buzan and Little 2000). Taking this first world as the departing point, it is logical to conclude that this world was global, since it was opened and without human hindrances to movements or flows. However, the first challenge that a conclusion as this would face especially by the **globalization** paradigm¹⁴ is that, an open world without boundaries does not mean globalization. This challenge, to the conclusion that globalization does not only mean openness holds. Given that globalization theory defines globalization as not just openness, but also, the interaction that is taking place in the world at large and how the interaction is being intensified and affecting space and time, in that, a cause at a geographical point on the globe has effect on other places in the world and as a result, opening up the borders of the world. Accordingly, globalization theory denies us any departure from a world antecedent a state system and specifically the sovereign state system.

The denial to assert globalization in the world without borders can be explained by applying **sources of explanation** presented above. Interaction capacity, process and structure are the three main sources of explanation applied in this work. Although this first world was a world with no

borders and was all opened, interaction capacity – that is, transportation, communication and organization – was lacking. Due to the lack of interaction capacity, processes – that is, the pattern of actions and reactions that can be observed among the units that make up a system – was absent as well. Since there was no “system”, structure, cannot be discussed in the sense that structure is applied in this work. As we can see, the only concept in the definition of globalization that applies in the world without borders is openness.

As can be understood from the following definitions of globalization: *Deterritorialization or a spread of supraterritoriality – reconfiguration of geography, so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distance and territorial borders* (Scholte 2000); *The intensity of global flows such that states and societies become increasingly enmeshed in a world wide system and network of interaction* (Held & McGrew 2000, McGrew 2005); openness is one of the core arguments of the globalization paradigm. Although a world prior to any state system, especially, the sovereign state system, does not have the problem of openness, it is not able to assert globalization. As have been explained above, interaction capacity and processes must be present to be able to assert globalization. Given that this first world is already opened, the question of openness is not the problem for the world without borders but rather interaction capacity and process. A concept that describes this world best is, **open world**.

The Suzerain States World

Taking a step further, to look at a different world with borders but without sovereign rights; a system that Martin Wight (1977:24) calls suzerain state system, openness was the ideal situation as well. Though there were boundaries to some degree in the suzerain state system, the boundaries were weak and sovereign right or independence was not the bases on which the boundaries operated, however autonomous they were. What classifies suzerain state system is the hegemonic authority, that is, one state is able to claim unique and overall rule to which all other states willingly or forcefully bow. Citizenship was emphasized on the bases of empire or kingdom than that of a specific state. For example, within the Roman Empire all were Roman citizens. Movement and communication were open within and even to the outside world. The system of rule was different in character whereby; one judicial authority overlaps the other in most cases. There were no real boundaries in the suzerain state system and the question of sovereignty was at best disputable. The logic of organization even in cases where jurisdiction might be claimed over a given area, territory was not the means of defining a society (Spruyt 1994:35). Kingdom or empire borders and state borders were not that fixed geographically but based on concurring and claim over areas.

In the suzerain world, interaction capacity was much higher than the first world discussed above. As Wight (1977:25) notes, “during the latter half of the second millennium B.C., the revolution in communication and invention of cuneiform writing seems to have produced a state system....” Processes like; war, Babylonian becoming the *lingua franca*, treaties of commerce and dynastic alliance were also in progress by this time. However, the ability to intensify the interaction capacity was lacking – that is, the means of communicating over long distances within the

shortest possible time. The structure of the system, which will be discussed later, as already explained above, was different compare to the sovereign state system.

Thus, a description that better befits the suzerain world is cosmopolitan society. Given that; one: the suzerain world lacks a true territorial identity. Two: it was not really closed and movement and communication were less controlled. Although it was opened and to some degree has the interaction capacity, the suzerain world lacked the intensification abilities such as, extensity, velocity and impact due to factors like technology and geography. These limitations deny the suzerain state system as well of being really qualified as a proper globalized world. In a world such as the suzerain, causes and their effects may be known within but their spread was at a lower pace. Knowledge of the world was very much limited to the kingdoms and empires.

The Sovereign Nation-states World

Finally, looking at the sovereign “nation-states world”, this emerged by closing up the open worlds discussed above and yet, it is only at this time that we can asserts globalization in full-fledged according to the theory of globalization. Globalization theory does not start with openness but rather ends with it. Once again, taking a close look at some of the definitions of globalization makes clear the postulation that, globalization theory does not start with openness but rather ends with it. Modelski (1972) defines globalization as, a process of bringing historical societies together. Deterritorialization or a spread of supraterritoriality, that is reconfiguration of geography so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial borders (Scholte 2000). Held and McGrew (2000), whose definition is one of the corner stones of the globalization paradigm states: “...it is intensity of global flows such that states and societies become increasingly enmeshed in a worldwide system and network of interaction”. Borders have become partially liberated from territory (Carpenter 2019). All of these definitions presuppose a closed world, a world that is divided and has taken a new course in a direction different from the open worlds discussed above.

