

The Problem of Preserving the Nation-state Sovereignty in the Context of Globalization

Adam A. Albekov¹, Anna A. Polubotko¹ & Elena S. Akopova¹

¹Rostov State Economic University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Correspondence: Elena S. Akopova, Rostov State Economic University, Rostov-on-Don, Bolshaya Sadovaya st., 69, 344002, Russia. Tel: 7-863-240-7355. E-mail: akopova-sovet@rsue.ru

Received: August 19, 2014 Accepted: September 19, 2014 Online Published: November 14, 2014

doi:10.5539/ass.v10n23p178

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n23p178>

Abstract

The article examines the discourse of identity in the context of globalization, analyzes the four main paradigms of globalization: the realist paradigm, the neo-liberal paradigm, neo-Marxist paradigm and the constructivist paradigm, and stands integration aspect of nation-state sovereignty. The author analyzes the philosophical aspect of the preservation of national and state sovereignty in the context of globalization and concludes that the risks that globalization brings with it, superimposed on the philosophy of radical ideas formulated at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries. Their original content is obvious enough: the rejection of the entire national in favor of universal (abstract human), the rejection of the state as a form and debilitating human activity and freedom, the abandonment of national economic structures in favor of the world economy. During the research, the author comes to the conclusion that the concept of nation-state sovereignty is not absolute. Historical versions of understanding and realization of the sovereignty vary in 3rd parameters: carrier of sovereignty, the absoluteness of sovereignty, as well as the internal and external dimension of sovereignty. Particularly affected by the restrictions of state sovereignty was felt in practice after World War II and has been reflected in the processes of European integration. Another trend in rethinking the concept of state sovereignty has been realized in the framework of the European Union. Based on this analysis the author proposes a solution for preserving the nation-state sovereignty in the context of globalization.

Keywords: globalization, the discourse of identity, integration, national-state sovereignty, national borders

1. Introduction

The advent of the new century has always been the symbolic turning point in the history of mankind. The 21st century is no exception. An essential feature of this stage is great economic, social, cultural and political changes that can be characterized by one common term "globalization". This term means a reduction in the time and space constraints, which in turn, leads to the gradual integration of the political, economic and social spheres and blurring of national boundaries.

Globalization is extremely complex and multifaceted phenomenon. On the one hand, there is a tendency to uniformity, synchronization, integration, unity and universality. On the other hand, have a tendency to localization, heterogeneity, differentiation, diversity and particularism. These processes are inextricably intertwined, and are in fact two sides of the same coin. Thus, the term "globalization" is used to refer to various phenomena which manifest itself in different ways in different contexts. Especially important is the problem of preserving the nation-state sovereignty in the context of globalization.

2. Four Fundamental Paradigms of Globalization

The term "identity" was first used in the work of psychologist G. Erickson in 1968 Although H. Erickson connects definition of a person with the same or a continuity in time and space, other authors also emphasize the unique, that is, those characteristics that distinguish humans from other people or the whole of humanity (Erikson, 1996). The conflicting forces of globalization and localization, two-pronged strategy of state sovereignty becomes largely unrealistic and is often perceived negatively significant segments of the population of heterogeneous states. As soon as the existential theory of the security offered by the state, have been rejected, the old history of the individual, which are based on a sense of belonging to a particular state, lost much of its credibility.

There are four fundamental paradigm of globalization: realism, neo-liberalism, neo-Marxism and constructivism (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative analysis of the fundamental paradigms of globalization

| Paradigms of globalization | Representatives | The core of globalization |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Realism | S. Hall | Anarchy of the international system, the principles of self-reliance in the struggle for survival and the central role of the nation-state as a key actor in the decision-making |
| Neo-liberalism | H. H. Frederick | The concept of interdependence of nation-states, free movement of resources, economic efficiency and competitiveness are the main factors that determine the result of the global economy |
| Neo-Marxism | M. Featherstone | Globalization is seen as deepening imbalance in the international system, the spread of neo-colonial exploitation around the world. Recognition of the structural violence concept |
| Constructivism | M. Tehranian, & K. K. Tehranian | Globalization is the source of the transformation of human consciousness. Changing the normative content of social systems, globalization creates a unified international environment, thus providing a universal significance for political concepts |

