Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization: Challenges & Opportunities

Hawa Singh

Student, Symbiosis Law School, Nagpur

ABSTRACT

States have always had unchallenged sovereign power, but in the present time, this power is collapsing due to the emergence of international organizations, regional organizations, international courts, and tribunals, NGOs & MNCs. Sovereignty and globalization are both concepts that are looked into in this paper through the application of a methodical framework. Global factors influence the internal matters of a state, ultimately affecting the effectiveness of the state's sovereign powers. Furthermore, the paper talks about the challenges faced by the state due to this increased involvement. And opportunities. Undoubtedly, nationalism has risen across the globe because of global expansion. Migration is on the rise due to globalization, and along with it, the nationalistic sentiment has also increased. Numerous nations are facing severe difficulties owing to migration, resulting in a direct impact on state sovereignty. In regards to challenges faced by the sovereignty of the state, the paper even highlights futuristic aspects, keeping in mind the past and historical events that helped mankind throughout this challenging journey.

KEYWORDS: globalization, sovereignty, capitalism, global organization, nationalism.

1. INTRODUCTION

A new threat has emerged in the last few decades, developed over the latter half of the previous century and early years of the current one, and in some ways, it has succeeded in challenging National sovereignty, jeopardizing the global order and governance today.

Sovereignty has been uncontested for many decades, and people have come to regard it as the ordinary course of events. But as a result of the increased importance and reliance on trade associations, international television, the Internet, Artificial intelligence, public organizations, and non-governmental organizations, the concept that the state is a self-sufficient, self-sustaining and autonomous entity is crumbling. Opinions of scholars/ thinkers still vary to the point that some still believe that the sovereignty of a state remains the foundation of state interaction, while some believe that the state is no longer sovereign.

Many scholars/thinkers have emphasised that not only is there an ever-increasing continuous reliance among nations, but nation-state interconnection has also made States appear weaker and less significant than they formerly were. However, this study will examine the degree to which the dependency impacts the sovereignty.

2. GLOBALIZATION & SOVEREIGNTY

Globalization pertains to the various mechanisms that cause numerous social relationships to become comparatively disconnected from their physical surroundings, resulting in an increased sense of global be-

coming one space for people to live their lives.

Everyone has developed a fondness for the term globalization, including legislators, media professionals, legal professionals, environmental groups, and agriculturalists. The term globalization is, however, frequently misunderstood and ambiguous.

Without a doubt, the trend of globalization plays a role in altering and diminishing the extent of sovereign powers held by States. Sovereignty shift processes stand among the most important in today's contemporary world. It is appropriate to discuss the majority of the nation's shift to a new level of sovereignty as well as the international relations framework as a whole. On the one hand, there is a lot of discussion about how globalization reinforces elements that inherently erode National sovereignty. However, from the post-war era, a growing number of governments have been voluntarily and purposefully car-telling their sovereign powers (a fact about which there is surprisingly tiny and frequent discussion).

Leslie Sklair claims that the lack of sufficient differentiation between globalization and internationalization among some users of the term has led to confusion in the literature. He contends that despite the seeming interchangeability of the terms by specific authors, there is a need to distinguish clearly between the terms inter-national and global.[1]

Globalization has undoubtedly occurred throughout human history. It has taken part in historical movements. The previous divisions between internal and foreign policy are becoming less and less significant due to globalization.[2]

It is crucial to understand that the expansion and contraction of states sovereign powers, including their terminology, result from bilateral processes. While the forces legitimately undermining each nation's sovereignty are becoming more assertive, most States also consciously and involuntarily narrow the extent of their respective sovereignty. Undoubtedly, one can also discuss all aspects of significant trends, directions, and mechanisms that make up global governance's complex, multifaceted, and frequently incompatible dynamics. As a result, they not only restrict sovereignty but additionally, in a sense, strengthen it.

The nation's primary characteristic as a type of political organization is its sovereignty. Because statehood and sovereignty are now so tightly associated, non-sovereign nations are sometimes only considered quasi-states. Not only is it referred to as a certain level of authority, but a nation's level of sovereignty could be determined by comparing its comparative strengths in military might and the economy. Being sovereign means having both the ability and the right to take action.

