

Globalization and State Sovereignty: Transformed or Eroded?

¹Bem Caleb Apinean and ²Gabriel Yina Iornumbe

¹Department of Political Science, Federal University of Lafia, Lafia, Nigeria.

²Department of Political Science and International Relations, Taraba State University, Jalingo
Email: calebbem00@gmail.com iornumbegabriel@yahoo.com

Abstract

Globalization is the process of intensification of economic, political, social and cultural relations across international boundaries aimed at the transcendental homogenization of political and socio-economic relationships. It represents the reality that we live in a time when the walls of sovereignty are no protection against the movements of capital, labor, information and ideas nor can they provide effective protection against harm and damage across the globe. This impacts significantly on developing states through systematic restructuring of interactive phases among nations, by breaking down barriers in the areas of culture, commerce, communication and several other fields of endeavor. These processes have impelled series of cumulative and conjectural crisis in the global distribution of economic and political power. This paper uses the world systems theory to examine the negative impacts of globalization on the sovereignty of states, and suggests that to translate the potential opportunities into actual capabilities, a country would need to adopt an appropriate set of policies. Thus, even though this interaction continues, countries must select what to accept and what to reject, by adopting appropriate policies that would be to their best benefit. This is a reflection of the sovereignty of such a state.

Keywords: Culture, Dependency, Economy, Globalization, States, Sovereignty, Technology

Introduction

It is very difficult to argue that the state and sovereignty have been unaffected by the forces of globalization. This particularly applies in the case of the territorial jurisdiction of the state. Being the essential building blocks of world politics, meaning that world affairs boil down, essentially, to the relations between states. This suggests that once you understand the factors that influence how states interact with one another, you understand how the world works.

Since the 1980s, globalization paradigm has become fashionable. This reflects the belief that world affairs have been transformed in recent decades by the growth of global interconnectedness and interdependence. In this view, the world no longer operates as a disaggregated collection of states, or 'units', but rather as an integrated whole, as 'one world'. It accepts that it is equally absurd to dismiss states and national government as irrelevant in world affairs as it is to deny that, over a significant range of issues, states now operate in a context of global interdependence. But how, and to what extent, has globalization reconfigured state sovereignty?

The idea of sovereignty is centered on exclusiveness of state powers and control while globalization on the other hand is concerned with weakening state control by establishing inclusive global governance that reduces the extent of state control over their own subjects. Governments and activists alike complain that multilateral institutions such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) overstep their authority by promoting universal standards for everything which in turn alters the scope of state authority. It is the intention of this paper to consider just how much globalization has affected state authority. The paper sets to achieve this through qualitative research.

Conceptualization

Sovereignty

Sovereignty is the central attribute of the state as a form of political organization. Sovereignty and statehood have become so closely interlinked that a non-sovereign state tends to be regarded as only a quasi-state. It does not signify merely a certain degree or quantity of power, as if the extent to which a state is sovereign can be measured simply by calculating its relative military and economic power. Sovereignty signifies simultaneously a right to act and a power to act. There are cases where the power of a state to act is so confined and limited that its sovereign right to act is rendered largely meaningless (Ganaie and Mohiuddin, 2016). Equally, there are times when the actual power of a state is so great that, although its sovereign right to use this power has not been formally acknowledged by others, it is tacitly recognized. These are extreme cases, however.

Normally, sovereignty means the possession of a right and power, and disputes about sovereignty are disputes about right and power. It manifests itself in different forms, and this largely accounts for the varying definitions that are given of it. Seen from one angle, the right and power of sovereignty is exercised over territory, and is akin to the right and power of possession or ownership of a portion of the earth's surface. This ownership of territory includes, in turn, a right and power over all that exists, whether static or mobile, human or non-human, within the territory concerned and extends to so-called territorial waters and airspace.

Sovereignty can be defined more narrowly as the right and power to make the ultimate or final decision about the terms of existence of a whole territorially-based body polity (Oji and Ozioko, nd). It denotes a central core of right and power which may be called the right and power of self-determination, that is, a right and power to determine for and by oneself—and not at the command of others—the fundamental issues relating to one's existence. No external body has the right to command or order a sovereign state to act in a given way about matters of fundamental concern to it.

Sovereignty is the principle of supreme and unquestionable authority, reflected in the claim by the state to be the sole author of laws within its territory. External sovereignty (sometimes called 'state sovereignty' or 'national sovereignty') refers to the capacity of the state to act independently and autonomously on the world stage. This implies that states are legally equal and that the territorial integrity and political independence of a state are inviolable (Oji and Ozioko, nd).

Globalization

Globalization is the process through which national economies have, to a greater or lesser extent, been absorbed into a single global economy. It is the process whereby information, commodities and images that have been produced in one part of the world enter into a global flow that tends to 'flatten out' cultural differences between nations, regions and individuals. Globalization, according to Akindele (1990), refers to the process of the intensification of economic, political, social and cultural relations across international boundaries.

Globalization is principally aimed at the transcendental homogenization of political and socio-economic theory across the globe. It is equally aimed at making global being present worldwide at the world stage or global arena. In other words, as Oluabunwa (1999) once opined, globalization can be seen as an evolution which is systematically restructuring interactive phases among nations by breaking down barriers in the areas of culture, commerce, communication and several other fields of endeavor.

