



## Sovereign States and Globalization in the New World Order

<sup>1</sup>Chinedu Okeke Ebenyi

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

*Corresponding Author's E-mail: neduebenyi2015@gmail.com.*

### Abstract

The increasing population and advances in technology are forcing states to be interdependent due to high rising demands for some uncommon solutions to such common problems such as diseases, economic depression, pollution, or some services as collective security, communication, transportation, weapons control and other advanced technologies. These developments in the world circle has become a source of worry as the world growing diversities, sophistication and organizational structure infuses integration and the expanding network of cultural unity in different parts of the world and has been a source of threat and insecurity globally. The integration superiority over all other authorities remains the exclusive source of new world order and globalization, the developments which place sovereignty under serious pressure as eroding of sovereign state is neither inevitable nor obviously desirable, this puzzle was necessarily analyzed. The framework of analysis chosen for the study is integration theory, is one of the most idealistic theory with the notions about how state sovereignty could be eroded. The study while employing historical research design adopted documentary method in the gathering of data and content analytical techniques was used for the analysis. The study found that international law; international organizations and diplomacy have been the major instruments of globalization in international search for new world order. The author concluded that the new world driven by globalization shall enhance more transnational integration of regional groupings of states and the number will increase, the continued cooperation in maintenance of universal or supper-national organization like United Nation can lead to the realization of international peace but end up in building supper-national organizational hegemony.

**Keywords:** Sovereign, State, Globalization, State system, World Order

**Citation of article:** Chinedu, O. E., (2022).Sovereign States and Globalization in the New World Order. *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies (AJPAS)*, 15(1):136-160.

**Date Submitted:** 19/04/2022 **Date Accepted:** 27/05/2022 **Date Published:** June, 2022

## **Introduction**

Historically, sovereignty as Bodin (1576) theorized in *De le Repulique*, published in Paris, is the supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law. Though, Bodin's sovereignty was based on royal absolutism which should not be restrained by any human authority while Grotius (1625) on *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* defined sovereignty as that power whose acts may not be made void by the acts of any other human will. Marshall (2002) statement in the *Schooner Exchange* case suggests, absolute state sovereignty was widely accepted as a description of the world's political organization in the aftermath of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648.

The traditional practices of international relations focuses on, states as states have power, both military and economic, that other institutions or individuals do not. Morgentau (1973) held that "the conception of a divisible sovereignty is contrary to logic and politically unfeasible. Marshall (2002) described sovereignty as the jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. Any restriction upon it, deriving validity from an external source, would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction, and an investment of that sovereignty to the same extent in that power which could impose such restriction (Schooner, 1999).

Sovereignty is often thought to be synonymous with Westphalia sovereignty. Westphalia sovereignty assumes the absolute control of nation-states over all conduct that occurs within their own territories. This conception of sovereignty may not always have prevailed, even among the nation-states themselves. Palmer and Perkins (2004) argued that sovereignty in its meaning of absolute, unlimited, and indivisible authority is incompatible with international law, perhaps with any law. Though, within a state's territorial jurisdiction, a nation's sovereignty is exclusive and absolute and limitation arises from international law or with the consent of the sovereign.

In historical reality, the world community is made up of all people everywhere, all of whom live in "sovereign" states that must co-exist on the same planet. This necessity for world co-existence had diminished or limited nation's sovereignty, which any such limitations must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. As Katzenstein et al (1999) has pointed out, nations have long been willing to discard certain elements of sovereignty when it suited their purposes.

Many scholars argued that the version of absolute state sovereignty had eroded, as globalization may be more certain than dreaming Westphalia sovereign mere shibboleth for neo-isolationists. But what makes the current round of sovereignties different is their marriage of sweeping, universal rules with independent institutions of enforcement. The sovereign states have sheered relations with each other and international organizations especially to promote their well being and security, thereby limits the absolute nature of sovereignty, these international political situations aids states to often enter into bilateral or multilateral commitments. These notions of interdependence commitments of states brought about the notions of globalization.

Julian and John (2013) readily admitted that the institutions of global governance are only now emerging from their infancy. They argued that some institutions such as the United Nations Security Council and the International Court of Justice, have existed since the adoption of the United Nations Charter, but have sought to expand their reach only in the last few decades.

In fact, institutions of globalization, such as the World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, have reoriented their missions and become more interventionist in the domestic affairs of nation-states. Also emerged were new species of international cooperation in which new multilateral agreements regulate the internal as well as external conduct of nation-states on interest. This development is called new world order; new world order offers a new framework for accommodating globalization which is popular sovereignty. We are trying to shifts the focus away from Westphalia sovereignty, which grants nations absolute autonomy within their territories, and toward “popular sovereignty” where the right of citizens of state guaranteed through Constitution. The new world order and emergence of globalization has become a source of worry as the world’s growing diversities and sophistication of organizational structure infuses integration and expand network of cultural unity has become a source of threat and insecurity to sovereign states. The integration superiority over all other authorities remains the exclusive source of new world order and globalization, the developments which place sovereignty under serious pressure as eroding of sovereign state is neither inevitable nor obviously desirable.

Today globalization been referred to the greater openness of national and international economies to the flow of trade capital, science and technology, foreign direct investment, market integration has shrinking space, time and disappearing borders and has created a

global village structure based on share value where technology and market integration processes have dominated the sovereign status of state. In discussion of this puzzle, we will necessarily analyze the nature of sovereign states, new world order and emergence of globalization, instruments of globalization in new world order, the features of the new world order and future of state sovereignty in the new world order.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The framework of analysis chosen for this study is integration theory, is one of the most idealistic theory with the notions about how state sovereignty could be eroded. Integration theory is built from the dependability experiences of human community. According to Deutsch et al (1957) integration means the attainment within a territory of a sense of community and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to ensure dependable expectations of peaceful change among its population. By sense of community it means a belief that common social problems must and can be resolved by process of peaceful change.