A more precise definition of sovereignty would be the authority and ability to ultimately decide what conditions will apply to the survival of an entire geographically based body of politics. It represents an essential component of authority and knowledge/right known as the rights and authority of autonomy, essentially the ability and right to decide the most important questions about one's survival on one's terms and independent of other people. Regarding issues fundamentally crucial to a sovereign nation, no outside entity has the authority to dictate or take action in any particular manner.

As a result, Sovereignty and independence are frequently misunderstood; nonetheless, as long as sovereignty isn't mistaken for complete freedom, the definition is correct. This is thus owing to the claim

---

[1] "Competing Conceptions of Globalization", Journal of World-systems Research, v, 2, summer 1999, 143-163; http://jwsr.ucr.edu/, issn 1076-156x © 1999 Leslie Sklair.
[2] Greg Nzeken, "Contemporary Experiences in Globalization" in Globalization and Nigeria's Economic Development. Proceedings of the one-day seminar held at the N.I.I.A Lagos, February 11, 1999, p. 30.

that sovereignty depends on other sovereign nations' acknowledgement of it and, hence, on ties to other sovereign nations. Though it is not widely acknowledged as such, the self-declared Republic of Northern Cyprus is a perfect instance of a country that lacks sovereignty.

The idea that The Holy Roman Empire (founded in 963 A.D.) was supreme and, above all, Christian authorities, monarchs, and republicans gave rise to the modern sovereignty philosophy as a response from European nations. Moreover, the idea that the Pipe is above all other Christian monarchs was the target of this backlash. The doctrine of sovereign statehood was created as a response to the aforementioned two external influences and an internal defence against the fissiparous and central forces of the feudal barons.[3]

The ability of the administrative authority of a state to control their political systems and control and impact their economies- particularly in relation to macroeconomics management has decreased due to globalization. There is compelling evidence that the degree to which politics are now primarily influenced by the market worldwide is a strong indicator of the effects of globalization. The government needs to supervise national politics to remain in power, not because they can no longer administer their nations, but because they need to adjust to the demands of global market influences.

The finest examples of financial globalization are the interconnections between marketplaces, money, commodities, and resources and the connections formed by multinational companies. The globalization of commerce and finance has grown significantly in the past few years even though the capitalist international framework has been, at its core, global for decades. The way capital moves due to technological advancements has expedited financial globalization. Many argue that the marketplace's capacity to move money around the world at the touch of a key has altered the norms of policy formulation and financial choices considerably more at the whim of the marketplace than they were in the past.

The significant shifts in politics that ushered in the current phase of events and separated the Renaissance from the contemporary era are responsible for the current framework for global law. Another way to put it is that it is the regional nation's transition from feudalism. Since the state establishes international law via its statutory relationship with different countries, public international law governs relationships among subjects of international law. As a result, the nation is the initial subject of international law. According to international law, a country is an organisation established by an association of individuals to achieve a number of objectives; the most crucial one is to upkeep the Rule of Law inside its boundaries and safeguard the autonomy of its citizens with regard to other individuals.

According to international law, sovereignty has both politically charged and legitimate components. It is the ability of any nation to freely characterize or alter its political or financial system on a foundation based on its own desires, free from outside influences, to participate in international treaties, assert its supreme authority over its borders, and to have authority over its citizens. Sovereignty thus refers to the ultimate foundation of power inside a community. Furthermore, for a nation to participate in global affairs, it must have complete sovereignty, which means that under typical circumstances, each country should have this sovereignty.

In addition to being what has already been stated, there have already been a number of reasons that constrained the inherent sovereignty and sovereignty and duties of nations in practice. However, Westphalian sovereignty, i.e., inexhaustible sovereign rights, remains in the thoughts of the thinkers. The Westphalian model, along with its tenets of global diplomacy, has undergone significant alteration in the modern era, as is becoming increasingly evident. It is also vital to note that, even from a strictly theoretical

---

[3] B. O. Okere, "Evolution of the Concept of Sovereignty".

standpoint, the concept of the nation's free play now seems incorrect. What has actually happened is the legal definition of internal sovereignty has shrunk significantly as a result of global treaties pertaining to human rights and pre-existing norms and patterns of sovereign contract.

Numerous writers approach the subjects solely from the perspective that strong global financial multinational powers, which are primarily nameless, have a significant impact on the evolution of the sovereignty of a state, altering it overall as though against the wishes of nations themselves. International monetary flows, supranational organizations, international media, the internet, & also the global interventions, as we have witnessed in Afghanistan, are just a few of the many dangers that threaten sovereignty. The proponents of globalization contend that such procedures, which result in border transparency, significantly undermine state power.