Lets' consider paradigms of globalization from in Table 1 in more detail. According to the realist paradigm, the magnitude and significance of globalization are limited. There are two main ways through which globalization affects global security (Hall, 1996):

- 1) Economic changes that shift the balance of trade in the global economy;
- 2) Cooperation and competition in the world economy due to changes in their relative economic strength.

As the economy is a key indicator of power for most realists, they suggest that changes in relative economic opportunities will inevitably lead to changes in the distribution of power on a global scale.

Changes in the environment are difficult to recognize, as the realists tend to be supporters of anarchy. States should act in the face of uncertainty, and globalization cannot change that. However, globalization can shift priorities in this anarchic environment, forcing the state to join the economic war, increasing competition for access to the mechanisms, which in turn help to gain more control over the results of globalization. On the other hand, globalization may also stimulate cross-border cooperation, as it can bring mutual benefits.

Neoliberal globalization paradigm is based on the concept of interdependence, according to which international relations are no longer produced by competing selfish and collaborators. Bound by mutual interests, actors are usually interested in long-term cooperation, which pays better than unilateral strategy, as it helps to achieve Pareto optimality in most situations. Driven by absolute rather than relative incomes, the state is no longer selfish in its purest form. They use cooperative strategies whenever it makes a profit.

The world consisting of cooperative partners depends on globalization differently than the world consisting of competing selfish. For neoliberalism the globalization is not merely a secondary process, which influences the policy further development of the growing interdependence, which qualitatively changes the principles of world politics. It does this with the help of (Frederick, 1993):

- 1) engaging non-state actors;
- 2) transfer of military priorities and strategic to the economic and social needs.

Due to these factors borders becomes easy to cross. Goods, labor and capital can move freely around the world. Economic efficiency and competitiveness are the main factors that determine the result of the global economy.

Neo-Marxist paradigm views globalization as the deepening imbalance in the international system, the spread of neo-colonial exploitation around the world. The concept of structural violence is fundamental here. According to this concept, there are serious structural imbalances in the world economy (Popkova & Tinyakova, 2013a;

Popkova & Tinyakova, 2013b), and the most developed countries (the so-called "center") receive additional profits from the exploitation of underdeveloped "periphery" (Featherstone, 1990).

Neo-Marxists are advocates of the "golden billion". Golden billion, which is located primarily in Western Europe, North America and East Asia, enjoys unfair high income, while the remaining few billion people suffer serious economic and social problems and their societies and economies vulnerable to destruction. This is because the structural violence of the most developed countries leads to the organization of an international framework so as to provide highly developed countries in the top of the most interdependent situations.

These various theoretical approaches to understanding the essence of globalization have one thing in common - they all pay attention to the material aspects of globalization: as it shifts the balance of power, creates the conditions for mutually beneficial cooperation and deepening inequality. Constructivists offer an alternative understanding of globalization on the basis of the analysis of ideas rather than material resources.

Constructivist paradigm comes from the fact that the political concepts have meaning only in a social context. Concepts such as "peace", "war", "security" or "power" are empty, if not integrated within a certain way of thinking about the world and international politics (Tehrani & Tehranian, 1997). Thus, constructivists question the objective character of anarchy in international politics, considering it a work of realistic thinking.

These four paradigms offer very different explanations of globalization. However, they are united by a common idea, which consists in the fact that one of the most important events attributed to globalization is the transformation of the role and functions of national states.