Simply put, the central preposition of Integration theory emphasized the positive impact of interdependent in shaping the global governance to achieve collective peace and welfare of humanity. Haas (1970) an integration theorist stress on the plural character of modern society composed of competing elites and conflicting interests. Integration here is seen as a process and not a condition in which politically significant elites both in government and outside government redefined their interests in terms of regional rather than in purely national orientation. Haas defines integration therefore as the process whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyal expectations and political activities toward a new and larger centre whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states. The key elements in Haas model are the following that significantly political actors in different national societies within a regional area would firstly decide in collaboration and beyond that, to confer authority or a decision making framework beyond the nation-state. In each area of cooperation, politicization of issues arises, national autonomy erodes and there is a choice between retention of autonomy of national decision making or moving to a supra-national decision-making. If the latter is successful in one field, the lesson is applied to other fields. This is the concept of spill over. Finally, this leads to the formation of new coalitions across frontiers so as to pursue interests at the regional level.

Puchala (1974) points out that the kind of sense of community that is relevant for integration turned out to be rather a matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties of “we feeling” trust, and mutual consideration of partial identification in terms of self-images and interests, of mutually successful predictions of behaviour, in short, a matter of a perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perceptions of needs and responsiveness in the process of decision making.

Another proposition of this theory aptly examines how societies, government and people in countries of the world unite to tackle the high rising demands for some uncommon solutions to such common problems such as diseases, economic depression, pollution, and some services as collective security, communication, transportation, weapons control and other advanced technologies. Mitrany (1966) adduced that the best way state sovereignty could be eroded was through creation of international organizations whose exclusive role would be to deal with human welfare tasks at the global level. He argues, such welfare tasks include technical and politically neutral functions such as health, transportation, communication and tasks which cannot be performed at the national level. Such tasks should not be left to national governmental officials but to non national experts. Soroos (1986) notes that in the sphere of global communications, International Communications Union (ITU) is responsible for the planning and coordination of international and global communication networks and much of the substantive policy take place in conventions of countries of all types. Most delegates are engineers and yet there is so much friction about the assignment for radio, television, and satellite broadcasts.

Finally, integration theory approach does not accept the national state as necessarily the ultimate and final stage of the world’s political development. The world after all evolved into the nation-state system and may evolve beyond it. The scholars working in this area investigate the roots of the consensus building that leads to the formation of political communities. They examine the nature of the integrative process in such area as the creation of federal states and the formation of alliances into globalization.

### **Methodology**

The researcher adopted explanatory research design method using documentary and in-depth behavioural analysis. This design enabled the researcher to ascertain the historical dimensions of the sovereign states and the trend of globalization in the new world order. The study while

employing historical research design adopted documentary method in the gathering of data and content analytical techniques was used for the analysis.

The researcher adopted content analysis (qualitative) method and also historical interpretation of data was vital as it provided the researcher the avenue to establish proximity and linkage between the past and the present events and subsequently predict future events. The researcher commonly employed explanatory research design as it offered a comprehensive understanding of socio-political behaviour which aimed to figure out the socio-political phenomenon. The analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data created the perfect framework in revealing the findings and drew versatile conclusions.

### **Nature of Sovereign States**

The concept of sovereign state developed during the Middle Age and was apparently legally used by Romans. Though socially, sovereignty began from ancient history in pre-Westphalia era, where such early states as Greece, Egypt, Persia, and Carthage possessed supreme power over a given territory and populace and were independent of any external power. According to Douglass and Robert (1973) observed that there are two key parts to such a system, what they might call internal sovereignty and external sovereignty. Internal sovereignty refers to autonomy, the ability of the state to make and enforce its own rules domestically. External sovereignty refers to the recognition of the state by other states, the acceptance of the state by the international community.

The genesis of the current system of states has often been dated back to 1648, when the Peace of Westphalia ended the Thirty Years War by diminishing the political role of many tiers of the feudal nobility (Barkin, 2006). The peace of Westphalia 1648 was a convenient starting point for the modern nation state, but in fact there were recognised forces that had been in making for some time, the European struggle to expand their political authority by breaking away from the secular domination of the Holy Roman Empire and the theological authority of the Pope which finally collapsed in 476 A.D when the rule of the last Western emperors, Romulus Augustus ended and a barbarian chieftain assumed the title of King of Rome.

Consequently, empires, rather than sovereign states, reigned in the political history of ancient civilizations, and the feudal era in Europe featured over-lapping and territorially indistinct patterns of political authority. The Eastern division of Roman Empire (Byzantine Empire),

toward ending of 700 A.D with its capital Constantinople, continued for a time as a successor state after the fall of the Western Empire. But Byzantine claims to universality were ended in 800 A.D by the rise of Charlemagne's empire in the West. Charlemagne was seen by some as the new Caesar and his coronation as a Roman emperor by Pope Leo 11 in 800 A.D. appeared to mark the rebirth of the Western Roman Empire and reigned till The Treaty of Verdun in 843 A.D. the great universal empire of the Caesar seemed doomed to disintegrate into thousands of feudal units. These incidents sparked off the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) mainly between the Holy Roman Emperor, Mathias, and the Czechs. The treaty of Westphalia ended the war but splintered the Holy Roman Empire into political entities that would develop into modern nation states (Greives, 1977).