Again, turning to sources of explanation, **structure**, shows that, the organization of the sovereign state system, whether states, regimes, institutions, corporations or agencies, call for processes. **Processes** that can be observed in the sovereign state system are, for example: trading, fighting, negotiating, treaties, threatening etc. Though these processes are visible to some degree in the suzerain state system, the **interaction capacity** was law, compare to the sovereign state system. In the sovereign state system, the intensity and the acceleration of the interaction capacity opens up the system and the observed phenomenon is globalization. Thus, as globalization comes forth and partake in the system, the direction of the sovereign state changed to a reversing process or take diverse paths which “may lead” to cosmopolitan society as some argue. Arguments of this sort envisage not a cosmopolitan society as was in the suzerain state system but rather an open world with no hegemony. By applying sources of explanation, is it vivid that globalization is better assert in the sovereign state system than the first two worlds above. Nonetheless, sources of explanation do not give the whole explanation as to why globalization is embedded in the sovereign nation-state.

The other aspect of the explanation is that, sovereign nation-states as entities are at distance to each other. Not just geographical distance, as is the case of a country in relation to other countries but distances that can solely attain meaning through sovereignty. Physical borders of every nation-state show where the dividing line is, but it is sovereignty that gives meaning to any geographical territory called nation-state that is part of the international system. Sovereignty creates the necessary distance that allows for the discourse of globalization especially the aspect of being brought together. The key words in Held and McGrew (2000): *brought together and increasingly enmeshed*, can only be actualised if there are both spatial and geographical distances between the entities that are being brought together or enmeshed. Other definitions that keepsalive the globalization discourse is: Deterritorialization or a spread of supraterritoriality – reconfiguration of geography, so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distance and territorial borders (Scholte 2000). Borders have become partially liberated from territory (Carpenter 2019). These definitions are impossible to be applied to the world without borders and the suzerain world, since the social space in terms of territorial places, territorial borders did not exist and as such, no territorial distances. But, to the world of sovereign nation-states, these mappings and liberation from territory make possible the phenomena of globalization.

Accordingly, it is impossible to assert globalization without the sovereign nation-state system. The departure is not from an open world to a closed world and reversing to its starting point. But rather globalization departs from a world closed by sovereignty. Thus, a careful reading of the globalization theory would be: *the forces of sovereignty are no longer able to fully fortify the nation-state since an inner force, namely globalization, is erupting and interfering with the nation-state's forces of sovereignty, hence generating diversions in the manner nation-states operate*. This implies that the two-way discussion of the concepts, such as the sovereign state is made weak by globalization as seen in the literature is unable to capture a good overarching understanding of sovereignty and globalization. As Volk (2019) notes, the discourse has been reproduction of the same conceptual structure and these are rigid binary separation into internal/external, national/global, a container theory of space, and the need to search for supreme. A new understanding as discussed here is that; how the sovereign nation-state and globalization are related must be part the main source of the analysis. Given that it is this relationship that generates the diversion and the new modes of operations and functions in the nation-state and at the same time globally. This close relation between state sovereignty and globalization needs in-depth examination. However, it suffices now to justify the hypotheses of this paper as stated above that globalization is encapsulated in the sovereign nation-state and that Sovereignty and globalization emerged as indispensable discourse.

In conclusion, if globalization departs from sovereignty, then it is logical to conclude that sovereignty has given birth to globalization, which is a force from within and not outside. It is like a process where that which is born is carried on the inside of the one that gives birth to it, and in the fully ripe time it is born. That which comes forth can only be born if and only if, there is an organ to nurture it and bring it forth both by the force of the organ and the force of that which is to be born. This inner force opens up the sovereign nation-state to whatever the future

holds for the sovereign nation-state. Whatever this is, we can at the moment only speculate, nonetheless we can deduce from our understanding of the three world systems discussed in this paper that, this openness will not lead to the open worlds that preceded the closed world of sovereign nation-states.