3. Philosophical Aspect of Preservation of Nation-State Sovereignty in the Context of Globalization

Dangers that globalization brings with it, superimposed on the philosophy of radical ideas formulated at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries. Their original content is obvious enough: the rejection of the entire national in favor of universal (abstract human), the rejection of the state as a form and debilitating human activity and freedom, the abandonment of national economic structures in favor of the world economy. Various embodiments of the disavowal worked in the doctrines of Western analysts, since the end of the Second World War to the present day (Akopova & Efremenko, 2011).

The situation would be truly catastrophic if these projects were fully implemented. However, they are implemented only in some of the trends of globalization, who mistakenly identified the anti-globalization consciousness with the new global order, which must be implacably resists. Identification with a total unification of globalization is the basis of possible serious strategic miscalculations. From a methodological point of view appear to be sufficiently substantiated conclusions that globalization is not total and that it provides for the development of the phenomenon of local connections.

Today, as a reaction on the part of common political and legal meaning of a growing conviction that should not be abandoned the state and its institutions, often do not really coping not only with the challenges of globalization, but also with internal problems, but to find ways of radical reform. In international relations, in addition to increasing transnational aspects, should be present previously dominated sector of international relations, albeit in slightly different proportions and form.

Globalization creates such a complex networking (both on the world stage, and in some countries), it is necessary to reflect not only on improving the system of global governance, but also on improving the macro-level (state) control. In the context of globalization, each State as a politically organized nation faces a greater or lesser extent that it is aware of the problem: how to dispose of their national sovereignty, what proportion of it should be transferred to supranational bodies and interstate alliances, what new forms of sovereignty to choose.

For example, reluctance of Ukraine to establish the Customs Union, which would include some of the CIS countries and thereby transfer a part of foreign powers to supranational bodies. But this solution fits into the sovereign right of each State to make independent decisions. The sovereign right of the modern state and the solution is to "share" part of their sovereignty, which is the genetic source of a sovereignty interstate union that has the scope of its distribution (for example, foreign policy, economic policy, human rights and freedoms) and sovereign space which must now fit the sovereignty of the nation state (Akopova & Efremenko, 2012).

These processes give rise to many doctrinal matters. This is no accident. State by embedding into a relatively unified global space and being institutionally organized system of unique features in the modern context of social, political and economic development, it is extremely complicated. Multidimensionality of the modern state makes it difficult for modern political science. No less difficult, even for the state is the problem of determining the design of their existence in the spaces of global integration.

This project is a conceptual core domestic and foreign policy - the answer to the challenges of globalization, which in the case of successful implementation will allow remain in the maelstrom of the integration process. Moreover, this project cannot be a purely distinctive it must be guided by a regional model of globalization, unfolding in an environment close to the culture, historical traditions, level of economic development of countries. Each state as a player universal globalization should belong more or less "team". This strengthens his chances in the world economy and politics, but does not mean the total loss of his foreign policy positions.

Today, almost universally accepted doctrine is the belief that the interests of individual states and their global competitiveness can be realized only in terms of participation in the various unions. This is a significant occasion in addition to not hurry with the abolition of state sovereignty, which is a form of sovereign statehood.

Despite the fact that globalization is marked by moments of unification, integration mechanisms and algorithms cannot be completely the same in all the blocks of the regional scale of globalization of the modern world. Integration, for example, in Europe, moving in the wake of European federalism, cannot be fully borrowed in all parts of the world integrates in the Eurasian space, or among the Islamic countries.

Versatility and some aggressive European standards for democratic values and algorithms unifying processes requires opposition to her sovereign position of certain states, choosing the degree of borrowing and the alleged responsibility of the authorship of the script to its integration into the global processes. But the European model is inherent in one important feature - saving state and national diversity, which, as in the case of human rights is based on the general consensual basis.

This project is a public-national development alien to the American model of globalization, claiming the total versatility. In this model the idea of the abolition of national sovereignty, of course not only the sovereignty of the United States, the most consistent. For this reason, each state decides whether to develop the project output in the economic globalization, political, cultural, social networks, designed for the modernization of state sovereignty, or to join the radical wing universalist projects requiring the sacrifice of the state, and, consequently, national sovereignty.