Bertrand (1957) observed that the growth of the concept of sovereignty was an answer to the "primordial character of the problem of who decides". He noted that in the medieval period, it was the church that first solved this problem by its concentration of power in spiritual realm. John and Mark (2001) agreed that sovereign states developed late in the Middle Age (ca. 500-1350) from a consolidation and simultaneous expansion of political power. First, the rulers of Europe expanded their political authority by breaking away from the secular domination of the Holy Roman Empire and the theological authority of the Pope. Second, the king also consolidated political power by subjugating feudal estate and other competing local political organizations within their rules. The resulting states exercised supreme authority over their territory and citizens; they owed neither allegiance nor obedience to any higher authority.

The systematic doctrine of sovereignty was formulated by Bodin (1576) *Les Six Livres de le Republique*, published in Paris at the period of France Civil War; Bodin linked his sovereignty ideology with a broader idea of a world community ruled by natural law and concluded that only a powerful central authority could preserve order. He made sovereignty essentially a principle of internal political order. The strong central authority was the "principal foundation of every state", there could be no state without sovereignty, which is "the absolute and perpetual power of a state" (Grievess, 1977). He argued that since the sovereignty is the single source from which all laws originate, a logical extrapolation is that the sovereign is not only above the law but independent of restrictions, internal or external. While some scholars saw sovereign state as the principle of international disorder. For instance in Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*, he argued that interstate relationships are similar to those of people in the State of Nature, characterised by war of every person against every

person. He emphasized that Nations being composed of men naturally free and independent, and who, before the establishment of civil society, lived together in the state of nature, Nations, Sovereign states are to be considered as so many free persons living together in the state of nature. But the body of the Nations, the state, remains absolutely free and independent with respect to all other men and all other Nations as long as it has not voluntarily submitted to them.

Barkin (2006) argued that one important feature of sovereignty, however, changed fundamentally in the nineteenth century. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, princes were sovereign. From the perspective of the international community, a country was the property of its ruler, and representatives of the country represented the interests of the ruler, rather than of the population. Beginning in the nineteenth century, and even more so in the twentieth, citizens became sovereign. Rulers became representative of their populations, rather than the other way around. He notes that in the twentieth century, even dictators usually claimed to be ruling in the interests of the people, rather than for their own gain.

Sovereignty therefore, symbolizes one of the most basic assumptions of international relations, the authority of the state to act independently. This does not mean, however, that the sovereign state is free from obligations to its own citizens or to other states, or that the exercise of this sovereignty cannot be restricted. Rather in the new world order, nation state inherits a style and culture which in their turn influence and decide the course of actions; the nation state has to follow in relation to other sovereign states.

This paradoxical turn in history confronts most nation- states, as the further spread of technology, trade, commerce, finance and information obliterates the socio-political and economic boundaries among nations. The new form of state based on the notion of sovereignty redefines the idea of integration. In the era of globalization, state may aims at preventing any alien power from violating its boundaries, but the process of globalization had made these boundaries porous. The current phase of globalization is important in the evolution of the nation-state. Precisely from this angle, economic globalization challenges the political authority, which the nation-state had retained by undermining gradually many of the norms of the traditional civil society. The political authority of the nation-state was consolidated in the process of expansion of commerce, as its law and jurisdiction extended over the national economy. This meant that although countries still warred with their



neighbours to increase their territory, they also became more likely to cooperate with their neighbours to maximize the welfare of their citizens.

### **New World Order and Emergence of Globalization**

Political order in the world from the Middle Age through the Westphalia sovereign arrangement, states traditionally handles international relations with other states on the basis of what is called balance of power politics. Though, modern era of balance of power politics lasted historically roughly from the congress of Vienna (1815) to World War 1 (1914), often called the classical period of international relations. It was the apparent failure of this system that incurred the reproach of President Wilson, a period that would enable states to conduct their relations peacefully (Grievess,1977).Grievess observed that not only did World War 1 apparently prove the balance of power system but was unable to keep the peace, and the system was widely blamed for causing the war. President Woodrow Wilson was a leading critic of balance of power politics, attacking the secret diplomacy, the overlapping alliances, and the philosophy of power politics. He advocated the League of Nations as a means of institutionalizing the balance power system by bringing it out into the open and legitimizing it.

Huntington (2002) notes that after World War I, President Wilson's idea of a new world order, based on moral principles and self-determination would lead to peace through the creation of a "concert for peace" which will be maintained by a partnership of democratic nations; and the League of Nations was born. He further noted that the World War I resulted in social upheaval, ideological conflict, and another world war. World War II, as President Franklin Roosevelt put it, would "end the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the balances of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries and have failed".

This new system, the League of Nations known as "collective security" was to enable the world to police itself on the basis of public control of the use of force and universal respect for the rule of law but in turn, failed to prevent World War II. Perhaps a significant reason was that states tried to retain the old balance of power habits without really using the League. By the end of world war II a new commitment was made to collective security, the emergence of United Nations in 1945 and by this time the classical European balance of power system was really dead. Grievess (1977) argued that the free-wheeling image of

classical international balance of power politics was destroyed by the rise of cold war alliances. This image was on the way out after the formation of the Entente Cordiale (England/ France) in 1904 expanded to the Triple Entente (adding Russia) in 1907, aimed at stopping German expansion, especially through the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy). He further notes that the modern international relations have involved a solidification of alliance system, in particular with rival blocs of East and West.