It will take a careful research in order to draw any conclusion that may give a clear picture of the destination to which this new (but inner) force “*globalization*” is leading. As rightly stated in a recent study, more research is needed: *In the absence of Weberian, let alone Hobbesian state, we are compelled to rethink the structural form of the global. This is not a well-charted territory*” (Cerny and Prichard 2017). The international system, the international society and the world society (see Buzan 2004; Bull 1977; Wight 1977) of the sovereign nation-states’ world and new analysis of “**high**” and “**low**” politics (Cerny & Prichard 2017), need to be included in the research when determining the destination. To researchers like Bull, it would take both state and non-state actors to bring about any transformation. As he put it: the mere presence of actors in the international system other than states does not provide any indication of a trend towards a new medievalism (Bull 1977; 2002: 254). But researchers, who adhere to globalization, seem to argue that the presence of non-state actors only could bring about the change.

The Forces of Globalization

Having concluded that it would take careful research to tell where the forces of globalization are leading, there are enough manifestations of globalization forces that allow for the ongoing discourse on the subject. Globalization forces are not only opening up the sovereign nation-state but they are also restructuring domestic and external structures (Cerny and Prichard 2017; Ku and Yoo 2013; Sassen 1999). The processes of production in most cases have transgressed the contours of national borders over to arrays of relationships operating at different geographical points and organizational scales (Carpenter 2019; Dicken 1998). As a result, networks of accelerated transnational exchanges, new identities units and values are generated leading to new universes that share access to the same symbols, markets and commodities (Luke 1993:240). One of such universes is global technology and information. Innovation centres at this universe are being forced to bring out their innovation through the movement of scientists, engineers and managers among organisations and production systems (Castells 1996). However, the forces of globalization bear the dynamics that are beneficial to, or can be to the advantage of the sovereign nation-state as well. As can be observed, the presence of national governments and their use of economy as political tool generate regional differences in the global economy (Castells 1996). The dynamics of globalization forces are shown in two ways. First the openness as discussed above brings unity, by bringing the world together. Dividing forces of society that emanated through sovereignty are being taking away in certain realms while social links across sovereign borders are being created. One such realm is communication. As technology aids the advancement in communication, means of reaching other countries do not only increase but also becomes faster and for that matter cheaper. Within the economic sector for example, large segments of national economies have become much more exposed to global trade and capital flows than they have ever been and sovereign forces are vulnerable to these exposures (Baker,

Epstein and Pollin 1999; Rodrik 1997:9). However, the aspect of the exposure is ambiguous due to its positive and negative effects (Cerny and Prichard 2017; Root 2013).

The positive is that, through trade social contacts are widened across national borders with different societies having direct or indirect contacts with one another across the globe. Trade takes place outside the formal national and institutional arrangements in accordance with the possibilities that technology provides. For example, buying and selling via Internet opens up a country's market to greater diversities even down to the individual level. The effects of this generate new dynamics in the national structure of governance and policy. This is further discussed under the second way.

The second is globalization divides. By this, it means bringing conflicts concerning elementary beliefs regarding social organization in any given society and as a result forces that may stand to resolve the conflicts are weakened. As mention above trade dynamism that elevates new structures would call for new policies and structures to either regulate or contain the new moves. As trade or business in general opens the door to new opportunities in a country, social dimensions are recomposed. Consequently, in some cases, safety networks provided by ruling governments could be strengthened and in others weakened. Some social fabrics would gain new economic opportunities and some would seek to retain and strengthen their economic position by taking advantage of the opportunities that new technologies offer. In advanced industrial countries for example, the division is manifested in the widening gap between low skilled workers and the highly educated. Thus, in an all-increasing cost of maintaining welfare systems due to other causes such as the second demographic transition, social safety nets are made weak. As a result, national policies are revised and new dynamics generated in the structures of governance.

One of the forces that accounts for the process of the conflict as mentioned above is, the economic effect illustrated by Rodrik (1997). As he explains, *“An increase in openness makes domestic capital more responsive to change in international prices and correspondingly manifest the amplitude of the fluctuation in real wages at home. Hence labour becomes worse off due to increased exposure to risk, even if the main (expected) real wage remains unchanged”* (Rodrik 1997:89). In this sense the question of legitimacy is at stake as far as domestic markets are concerned, owing to the view that *“Markets are a social institution, and their continued existence is predicted on the perception that their process and outcomes are legitimate”* (Rodrik 1997:71). In the presence of globalization segments of the domestic market have the potential to break away while other areas of sovereign governance become fragile, which results to divides of domestic legitimacy (Barkawi and Laffey 2002; Cerny and Prichard 2017; Jara 2018). When this happens, those that benefit from globalization would work in favour of it while the losers would want something else. Tension is exacerbated among groups regarding fundamental beliefs with respect to social organisation, this weakens the forces that would under normal circumstances mitigate and perhaps resolve the conflict through national debates and deliberation. A living example is the BREXIT, British effort to exit the European Union given

that the fraction that calls for exit sees globalization and regionalization as the threat to progress and economic development.