Simultaneously, there exists another facet of the issue that is largely overlooked (or undervalued), but I believe it is of utmost significance: nations willingly relinquish a significant amount of their sovereignty. These willingly reduced powers include the following: the ability to declare certain or all political liberties, the ability to define basic electoral rules, the ability to characterize electoral eligibility, the ability to prohibit and encourage the import and export of commodities and certain kinds of action, the ability to issue monies, the ability to set regulations for the imprisonment of prisoners and the application of their labour, the ability to use the death penalty, etc.

Furthermore, international law governs a nation's entitlement to war and peace, which has long been considered the most important aspect of sovereignty. In the well-known manifesto of Russell and Einstein, they stated that the eradication of war would necessitate unpleasant restrictions on the sovereignty of a state. This kind of authority no longer undermines pride in one's country. Totalitarianism and worldwide conflicts have demonstrated the risky nature of ultimate sovereignty, which includes the right to wage armies and persecute people.

The willful relinquishment of state sovereignty is a significant shift in the global political framework that will eventually necessitate the creation of a clear transnational political framework. Furthermore, this implies that a considerable deal of the fresh framework will be established only to gain power over participants who are difficult to govern, as several financial and other factors currently undermine nations. There are unquestionably numerous examples of willful agreements and pacts throughout history that severely limited the sovereignty of the nations.

3. EMERGENCE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Non-state actors are groups and people who, despite not being part of, controlled by, or supported by a nation that is sovereign, frequently have substantial political power and dominance over the region. Supranational Organizations, private banking companies, NGOs, organized militant groups, and terrorist organizations are examples of non-state actors (NSAs), every one of which has the potential to use power to further their goals.

Nations are continuously attempting to find solutions to these problems and adjust to a society that is becoming increasingly interrelated and interdependent. By classifying these issues as dangers to national sovereignty and citing a number of them, such as international monetary flows, supranational organizations, international media, the internet, etc., this process, known as globalization, unquestionably assists in the alteration and decrease in the extent of the sovereignty of a nation. All nations are now participating in or participating in different supranational organizations.

The dominance of private entities has grown as an outcome of globalization, with varying effects on the

utilisation of financial, social, and cultural liberties. A number of the biggest companies in the globe produce more monetary output than many nations do.

Non-state actors have the power to affect the foreign and domestic policies of a state. NGOs, for example, frequently influence states and supranational organizations to enact regulations that support their goals. For instance, Amnesty International has had a significant influence on global human rights legislation.[4]. Supranational organizations have the ability to significantly impact financial policies in a like way, especially in nations where they have major investments. This effect has the potential to threaten governments' sovereignty by undermining their capacity to decide on their legislation autonomously.

NSAs have the power to influence global rules and regulations. In domains like the general health of citizens of different nations and their rights, global bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and the World Health Organization (WHO) establish worldwide norms. Although these rules are not typically binding on nations, they frequently have an impact on their conduct. By limiting the scope of permissible national activities, this impact on nations has the potential to undermine state sovereignty.

These organizations function outside the jurisdiction of any specific nation. For instance, terrorist or militant groups and separatist organizations frequently function beyond the boundaries of a country, which makes it challenging for one nation to regulate its operations. This can undermine the capacity of a nation to uphold its legal system and defend its inhabitants, thereby challenging sovereignty.

The situation has become more complex due to the increase in technological advances. The internet has made it possible for new kinds of NSAs to exist that are completely independent of conventional state systems, including hackers and virtual groups. By interfering with governmental operations, disseminating their propaganda, & also manipulating voting, these cyber entities have the potential to undermine the national sovereignty of a state.