The new world that emerged after World War II was dominated by two superpowers struggle, the United States and the Soviet Union, called Cold War and refer generally to the intense hostility and tension that developed in Soviet- American relations. The end of Cold War and the events of 1989 marked an essential goals of the global society of mankind having changed with the respect to ideological perspectives, it turned to a new world order in which capitalism dominate. Echezona (1998) observed that “in this new world order, we are at a turning point in history in which order in world politics is not dependent on hegemonic powers but on human power. He notes that United States having led a multinational coalition and won the Gulf War and having stayed and watched the other hegemonic power, stands at the threshold of history where it can lay down the rules not only about global management but also about domestic management of states as well.

The new world order is marked by liberal values. Aida (2005) argued that Liberals have long maintained that the basic principles of democracy, competition and participation, presuppose an economic foundation whereby mass demands expressed through mass participation then formulated by elite competition, can lead to solid economic results and a better quality of life”. This free market view is probably most recognizable in (Fukuyama, 1989)’s widely read book “The End of History. For Fukuyama, The end of history signifies “ the end point of mankind’s ideological evolution and the universalization of western liberal democracy as the final form of human government”. Thinking along with Hegel that the contradictions which drive history forward exist in the “realm of consciousness”, he sees 1806, which marked the defeat by Napoleon of the Prussian Monarchy at the battle of Jena as the end of history, that marked the victory of ideals of French Revolution and the imminent universalization of the state incorporating the principles of liberty and equality. He further notes that before the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, history was characterized by a series of grand ideological struggles of Liberalism and Socialism, against Monarchy and Aristocracy; Democracy and Capitalism, against Fascism and Communism. But the end of the cold war,

Fukuyama believes signals that liberal democracy and free market capitalism have survived as the fittest forms of government.

Kissinger (1973) noted that "the traditional agenda of international affairs, the balance among major powers, the security of nations, no longer defines our perils or our possibilities. Now we are entering a new era, old international patterns are crumbling: old slogans are uninformative; old solutions are unavailing. The world has become interdependent in economics, communications and human aspirations. While these free market conservatives have ended history in the market place of ideas, they portrayed economic globalization as an outcome of evolution: a natural and inevitable. This was corroborated by this declaration of Judge Rosalyn Higgins, the former President of the International Court of Justice that Globalization represents the reality that we live in a time when the walls of sovereignty are no protection against the movements of capital, labour, information and ideas nor can they provide effective protection against harm and damage.

The consequences of new world order was the emergence of globalization which involve a host of state and non-state actors such as the International Governmental Organizations (IGOs), Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), Multinational Corporations (MNCs), and even individuals which have multiplied since the end of the Cold War, and all attempting to affect the foreign policy process of states. In making this argument, conservatives today point to the primary role played by advanced transportation and information technologies. They point to the way that the development and expansion of transcontinental airline, the frequency of air express delivery and the use of standardized containers have facilitated a vast expansion in both international trade and globalization of production. Julian and John (2013) observed that the internationalization of production and global exchange of goods and services have more direct implication for coalitions of national interests than for nation-states.

The symmetry of this view indicates that there is substantial tilt away from the significance of autonomous national policy design and policymaking. This means power relationships and processes of opinion making and decision making are increasingly located in complex and transnational settings, characterized by shifting alliances among international as well as national stakeholders instead of nation-states. While Adams (2004) argued that globalization of production is unique to today's global economy. Advances in transportation, technologies and new business techniques such as "just-in-time delivery" and "cross border

outsourcing” have created global assembly lines where single products are now designed, produced, assembled and packaged in and among a number of locations around the world.

Significant to the globalization of production are the advances in communication technologies. Direct-dial long distance telephone calls e-mail and personal computers, in combination with satellites, the Internet and fibre-optic cable, allow firms to monitor and coordinate their operations around the globe. The information technology revolution is also said to be driving force behind the globalization of finance, in which computerized currency markets now turn over almost \$3 trillion a day. In view of the chairman of Citicorp Bank, Restow(1971) argued that “our new international financial regime differs radically from its precursors in that it was not built by politicians, economists, central bankers or financial ministers it was built by technology men and women who interconnected the planet with telecommunications and computers”.

In fact, so many firms have now “gone global” that there are currently more than one million multinational corporations operating worldwide. Therefore, globalization is a relatively recent process of worldwide integration, cooperation and conscious building whereby an increase in the flows and trade of ideas, people, goods and services between national state borders is prevalent. It has assumed the emergence of single market system, dominated by international capitalism. It implies changes in the production and the integration of national economies into the global market. Though shrinking space, time and disappearing borders, it is refers to the greater openness of national and international economies to the flow of trade, capital, science and technology, foreign direct investment, market integration and so on. It signifies the ever growing importance of international trade to the various peoples and nations of the world. It has created a global village structure based on shared values and where principally technology and market integration processes have dominated the world economic system and advancing peace in the new world order.

### **Instruments of Globalization in New World Order**

There are many indications that we are living in a period of systematic change, which had led to new world of radical shifts in international relations. Changes in world affairs reflect more than quantitative changes, the increasing pace of modern international life and the increased number of participating actors. The developments was as a result of the qualitative changes in area of technology, thermonuclear weapons, strategic military planning, ideology,

environmental challenges, overpopulation, and world economy. According to Max (1962) “we are witnessing the beginning of the end of classical world politics” which was characterised by a world of nation states, based on the concept of sovereignty, applying the principles of balance of power, with war as a frequent result of the internal failures and external pressures.