The tension is also played out at the international level, where global economy in some areas has shifted or is shifting from countries that use to dominate the economy to new emerging countries (Jara 2018). The new authority of international organizations like the World Trade Organization WTO also generates tension (Ku & Yoo 2013) As a result, tension mounts up in international cooperation given that countries that experience decline in their economy may turn to have less influential power on the international stage while emerging economies gain more influence. In cases where the magnitude of the reduction in economy is huge, the effects turn to bear on domestic economy where welfare and employment become victims. Hence, domestic tension and legitimacy as discussed above come to the fore of the internal debate. The forces of globalization are also manifested in the national policies and rules. As some argue, globalization has weakened the domestic decision-making process of ruling governments. As the argument goes, politicians are not able to make the type decision that is in line with their political views or the promises they make during political campaign due to globalization.

Conclusion

This paper has analysed the relationship between sovereignty and globalization and how the two concepts discursively are set against each other. The first part of the discussion took the theoretical assumption that globalization is encapsulated in the sovereign nation-state and therefore the discourse of both concepts is indispensable. The main argument is that globalization can only be realised through sovereignty. It is only through the geographical divide of the world that the postulations such as: the world is being brought together and enmeshed, and borders have become partially liberated from territory (Castells 1996, 1998; Carpenter 2019) can be asserted. Further discussed is; through processes and interaction capacity within the sovereign state system, forces are generated and the forces in their turn opens up the nation-states and the results are that which is called globalisation. The positive effect globalization has is that the world is brought together and new ways of organizing and operating domestically are generated. Albeit, negative effects could be generated internally regarding elementary believes of social organisation in a society. The overall conclusion is that globalization is born of sovereignty and since the discourse of sovereignty and globalization is about the same space and its inhabitants, they are bound to be set against each other discursively if only the trends of development are the focus of the discussion. The forces of globalization and sovereignty need to be further researched into to be able to tell where they are leading us.

The findings of this paper contribute chiefly to the sovereignty and globalization discourse in political and IR theory and generally to other areas like sociology, legal philosophy globalization studies and most of the social sciences where globalization is employed. What is new about this study is the notion that globalization is born out of sovereignty and they both have forces that interrupt each other and when the forces of globalization interfere with the nation-state's forces of sovereignty new paths are generated in the operations of the nation-state. These new paths in the operations of the nation-state can be seen at national and individual levels. At the national

level, networks of accelerated transnational exchanges at a rate faster than before and new means of organizing take place. For example, states can today implement border crossings at the source of movement and new local and global border appearing in regulatory systems (Carpenter 2019). At the individual level, new identities, units and values are generated leading to new universes that share access to the same symbols, markets and commodities. Technology and global information are some of such universes.

References

- Baker, Dean. Epstein, Gerald. Pollin Robert. 1999. *Globalization and Economic Policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barkawi, Tarak. Laffey, Mark. 2002. Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 31:1; 109-127.
- Bartelson, Jens: *A Genealogy of sovereignty*. University of Stockholm Department of political Science, 1993.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1999. "What is Globalization?" In Held David & McGrew Anthony. (eds), 2000. *The Global Transformations Reader An introduction to the Global debate*. Polity Press.
- Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical society, A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Bull, Hedley. 2002. *The Anarchical society, A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: PALGRAVE.
- Buzan, Barry. 2004. *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Construction of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, Barry and Little, Richard. 2000. *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carpenter, Michael. Understanding Territoriality through a BIG Reading of Agnew's Globalization and Sovereignty. *Borders in Globalization Review* Volume 1, Issue 1 (Fall 2019): 123-126 <https://doi.org/10.18357/bigr11201919267>.
- Castells, Manuel. 1998. *End of Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Information Age*. Vol. 1: *The Rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Cerny, Philip and Prichard Alex 2017. The new anarchy: Globalization and fragmentation in world politics, *Journal of International political theory* Vol. 13:3; 378-394.
- Deutsch, Karl W. 1969. *Nationalism and its Alternatives*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Deutsch, Karl W. 1966. *Nationalism and Social Communication*. First M. I. T. Press.
- Dicken, Peter. 1998. *Global Shift: Transforming the Economy*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Encyclopedia of Public and International Law, Volume 4 ed. Peter Macalister Smith. Elsevier science 2000 North Holland.
- Ford, J.D.. Sovereignty, 1998, doi:10.4324/9780415249126-T024-1. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Taylor and Francis, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/sovereignty/v-1>.
- Held, David and McGrew, Anthony (eds). 2000. *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Polity Press.
- Hilleiner, Erik. 1996. "Is the Financial Liberalization Trend Likely to be Reversed?" In Boyer, Robert Drache, Daniel. (eds), *States Against Markets*. New York: Routledge
- Hilleiner, Erik. 1999. "Sovereignty Territoriality and the Globalisation of Finance." In Smith David A., Solinger, Dorothy, Topic, Steven C. (eds), *State and Sovereignty*. London: Routledge.