Models of state sovereignty is usually said little, because the emphasis is on the uniformity attributes of state sovereignty as such, including the independence, territorial integrity, the rule of power. However, in the paradigm of pluralism and diversity of the existing states that are, as you know, in relation to formal equality, spoken of a universally valid model of state sovereignty is not possible. But this does not mean that in the modern world must be absent some legal-political ideal of state sovereignty.

In our view, this ideal is an integral part of the standard of the modern state, having doctrinal and enshrined in international public opinion. This standard includes the necessary functions, styles of behavior guidelines that each state must implement in order to adequately respond to the challenges of globalization.

Implementation of this standard should allow a variety of forms. The standard should also include the variability of the parameters themselves a modern state, including its sovereignty.

Most appropriate basis for such a standard is, of course, the liberal-democratic paradigm that stresses on the one hand, the individual's right to self-determination, and on the other - the right of people to self-selection of the direction of development of the internal state, the choice of socio-economic system and self-determination in the international arena. Of course, these attribute properties (essential features) sovereignty is not simply certify, and make a sovereign state, but also to make it, first of all, a sovereign state, i.e. E. States as such - the visible expression of the sovereignty of the people.

In the analysis of threats to the state and constitutes its sovereignty, without which the state simply cannot perform its function, often forget that globalization is represented by certain trends that blur the regional unity of the people, called by the people. It is in the destruction of the people as a sovereign entity, i.e. E. In erosion of national sovereignty, can quite clearly see the source of the destruction of the state.

Basis for the existence of the state is not only a defined territory and governments, but also detached in their spiritual and cultural identity of the people. Sovereignty of the people living on state-organized life and possessing absolute, i.e. E. Substantiality sovereignty, makes it impossible for the real existence of positivist understood absolute sovereignty as the absolute power of the state structures.

4. Integration Aspect of Nation-State Sovereignty

The modern system of international relations is characterized by a high level of interdependence, which leads to a decrease in the absolute weight and the transformation of the role of state sovereignty. Corresponding changes are most evident in the participation of States in regional integration.

The concept of nation-state sovereignty is not absolute. Historical versions of understanding and realization of the sovereignty vary in 3rd parameters: carrier of sovereignty, the absoluteness of sovereignty, as well as the internal and external dimension of sovereignty. Particularly affected by the restrictions of state sovereignty was felt in practice after the Second World War and has been reflected in the processes of European integration. After the war, restrictions sovereignty got defeated countries, and in the future - the country of the "socialist camp" (Carneiro, 2011).

The process of determining the boundaries of sovereignty has had a significant impact the rule of human rights recognized in the post-war era in a number of international legal instruments. In order to prevent such crimes as genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, in the framework of the United Nations in 2009 adopted a document "The responsibility to protect", in which state sovereignty rethought not as a privilege but as a responsibility of the State to its own population and at the same time provide for cases of possible intervention by the international community if the state is unable to protect their populations from such crimes (Cedar, 2011).

Another trend in rethinking the concept of state sovereignty has been realized in the framework of the European Union. Appropriate process has been linked to the gradual integration of the European countries for over 60 years. Member countries of the European Union are legally sovereign states voluntarily, of their own choice "pooled their sovereignty in order to increase their power and influence in the world, which none of the member countries could not achieve alone" (Zodrow, 2010).

The problem of state sovereignty within the framework of the integration structure is solved so that member countries "combined" some important aspects of their sovereign rights. The term "sovereignty association" means an association of decision-making system in the process of international cooperation. Whereas the principle of consensus (unanimity on the basis of the consent of all participants) leaves intact the sovereignty, giving each of the participating countries the right to veto any unilateral decision, the union of sovereignties provides a departure from the system. Each of the member countries of the European Union has the ability to defend national sovereignty (Kempf & Rota-Graziosi, 2010).