Nation-states as created by the Westphalia Treaty no longer hold the monopoly of power; more and more, they are being shared by a plurality of sources that traverse national boundaries and compete for authority, pacts and alliances. In the contemporary international system, national security has taken a new meaning no longer equated exclusively with military issues; it has been broadened to include economic, ecological, and welfare issues. The most defining interests of the post-modern era that have drawn sovereign states into union have centred on political, economic and security-related safekeeping. International political relations in the 20th century have drastically transformed the way in which nation-states co-operate. Since the 1940s, substantial political integration has become so predominant that some political theorists believe that the idea of Westphalia sovereignty no longer pertains. Political interconnectedness via international and regional organisations such as the United Nations and European Union has meant that nation-states are increasingly coalescing and thus sacrificing their recognition as sovereign.

The progress in cooperation and the dramatic changes in the basic pattern in the new world order contradicted the Westphalia structure of international system. There is several interesting global development in the new world order with the following features:

#### **(i) Integration**

Scholars of international relations have generally agreed with the varying degrees of experience on prospects for regional and universal unity. Grievs (1977) argued that nation state itself appears to be moving in two directions. On the one hand there is a great deal of excitement over the prospect of regional integration and the creation of organizations with supranational powers. In this new world order many states have joined in the union of confederation, many continents have one continental organization or the other. European Union for instance had evolved into a value government with political and economic forces. The prospect of European Union have provoked Asian, Latin America and African states to form unions closer to European Union, which had every organs as nation states. Though, the components of European Union still retain their sovereign integrity and functions as nation-

states but their deepening integration has made European Union super-national that supplanted other regional integration in the evolving new world order.

These integrative forces at work in the current world order have substantially brought fundamental restructuring of national power in different continents of the world. The restructuring was possible because of technological advancement especially, in transportation and communications which have started eroding the boundaries between hitherto separate markets territorial boundaries that were necessary condition for autonomous national policies. Internationalization of production has eroded the state's capacity to control its own economic future rather the sovereign states continue to place their national interest in the forefront while taking decisions concerning their economic policies but clearly their autonomy are restricted by market decisions. Smith (1987) observed that monetary and fiscal policies of individual governments are dominated by the movements in international financial product markets. In fact, global market has played greater competitiveness and increase dependence among states, making the idea of independence of nation-states redundant but creates serious cooperation among the modern nation-states.

The new world order driven by globalization has much basic elements of integration such as the acceleration in cross-border activity between governments, businesses, institutions, and individuals. Mainly, international organizations has been an instrument of globalization that provides a convenient at both the universal and regional levels, in which much issues of common interest especially in socio-economic and political consensus has been addressed. The integrated alliances and shifting of the decision-making process from the nation-state to the power blocks are increasingly mediated through rationalized institutional processes" rather than the anarchy of the Westphalia sovereign system.

According to Micklethwait and Afutureperfect(2000) globalization also includes the growth of political cooperation, migration, and communications, as well as sharp reductions in transportation costs and the blending of national societies and cultures. Scholte (2000) also viewed, the explosion of cross-border interaction as has strengthened international institutions and the development of cosmopolitan legal obligations. In the above views, "globalization in this new world" accelerates various processes of economic, social, cultural, and political integration across national borders. It has a profound effect on the concept of physical territory as an individual, corporate organizations located in an industrialized nation can comfortably communicate, transact, interact, or work on another state abroad, thereby

increasing integration, among states and widening degree of order. Carayannis (2012) argued that when a system, like global system, is functioning by designated sets of rules and standards, there is no time for conflict to emerge, similar to the past-centralized mechanism, it is dissolved in a multitude of micro- decisions within the existing hierarchy structure. Guehenno (2000) noted that diffusion of power has taken the sting out of conflict. “And like a block of granite that is being eroded into sand, the imperial (global) age is dissolving conflict into a thousand impalpable fragments.”

Therefore, globalization’s acceleration of the movement of goods and services, people, capital, and information, has increased states ability to regulate universal economic activity on its territory and centrally redefined national sovereignty. The conduct that crosses state borders gives rise to demands for international cooperation and the dream of an open and cooperative world order to which mankind look beyond the obvious potential sources of state power has achieved greater global integrated alliances in the new world order.

#### **(ii) New International Actors**

In the classical international relations, states have been the only true international actors, though; they are still the only dominant member of international community. But in the modern international relations more important responsibilities are been handle by individuals, Multinational Corporations and international organizations in international affairs. The new actors other than nation-states include: international organizations, governmental and nongovernmental, business corporations, and even single individuals. Non-state actors have come to influence the content and scope of many different kinds of international law, perhaps most so in the area of Customary International Law (CIL, NGOs and IOs) have sought to accelerate this process by promulgating a new norm of international law, persuading states to adopt it, and then arguing that dissenting states refusing to follow are bound by universal practice. In this way, NGOs outside the control of any nation-state can use their influence to co-opt the process of identifying customary state practice, effectively imposing legal obligations on unwilling nations which further reduces state sovereignty. The development of these international and transnational organizations has led to important changes in the decision-making structure of world politics. New forms of multinational organizations have been established and with them new forms of collective decision making involving states, inter-governmental organizations and a whole variety of transnational pressure groups, also moderated the idea of state sovereignty.

Quincy (1955) argued that the role of sovereign state can be interpreted in two different ways namely: the state as sovereign, protecting, punishing individuals in its own interest under such guidance as it chooses to accept from international law, but it is also possible to interpret the individual as a jural personality with rights under international law which he can only pursue through the agency of his state and with duties under international law which the society of nations can enforce only through the agency of the state with jurisdiction over him. The state in other words, may be construed not as a sovereign entity valuable in itself, but as an agent on the one hand of the individuals that compose it, and on the other of the universal society embracing all humanity.