- Hirst, Paul and Thompson, Grahame. 2000. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hirst, Paul and Thompson, Grahame. 1996. *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hobson, John M, Ramesh, M. 2002. Globalisation Makes State What States Make of it *New Political Economy* Vol.7, No. 1.
- International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science; Volume 22.ed. Neil Smelser, Paul B. Baltes, Elsevier Science Kidlington 2001 Oxford.
- Jara, Alejandro. 2018. The Future of Globalization Under New Political realities. *Global Journal of Emerging Market Economies* 9:1-3;75-85.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 1999. "Globalisation and Sovereignty." in Smith David A., Solinger, Dorothy, Topic, Steven C. (eds), *State and Sovereignty*. London: Routledge.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 2001. *Problematic Sovereignty*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ku, Julian G, Yoo John, 2013 Globalization and Sovereignty, 31 Berkeley J. Int'l L.210.
Available at: https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/faculty_scholarship/574.
- Mayr-Harting Henry 2001. Liudprand of Cremona's Account of His Legation to Constantinople (968) Ottonian Imperial Strategy, *The English Historical Review* Vol. 116: 467, 539-556.
- McGrew, Anthony. 2005. "Globalization and Global Politics." In, Baylis, Jonh. and Smith Steve. (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Modelski, George. 1972. *Principles of World Politics*. New York: Free Press.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. 1990. *The Borderless World*. London and New York: Collins.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. 1993. "The Rise of the Region State" *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 72:2;79-87.
- Philpott, Daniel, "Sovereignty", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/sovereignty/>.
- Reich, Robert. 1991. *The Work of Nations*. Great Britain: Simon & Schuster Ltd.
- Rodrik, Dani. 1997. *Has Globalization Gone Too Far?* Institute for National Economics: Washinton, DC.
- Root, Hilton. 2013, *Dynamics Among Nations: The Evolution of Legitimacy and Development in Modern States*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1999. "Embedding the Global in the National." In Smith David A., Solinger, Dorothy, Topic, Steven C. (eds), *State and Sovereignty*. London: Routledge
- Scholte Jan Aart, 2000. *Globalisation a Critical Introduction*. PAIGRAVE Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Spruyt, Hendrik. 1996. *The Sovereign state and its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Volk, Christian. "The Problem of Sovereignty in Globalized Times." *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, (February 2019). doi:10.1177/1743872119828010.
- Waltz N. Kenneth *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw Hill, 1979.

- Weiss, Linda. 1999. "Globalization and National Governance: Antinomy or Interdependence?" *Review of International Studies* 25:3
- Wight, Martin. 1977. *System of States*. Leicester University Press.

Notes

¹ The asymmetric position hold by the transformation theory, leads us to a domain of political theory, namely, the world system theory where the world is rather structured into classes determined by wealth

² In Wendt's view, there are two ways in which society is organized. First: "human beings and their organization [e.g. the state] are powerful actors whose actions help to reproduce or transform the [domestic and global] society in which they live; and second: society [global/domestic] is made up of social relationships, which structure the interaction between these purposeful actors" (Wendt, 1984).

³ See Bartelson Jans, *Genealogy of Sovereignty* (Stockholm 1993) p. 3

⁴ Bartelson Jans, p. 78

⁵ See Matthew chapter 16:18-19, the King James version of the Bible

⁶ Bartelson, p. 82.

⁷See Philpott, Daniel, "Sovereignty", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/sovereignty/s>.

⁸ See Encyclopaedia of Public and International Law p. 503

⁹ See International Encyclopedia of the social and Behavioral science p. 14707

¹⁰ See Encyclopaedia of philosophy 1998, article by Ford D.J

¹¹ See Stephen D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999)

¹² Natural cause here implies that, people were not coerced to move from their scattered society to more populous areas but rather the change in society at the time was the attraction to moving.

¹³ See Buzan and Little (2000:147)

¹⁴ See above under theory, for the view of this paradigm