4. NATIONALISM IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Nationalism" describes the emotion of honour and dignity a person feels regarding his nation-state and the bonds of loyalty that its citizens have to one another. As a globally recognised concept, nationalism serves as a means for the defence and advancement of specific cultures and lifestyles. For instance, the feeling of nationalism can be seen when someone relocates but still follows the news from their hometown and supports their native nation's sports clubs. Leaders employ nationalism to encourage patriotic emotion and a sense of unity, but nationalism is also the cornerstone of contemporary culture and unity among people. By dividing ethnic groups along geographical lines, nationalism gave birth to regional conflicts, which in turn led to the main battles of the twenty-first century. As a result, nationalism has a vast history- it existed prior to globalization, and humans have always fought for it. Financial nationalism is one kind of nationalism that hurts the nations that practice it in various ways. Protectionist tendencies constitute one of the primary expressions of financial nationalism, and it has negative effects on the world market/business as a whole. The future of a particular nation is connected to and reliant upon the future of a different nation as the world grows increasingly interconnected. This is essentially the fundamental aspect of globalization. Thus, any nation that wishes to sever its connections with other nations will always lag behind.

Such organizations are by nature manifestations of sovereign states, as their creation resulted from mutua-

---

[4] Briefing on shrinking space for civil society in Russia, presented at the carnegie center on february 23, 2016, by experts from human rights watch and eu-russia civil society forum, Https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/03/23/briefing-shrinking-space-civil-society-russia, last seen on 23 March 2024, at 20:19 hrs.

lly beneficial arrangements between their participating nations. However, since these exact accords have weakened the legal independence of its own participating states, it also essentially defies accepted notions of sovereignty.

There are many ideas that discuss the connection between nationalism and globalization. According to the first contention, nationalism has decreased as a result of globalization since it has boosted interconnectedness and weakened state boundaries across nations. Furthermore, as a result of individuals being capable to communicate more quickly due to the reduction of time and space, global indifferences have either vanished or at least gotten less significant and obvious.

Another contention sustains that nationalism and globalization have a complex connection in the sense that one fosters another, which further triggers another. This claim emphasises how countries existed prior to globalization and how every country has aided in the formation of an international framework. However, despite globalization, it continues to exist and advance the international order.

Culturally speaking, indigenous cultures have given way to diverse cultures around the world, thereby homogenizing world culture as opposed to nationalism. Because transnational corporations operate internationally, they contribute to the creation of the international framework, which determines how other nations' economies prosper. The emergence of an international society via media products, new technology, and interconnectedness undermines nationalistic thoughts. Thus, being involved in supranational corporations, abandonment of some national sovereign powers, technological advancements, and easy international travel poses numerous risks to nationalism" associated with globalization.

In Eric Hobsbawm's oft-quoted statement, the owl of Minerva is now circling around countries and nationalism.[5] He believes that nationalism's peak is long gone and that it hardly has the equivalent resilience, influence, or significance as it did in the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. It is easy to mock this viewpoint as Marxist utopian contemplation of the final demise of states and nationalism in the face of facts to the opposite. It is only reasonable to anticipate the demise of countries and nationalist sentiments when nations as functioning institutions collapse. He questions if nationalists' sentiment and its societal and psychological significance can support states and this sense of nationalism in perpetuity after their political significance in relation to statehood diminishes. As Hobsbawm put it, "Once extracted, like the mollusc, from the apparently hard shell of the nation-state, the idea of 'the nation' emerges in distinctly wobbly shape."[6]

According to Yael Tamir, a sense of nationality is primarily a cultural idea instead of an ideological assertion. According to Yael, "National movements are not just about seizing state power; they are also about assuring the existence and prosperity of a particular community, to safeguard its culture, customs, and language." [7]According to narratives about nationalism and globalization, the primary goal of modern nationalism is, in fact, the safeguarding of cultural heritage and ethnicity. The result is a conception of nationalism as an adversary opposing globalization and waging a counterattack over dangers to the "national" communities that come alongside it.

The concern concerning the nation's impending demise might be overblown, and there are solid grounds to think that globalization as, especially in its present, form-poses less of a threat to the preexisting global structure. First of all, people who assert that the nation is about to collapse appear to be suggesting that

---

[5] Eric Hobsbawm (1992) Nations and Nationalism Since 1780, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 192.
[6] Ibid., p. 190.
[7] Yael Tamir (1993) Liberal Nationalism, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. xiii.

just a few decades ago, nations were supreme institutions that controlled the majority of facets of society as a whole. Yet, historical proof is even more inconsistent.