The new international law is openly concerned with the relationship between a nation and its own citizens or between citizens of different nations. New international law includes rules and principles governing states relations with persons. It means that individuals have full remedy in international law and that the subject matter of international law has expanded. The International Convention on Civil and Political Rights guarantees the individual rights of free expression, political association, property, life, and procedural justice, among others (U.N.T.S 16, 1966, 999. 171). Rights and duties are recognized in international law which transcend the claims of nation-state and which, whilst they may not be backed by institutions with coercive powers of enforcement, have far-reaching consequences.

The point remains that individuals, multinational corporations, and international organizations have gradually emerging more important in running the day to day affairs of international community. These non state actors have assumed serious active forces, often able to defy the attempts of national governments to gain effective control over them. The new sets of actors on the world scenario, unlike governments, do not approach problems from the perspective of national interest. There are international coalitions of non-governmental organizations and issue-networks among people across borders. These groups are shaping a whole set of standards, rules and norms. There have been much impacts played by International Standards Organization, International Organization of Security Commissions, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Amnesty International, Green Peace, and other global civil society and global mass movements.

These international organizations have generally existed at the intergovernmental or confederation level with primary aim of cooperation and common policies largely within the context of international organizations, individuals have allowed an enhanced international



status. This was particularly possible through emphasizing human rights increasingly in the new world order.

Multinational business corporations have also emerged as very important new participants in the world stage; these multinational corporations are in many respects beyond the control of either nation-state or other international organizations. Their power lies in their size, their sophisticated ability to move goods and services worldwide and generally public knowledge of their structure and operation. Equally, multinationals have been highly successful in their transnational organization, their control of international goods, services, capital, labour, management, resources and the like on an extremely efficient basis which individual and governments have been benefiting.

### **(iii) Internationalisation of National Conflicts**

The development of international and transnational organizations has led to important changes in the decision-making structure of world politics. New forms of multinational organizations have been established and with them new forms of collective decision making involving states, inter-governmental organizations and a whole variety of transnational pressure groups, also moderated the idea of state sovereignty. The new world order introduced new national conflicts that have international significance such as terrorism, insurrection, guerrilla warfare, civil war and similar violent activities that were once primarily of domestic concern and responsibility. This internationalization of domestic conflict is possible because of the modern technology especially in communications and mobility which the dissident national groups can easily solicit worldwide support, easier for foreign governments to aid surreptitiously dissidents and terrorist groups can connect international network because of the vulnerability of modern technologies.

As technologies that driven the new world of humanity changes in its advancement, human beings changes and society changes, the world has recorded all forms violence stemmed from changes in world power structure. Palmer and Perkins (2004) argued that the vital issue is the capacity of men to devise a regime of peace that also carries with it some assurance of security and well being. Each generation pose the issue a new, each in its own set of concrete terms. If we may believe the lesions of history, once the present impasse has been resolved we shall pass on to new names and threats of aggression.

The aggression from terrorism, civil wars, insurrection, guerrilla warfare, and the threat of nuclear proliferations in world affairs have been a serious threat to the sovereignty of nation-states and challenge to new world. According to Reinhold (1949) our problem is that techniques have established a rudimentary world community but have not integrated it organically, morally or politically. They have created a community of mutual dependence, but not one of mutual trust and respect. Without this higher integration, advancing techniques tend to sharpen economic rivalries within a general framework of economic interdependence, they change the ocean barriers of yesterday into the battle ground of today; and they increase the deadly efficacy of the instruments of war so that vicious circles of mutual fear may end in atomic conflicts and mutual destruction.

These groups are shaping a whole set of standards, rules and norms, of the world, they have been playing many impacts in International system, international security and global mass movements and has significantly change the direction of the modern state, challenge the principle of military discipline and subverted national sovereignty. Internationally recognized legal mainstays of sovereignty have been progressively questioned by operations of internationalisation of national conflicts. According to Grievies (1977) the rapid, complex, interwoven international changes have perhaps left us all somewhat overwhelmed trying to understand a whole world we must somewhat manage. He believes in human rationality, a belief that human beings are able to sort out their experiences and attach meaning to them. It is on the premises of rationalities and human ability to confront complex human problems and guarantees world peace that the main instruments of globalisation in new world order emerged.

#### **(iv) Universal or Worldwide Culture**

There have been frequent changes in power relationships among states and groups of states, other actors, including sub-national and super-national groups, unofficial as well official, continue playing an increasingly active and influential roles. International relations continued broaden and deepen and become meaningful to larger number of people, as contacts increase and horizons expand. Though, states continue pursuing security through military establishments, defensive alliance, and collective security arrangements and many adhoc power alignments, but diplomacy as an instrument of globalization has been used in several occasion to build consensus and resolve dispute as well as to provide solution to foreign policy confrontations.

The necessary ingredients are the courage and commitment to seek mutually acceptable solutions to our problems, and to continue to search for peace, no matter how discouraging the prospects and how tempting it is to resort to arms. Lester (1959) notes that what is needed is a new and vigorous determination to use every technique of discussion and negotiation that is available, or more important, that can be made available, for the solution of the tangled, freighting problems that divide today, endanger peace.

While global and national mechanism differ in many respect, the extent of their control over political and economic affairs, have faced the similar challenges to governance. Both are faced with rapidly changing world in which goods, information, people and idea are in “continuous motion” that propels perpetual rearrangements of social, economic and political spheres that continue evolving global unity. The modern communication and the growing internationalization of human experiences are bound to force us to refocus our conceptions of ourselves and others.

The history had shown that people with a great deal in common cannot fight because of the bridge of communication gap. We should hope that as the world “get smaller” our common problems will provoke a common determination to solve them and entrench peace (Grievess, 1977). The increasing population and advances in technology are forcing states to be interdependent as there were higher rising demands for some uncommon solutions to such common problems as disease, economic depression, pollution, or some services as collective security, communication, transportation and other advanced technologies. These rising problems that do not stop at territorial boundaries have increased the importance of international organizations as well as of individual persons in international relations.