5. Conclusion

With the globalization of content and the role of state sovereignty transformed. Integration projects, which have been widely spread throughout the world, may restrict national sovereignty of member countries. Lack of balance in foreign policy and foreign economic policy of the nation state is factor negatively affecting the international position of the State as a result it loses international political feasibility of its sovereignty (Freeman & Quinn, 2012).

Events that took place in mid-2014 demonstrate some reluctance and inability of other nation-states to uphold its sovereignty in the context of globalization. Use of economic sanctions against the Russian Federation by a number of states who are its close trading partners reflecting their unwillingness to uphold their own interests under the pressure of the United States intervention.

Under these conditions, the problem of preserving the nation-state sovereignty actually reflects the problem countries' ability to survive in the international confrontation. There is no doubt that the complete collapse of a multi-polar system of the device of the world economy and the establishment of a mono-polar system of one world leader will lead to the establishment of control over the actions of the leader of the other countries and the loss of their national and state sovereignty.

In conclusion, it can be concluded that, despite the fact that many countries are willing to voluntarily renounce maintaining their nation-state sovereignty the consequences of its loss can lead not to the expected global unity, and to the proclamation of the dictatorship and the global confrontation of different countries.

Acknowledgments

Work is executed with financial support of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation within the limits of a base unit of the state task (the project # 1525).

References

- Akopova, E. S., & Efremenko, I. N. (2011). The impact of globalization of the world economy on the mechanism of economic integration. *Economic sciences*, 85(1), 291-296.
- Akopova, E. S., & Efremenko, I. N. (2012). Neo-paradigm approach to the study of recurrence of financial globalization. *Economic sciences*, 86(1), 400.
- Bornman, E., & Olivier, J. (2001). *Patterns of social identification in the post-apartheid South Africa*. Paper presented at the 2nd Biennial Congress of the International Academy for Intercultural Research, Oxford,

Mississippi.

- Brewer, M. (1993). Social identity, distinctiveness, and in-group homogeneity. *Social Cognition, 11*(1), 150-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.1993.11.1.150>
- Carneiro, F. (2011). *HRIS and Global Compliance Framework*. IHRIM Workforce Solutions Review. October/November.
- Cedar, C. (2011). *Global with HR Technologies: One Organizational Model Consistently Outperforms!*
- Erikson, T. N. (1996). *Globalisation and Norwegian identity*. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from <http://odin.dep.no/odin/engelsk/norway/history/032005-990471/index-dok000-b-n-a.html>.
- Featherstone, M. (1990). *Global culture: nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: Sage.
- Frederick, H. H. (1993). *Global communication & international relations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Freeman, J. R., & Quinn, D. P. (2012). The Economic Origins of Democracy Reconsidered. *American Political Science Review, 102*(1), 58-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000505>
- Hall, S. (1996). Cultural identity and diaspora. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory* (pp. 110-121). New York: Arnold.
- Kempf, H., & Rota-Graziosi, G. (2010). Endogenizing Leadership in Tax Competition. *Journal of Public Economics, 94*(9/10), 768-776. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.04.006>
- Popkova, E. G., & Tinyakova, V. I. (2013a). Drivers and Contradictions of Formation of New Quality of Economic Growth. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 15*(11), 1635-1640.
- Popkova, E. G., & Tinyakova, V. I. (2013b). New Quality of Economic Growth at the Present Stage of Development of the World Economy. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 24*(5), 617-622.
- Report on the General Assembly Plenary Debate on the Responsibility to Protect 15 September 2009. Retrieved August 19, 2014, from <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICRtoPGAdebate.pdf>
- Tehrani, M., & Tehranian, K. K. (1997). Taming modernity: towards a new paradigm. In A. Mohammadi (Ed.), *International communication and globalization* (pp. 119-167). London: Sage: 119 -167.
- Zodrow, G. R. (2010). Capital Mobility and Capital Tax Competition. *National Tax Journal, 63*(4,1), 865-902.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).