According to Stephen Del Rosso Jr.'s argument, the past demonstrates that the abilities of the nations have consistently remained extremely unforeseen and irregular in each of the major domains where authority is purportedly diminishing, such as interaction governance, financial oversight, as well as the capacity to maintain safety and preserve its sovereignty.[8] Currently, there is significantly more regard towards the fundamental tenets of the rule of law and the inviolability of boundaries, with only a couple of exceptions we see here and there. It partially explains why numerous tiny nations that were previously on the verge of extinction or severed by more powerful neighbours have managed to hold onto their freedom and sovereignty.[9]

This study explores the link between patriotism and globalization, which carries multiple real-world and ethical ramifications. This relates to handling multicultural disputes and conflicts, which during the post-Cold War period became significant threats to security. In this perspective, globalization's impact and influence aren't as bad as is sometimes believed. Extreme patriotism that feeds on instability, uncertainty and solitude alienation may be controlled by globalization.

5. CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION AND SOVEREIGNTY

Culture can be defined as behavioral and cognitive patterns that members of communities acquire, develop, and propagate. Culture sets the communities apart from one another. Individuals' ideas, codes of conduct, language, customs, artwork, clothing styles, technological advances, and methods of culinary preparation and production, religion, and economic and political frameworks all constitute their culture.

There are various attributes that set cultures apart. Symbols are the first building block of; these are conceptual representations of concepts, things, emotions, or actions, as well as the language-based means of communicating with symbols. Culture is generally shared. People who live in one community have similar cultural perspectives and attributes. The knowledge of a culture is acquired and learned through generations. Social inheritance is the source of culture, whereas biological inheritance accounts for most physical characteristics and psychological inclinations. Members of the same community must teach others about their culture. Culture is also flexible. Individuals use their culture to swiftly and nimbly adapt to shifts in their environment.[10]

As no civilization can survive in total solitude or isolation, cultural interchange and sharing occur across all cultures. In actuality, social connections occur in all cultures, both as a result of fascination/intrigue and due to the fact that every independent civilisation occasionally requires help from its counterparts. For example, a large number of individuals utilise similar types of technology like automobiles, cell phones and TVs all over the globe nowadays. Global culture is a product of economic commerce and communication through computer networks. Thus, it is getting harder and harder to find commonalities in culture inside a single community. Every community can gain much from interactions between cultures. It is possible for various cultures to trade natural resources, man-made items, individuals, concepts, & even their ideals. However, there may be negative aspects to these interactions as well. The amalgamation of elements from different cultures can frequently cause an individual's harmonious existence to be upset. The contemporary global system is continually diverse and inclusive of different cultures, and one signi-

---

[8] Stephen Del Rosso Jr. (1995) "The Insecure State (What Future for the State?)," Daedalus, 124:2, p. 4.
[9] Ibid., p. 3.
[10] Microsoft ® Encarta ® 20080 1993-2007 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

ficant development of the 20th century has been the increasing impact and adoption of Western principles and beliefs such as individualistic thinking, effectiveness, equal opportunity, equitable treatment, and rationale. This moment has accelerated in terms of pace and character. The recent development of digital technology, such as the internet and AI, has only served to accelerate and prolong the lingering tendency of acculturation by compressing distance as well as time that one needed prior to these developments.

The proliferation of famous cultures constitutes the four most evidence waves that globalization has impacted regional cultures. Cultural creations like songs, movies, and TV shows have become readily available for every reason of the globe, owing to the growth of worldwide media and the advent of the internet. Cultural preferences have become more uniform as a result, and customary cultural behaviours have decreased.

The decline of regional or indigenous languages is a further indication that globalization has affected regional customs. The tendency of an individual to acquire the language of the prevailing worldwide culture increases with exposure to international media and voyages, frequently at the price of once native tongues. Loss of linguistic variety and a feeling of alienation from once native roots may result from this. Not passing on languages to generations to come can potentially result in their demise in certain situations. Indigenous societies experience economic effects from globalization as well. As a nation increasingly integrated into the global economic system, it is likely to adopt Western-style industrialist financial structures and consumption habits. As an outcome of this, traditional methods of existence may be interrupted, and outdated financial structures, such as arts that are handmade by artisans and agriculture, may disappear. Moreover, the occupation carried out by global enterprises may result in the loss of customs, and the hindrance may be caused to the local small businesses. It can lead to a severe feeling of monetary instability and alienation from their familial ancestry.