The world systemic change undoubtedly have affected by the sophisticated diplomatic development of the new world order. Meanwhile, International peace operations and their relationship to broader processes and trends within global politics are transforming from an activities primarily involving states to one characterized by transnational relations between different types of politically significant actors which are connected by potentially global diplomatic communications. In fact, the modern world systems have been extremely coexisted because of economic bond, multinational corporations and international organizations that have been active forces, often able to challenge the attempts of national governments to gain effective control over them and has continue shifting to keep on trying

to solve problems one by one, and stage by stage, not because of confidence but for cooperation, mutual toleration and improvement in world coexistence.

Today's world is shaped by contemporary globalization, which has facilitated the important of events that happen in one part of the world invariably impact on the others, such connectivity has given rise to international society as a whole as a 'responsibility to protect' individuals from grave breaches of their human rights in situations where their own state is either unwilling or unable to do so. The implications is universal world culture, this commonality in culture in this new world will surely bring clear guarantee of peace as social conflict will drop simply because people are in steady contact with each other.

### **Future of State Sovereignty in the New World Order**

The contemporary international system offers some intriguing and complex impediments to the historical Westphalia sovereign state. The growing challenge to state sovereignty around the world seems to originate from the inability of the modern state to navigate between the power of global networks and the challenges raised through the increase in ethno-political conflict, the expansion of terrorism, the growth of sophisticated weaponry production, all of which undermine state boundaries and sovereignty, and had made us rethink the changing nature of war and peace in the new post-Westphalia world order (Aida, 2005).

Westphalianation-states sovereignty have move into a new world where transnational negotiation and cooperation can lead to the realization of Kant's "perpetual peace." New world order driven by globalization seems to be the world of competitors whether they are friends or foes, everyone fears not the other as much as the rapid change created by that order we cannot see, touch, or feel. Globalization is an ongoing process and its key feature is integration. Its integration of all people living within and out the boundaries of a certain space into the political community and their political equality of citizens make up the essence of a new nation-state; and seems to be a democratic ideal few nations have reached.

Thomas Friedman observed, "It is the inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before, in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations, and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before. These three key actors in this process: the state, the global market, and the individual's interaction with each other helps us better understand the system.

Katzenstein et al (1999) accepts it as a system where state interdependence has somewhat reduced the Westphalia concept of state sovereignty when the domestic jurisdiction of sovereignty is taken into account, he argues that globalization is not necessarily eroding the concept of state sovereignty but evolving, enhancing and expanding. Political integration is practically inseparable from economic integration. The latter has also been a historic product of globalization, specifically since the end of the Cold War. Though, (Reynolds, 2000) argued that internationalization of commerce', spreading global capitalism into all continents, has become so substantial that the issue of borders has become irrelevant and vanished as an effective control mechanism.

Economic amalgamation has become an inevitable consequence to which many feel has both merits and demerits, for instance international economic organisations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have played an extensive role in shaping intercontinental trade. This was anchored by Osterhammel and Petersson (2005) when argued that the internationalization of trade has not only created greater wealth but also lessened the prospect of military conflict among state actors that adopted liberal democratic political values and thus capitalist economics. Interlinked with state stability and sovereignty in a global era is the issue of security-related safekeeping. The issue of security-related safekeeping is also, like political relations, intertwined with the economic aspect. Technological advance in areas such as transport and communications has had an impact on sovereignty on a global scale so much so that it has shaped, if not dictated, greater co-operation among state actors.

Mansbach (2000) ultimately considered that 'since state evolution was gradual, states managed to monopolize the means of coercion but today, some states have surrendered that monopoly. This does not suggest that states will become irrelevant or disappear. Rather they must share pride of place with other actors and must co-operate with one another to cope with today's challenges'. The view was corroborated by Viotti and Kauppi (1999) when observed that the new form of global integration will enable humans to co-operate more meaningfully with each other, because according to the Kantian concept of "pacific federation", cooperative relations between democratic states with unity of interest based on a "cosmopolitan law adds material incentives to moral commitments", and that is why they renounce the option to use force in their mutual interactions'' It was within this hope in mind that president George Bush Sr. Spoke of the emergence of a "new world order" to describe

the onset of the post-cold war era. From some observers, this triumphant and optimistic Immanuel Kant world view was shattered by the tragic events of September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001.

In fact, with Islamic terrorists having launched a successful attack on the American homeland, Fukuyama's work, 'The End of History' was challenged by Samuel Huntington's work, 'The Clash of Civilizations'. Adams (2004) notes that in contrast to Fukuyama's free market view, Huntington draw on the approach of security trumps trade and the movement of history appears as a circle rather than a line. The circle represents the idea that history is a repetition and basically unchanging process one driven by the pursuit and distribution of power between competing political groups''.

Thus from the perspective of the national security view, the current clash of civilizations developed in this ongoing struggle, while some see a clash of civilization driven by the competition between political groups. But from this perspective, best described as the social democratic view, the challenge today is the free market capitalism rather than the liberal democracy. Others sense, the clash of globalizations as also just the latest development in an ongoing struggle between the proponent of free markets and those who advocate greater government intervention. Therefore, those who found the prospect of a returning state less desirable also sought to play down the renewed trust in government, as the other group is in opposite.