The dislocation of typical household frameworks acts as an additional consequence of globalization. Growing association with European culture and intellectual traditions has led to a regular rethinking of male/female stereotypes and switching out of household frameworks with unbigoted and individualized systems. Citizens might struggle to strike a balance between their traditional beliefs and contemporary international norms, which could lead to instability in society and cause hardships to individuals. It could also lead to a feeling of escapism from conventional ideals and an alienation of them.

Among the foremost significant effects of globalization on regional traditions is the impact on eating habits. As societies become increasingly correlated, consumers now have access to a wider variety of global culinary options. However, easier access could also be a factor in the decline of traditional cooking customs.

Culinary inclinations may benefit from globalization as well. For instance, globalization can help preserve endangered regional cuisines by providing a forum for marketing and appreciation for their betterment. The sharing of food traditions and ideals may additionally be a consequence of globalization, and this can promote understanding and appreciation between various ethnic communities. As a result, globalization can promote a sense of correlation towards other states as well as a deeper comprehension of the variety of cuisines.

6. CONCLUSION

Given that sovereignty can be characterised as a nation's complete authority and its power to exercise authority under particular circumstances, it is easy to draw the conclusion that a nation can either be sovereign or not, with no grey area in the middle. While governments are generally not compelled to alter

their conduct in relation to fellow nations or the global community, it's in their own best interests to do so. A nation's capacity to handle its own affairs on its own is a component of sovereignty, but as dangers and issues in the modern era become more globalised, it becomes harder and harder for a nation to function autonomously. This trait is particularly specific to tiny and feeble nations that are also known for having fragile democracies.

It can very well be said that globalization will cause the concept of the state sovereignty and its fundamental ideas to eventually erode and to fall. It is additionally possible to draw the conclusion that there's a shifting trend in our understanding of the sovereign rights of a nation currently by considering the growing interconnectedness of nations, the establishment of supranational entities, supranational corporations, and other agencies, alongside the integration-related problems like those in Europe. International law is always evolving.

Nonetheless, states and their sovereignty have endured and evolved in spite of significant advancements in technology and the degree of dependency of nations upon each other. Not only that, but topics that were previously unknown as territorial or sovereignty issues have entered the state policy conversation. The state continues to be the primary player in global affairs, even though powerful new players frequently emerge.

Although globalization is still in its infancy, it is a novel and unfamiliar, complex, and unexpected movement that will produce fresh issues in all aspects of life and necessitate remedies. For many years to come, the biggest pressing issue will be balancing domestic, international, and global objectives. Because, only an entrenched remedy to this massive challenge will eventually result in a somewhat sustainable global system. Obviously, it is going to take a while for a major shift in the leaders' and citizens' perspectives to occur, and so domestic issues will begin to be evaluated mainly via the lens of shared goals, and only then in light of shared tasks and challenges.

The rise in what have come to be referred to as New Social Movements (NSM)[11] Over the past 20 years, coincidentally, it has coincided with interest in globalization. Regardless of their significant indifferences, proponents of NSM theory contend that class politics-which considers sexual orientation, race, ethnic background, community, and faith systems-have replaced the labour movement's traditional class-based approach to capitalism worldwide. Almost all specialities of sociology now have a "globalization" perspective.

The claim that wealthy nations "think global and act local" is the primary financial obstacle to the development of capitalism worldwide. The wealthy and a select few developed nations are primarily capable of capitalising on the advantages offered by the global financial system. Nations that are impoverished are unable to obtain, which widens the divide between wealthy and poor nations as well as between wealthy and deprived individuals across nations.[12]

7. REFERENCES

1. E. J. Hobsbawm (2012). Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.
2. Dukagjin LEKA (2017). Challenges of State Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization. JURIDICA INT-

---

[11] L Sklair, 'Social Movements and Global Capitalism' in F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi, eds. Cultures of Globalization, Durham, NC. Duke University Press. (1998); T. Spybey, Globalization and World Society, Cambridge Polity Press, (1995).

[12] International Monetary Fund, globalization: Threat or Opportunity, by IMF Staff, January 2002, p. 11, available at http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm

ERNATIONAL.

3. Leslie Sklair (1995). Social Movements and Global Capitalism. Vol. 29. ResearchGate.
4. Leonid E. Grinin (2012). State Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization: Will it Survive? Journal of Globalization Studies, Vol. 3, Num 1, pp. 3-38.
5. Elizabeth A. OJI and M.V.C Oziko (2012). Effect of Globalization on Sovereignty of States. African Journals Online.