## **Conclusion**

The history of mankind is a story of trial and error, and the most inspiring part of it is the persistence of good men in good cause. In this unfolding and expanding universe, international relations have come of age, or at least have taken on new and more challenge (Grievess, 1977). The modern sovereign state structure has been dominated by globalization driving by liberal democracy and free market economy. Large numbers of multinational corporations, international governmental organizations, nongovernmental organizations have emerged as active forces, often able to defy the attempts of the national government to gain effective control over them in the new world order.

The increase role of international organizations in regulating international affairs has meant that many of them, in order to perform these roles successfully, have assumed a judicial personality. This is substantially different from the situation in classic international system, in which states were the sole legal subjects, unchallenged by lesser entities. The state

sovereignty is subject to very real limitations stemming from the structural nature of the new world itself, the interaction of these key actors: the individual's, the global market, and the nation-states with each other helps us better understand the new world order.

The new world driven by globalization and its key feature "integration" has changed boundaries of a certain space into the political community and their political equality as it full utilization of sciences, technologies and cultures have reach around the world and its citizens farther, faster, deeper, and easier. Therefore, new world driven by globalization has enhance more transnational integration, regional groupings of states and the number will increase, the continue cooperation in maintenance of universal or supper-national organization like United Nation can lead to the realization of international peace but end up in building supper-national organizational hegemony.

## References

- Adams, H. (2004). *The Return of the State. Protestors' Power-Brokers and the New Global Compromise*. Douglas and McIntyre Ltd, Vancouver/Toronto.
- Aida, D. (2005). Globalization and the Challenges to State Sovereignty and Security. [https://www. lebarmy.gov.lb/en/content/52-d](https://www.lebarmy.gov.lb/en/content/52-d).
- Barkin, J. S. (1998). *The Evolution of the Constitution of Sovereignty and the Emergence of Human Rights Norms*". Millennium.
- Barkin, J. S. (2006). *International Organization: Theories and Institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan 175 Fifth Avenue, New York.
- Bertrand, De J. (1957). *Sovereignty: an Enquiry into the Political Good*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Camilleri, J.A. and Falk, J. (1992). *The End of Sovereignty: The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmentary World*. Edward Elgar, England.
- Castles, S. and Alastair D. (2000). *Citizenship and Migration, Globalization and the Politics of Belongings*. Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Carayannis, E.G. (2012). Institutional Learning and Knowledge Transfer Across Epistemic Communities, Innovation, Technology, and Knowledge Management 13, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-1551-0\_2, © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Clyde, E. (1948). *International Government*. rev. ed. The Ronald Press Company, New York.

- Deutsch, K.W. and Burrell, C.(1957).*Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Douglass, N. and Robert P. T. (1973).*The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Echezona, N. (1998).*International Politics in the Post Cold War Era*.Meks Publishers Lid, P. M. B 5039 Awka.
- Friedman, T. L.(2000).*The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. Anchor Books.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989).*The End of History?National Interest*. New York: Avon Books
- Grievies, L. F. (1977).*An Introduction to International Relations*.University of Montana. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Grotius, H. (1646).*De Jure ac PacieLibriTres, Prolegomena*, Vol. 11,edited by Francis W. K. Carnegie Endowment Series.
- Guehenno, J. (2000).*The End of Nation State, translated by Victoria Elliott*.University of Minnesota Press.
- Haas, E.B. (1970).The Study of Regional Integration’’ Reflections of the Joy and Anguish of Pre-theorizing’’ *International Organization*,24(3).17-29.
- Higgins, R.(1999). *International Law in a Changing International System*.58CAMBRIDGE L. J.78, 82.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations*.New York Simon & Schuster.
- Julian, K. andYoo, J. (2013).Globalization and Sovereignty.*Berkeley Journal of International Law*.31(1).
- Katzenstein, P. Keohane, R. and Krasner, S. eds. (1998).*International Organization and the Study of World Politics*.The MIT Press.
- Katzenstein, P. Keohane, R. and Krasner, S. eds. (1999).*Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Keohane, R. and Nye J. (1977).*Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Kissinger, H. A. (1973). *A World Restored*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston
- Lester, B. P.(1959).*Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age*.Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Mansbach,R. W. and Rhodes, E ed. (2000).*Global Politics in a Changing World*.Houghton Mifflin.



- Marshall, W. (2002). *Big Government Conservatism*. Claremont Review of books, Spring.
- Max, L. (1962) .*The Age of Overkill: A Preface to World Politics*. New York.
- Mitrany, D. (1966) *A Working Peace System*. Chicago
- Palmer, N. D. and Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations, the World Community in Transition*. Third Revised Edition, A.I.T.B.S. Publishers and Distributors. J-5/6, Krishan Nagar, Delhi-110051 India.
- Paul, B. S. (2000). *International Governance and American Democracy*. 1 CHI. J. INTL.L. 237, 241.
- Puchala, D.J. (1974). *International Politics Today* Dodd. Mead, N Y.
- Quincy, W. (1955) .*Contemporary International Law: A Balance Sheet*. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City New York.
- Robbie, R. (2003) .*The Three Waves of Globalization, A History of Developing Global Consciousness*. Zed Books publishers.
- Rostow, W.W. (1971). *Politics and Stages of Growth*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rourke, J. T. and Boyer M. A. (2002). *World Politics, International Politics on the World Stage*, Brief, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Scholte, J.A (2000). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Houndmills, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Soroos, m. (1986). *Beyond Sovereignty, the Challenge of Global Policy*. University of Carolina Press.
- United Nations Treaty Series 195 (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. New York: UN.
- Viotti, P. R. and Kauppi M. V. (1999). *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 3rd edition,
- Yoo, J. (1998). *The New Sovereignty and the Old Constitution: The Chemical Weapons Convention and the Appointments Clause*, 15CONST.COMMENT.