Globalization is the term used to describe the changes in societies and the world economy that result from dramatically increased international trade and cultural exchange. Cerry (1994) states that, globalization describes the increase of trade and investment due to the falling of barriers and the interdependence of countries. In specific economic contexts, the term refers almost exclusively to the effects of trade, particularly trade liberalization or "free trade." Banjo (2000) insists that the process of globalization is impelled by the series of cumulative and conjunctural crisis in the international division of labour and global distribution of economic and political power, in global finance and the functioning of national states.

The paper concedes to the suggestion of Kudrle (2012) that in defining globalization, it should be considered with regard to the specific intent of those using the term. Since we are considering the political effects of globalization, we shall define globalization as the expansion and intensification of international political and economic intercourse. There is no gainsaying the fact that economic and political independence and interdependence are interrelated. Political globalization is the process through which policymaking responsibilities have been passed from national governments to international organizations. No development has challenged the conventional state-centric image of world politics more radically than the emergence of globalization.

Theoretical framework: *World Systems Theory*

World Systems Theory argues that international trade specialization and transfer of resources from less developed countries to developed countries (known as a "core" countries) prevents development in less developed countries by making them rely on core countries and by encouraging peripheralization (Szymanski, 1982). World Systems Theory, therefore, views the world economy as an international hierarchy of unequal relations. A country can change its position in the global hierarchy with changes controlled by the "World System". Relations between countries are similar to what developing theorists described (Szymanski 1982). In other words, wealth is taken from semi-periphery or periphery zones to economies in the core countries.

World Systems Theory is a theory of development that deals with different forms of capitalism world-wide (Reyes, 2001). It thus takes a world-centric view and focuses on the relationship between countries. This relationship is directed by culture through social change. World Systems Theory explains inequality by identifying different cultures and the role of the state in international connections. Reyes (2001, p. 6) identifies the origin of World Systems Theory “as capitalism in its various forms in different parts of the world, specifically since the 1960s”. From this date onward, Third World Countries (TWCs) tried to raise their levels of life-style and develop their overall situation. Such development started when international trade interactions played an important and influential role compared to the national government roles and activities, which became less significant. Such international economic interrelations caused radical researchers to conclude that new practices in the economy of the world in capitalistic theory are very difficult to define, considering the limitations of the Dependency Theory point of view.

Still, Reyes (2001) concludes, most theorists of World Systems Theory consider that, as a whole, this is the only theory that unites the socialist countries in the twentieth century. For Wallerstein (1979, p. 5), World Systems is a “multiple cultural system with a single division of labour”. He argues that the basic feature of this system is having a pool of labour in which different divisions and areas are dependent upon each other in exchanging the provisions of those areas (Wallerstein, 1974; Wallerstein, 1979). As Szymanski (1982, p. 57) pointed out, most theorists of the World Systems school argue that “there is only one World System, the capitalist world-economy, and specifically that this single system incorporates the socialist countries”. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries especially, there was one only world system, namely, the capitalist trade economy.

Onyemelukwe (2005) traces the source of World Systems Theory in the early 1970s to a reaction against Structuralist theories. This viewpoint does not accept the idea that the wrong model of social structure would lead to countries becoming impoverished. According to this idea, it is the foreign capitalistic countries that are responsible for the underdevelopment of such poor countries. Paradoxically, the way ahead for underdeveloped countries is to adopt the practices and systems, including accounting, of developed nations. These changes inevitably have a negative cultural impact. Reyes (2001, p. 1) observes that the methods of international relations with “the focal point of geopolitics, the neoclassical theories of the economy that apply comparative progress as a base, and the World Systems viewpoint with the emphatic point of unequal exchange, all illustrate various patterns of international systems”. Rather than a two phase system, three types of country classifications “can be identified: core, semi periphery and periphery countries” (Reyes, 2001, p. 1).

Information and communication technology and sovereignty

Media as large scale business corporations are employed to guarantee the cultural dominance and economic dependency; and maintain the difficulty in free exchange, equality and balance in international communications and free flow of information. The industrialized North retains absolute monopoly of the invention, ownership and control of the new communication media and new technologies. Modern technologies have made the world increasingly more interdependent than ever. But the new technologies have the dysfunctional role of aggravating the situation of unequal partnership in North-South relations. As Dizard (2000, p.5) remarks;

...in today's world, communication has all too frequently become an exchange between unequal partners allowing the predominance of the more powerful, the richer and the better equipped. Discrepancy in power and wealth ... has an impact and influence on communication structures and communication flows.

The emerging global information and communication order is being facilitated by the internet and other technologies that offer an expanded range of domination of information and entertainment services. Such control of advanced technology makes it impossible to correct the imbalance in world information flow. For instance, the declining African states are today under the electronic siege struggling to maintain sovereignties and right to existence. The very fabric of our societies are rewoven or ripped apart as a result of new technologies in information. Multinational corporations employ satellites to bombard our villages and towns. We receive what they want us to receive but they refuse to report what we want the world to know about our plight. The new gospel of electronic elitism in theory, promises freedom for all but in practice is under developing Africa faster, faster than direct colonialism (Ciboh, 2003). This imposes greater foreign domination and control of economic, social, political and cultural thinking and orientation, especially in the developing nations.

Globalization and Economic Sovereignty

The interrelationships of markets, finance, goods and services, and the networks created by transnational corporations are the most important manifestations of economic globalization. Though the capitalist world-system has been international in essence for centuries, the extent and degree of trade and investment globalization has increased greatly in recent decades. Economic globalization has been accelerated by what information technology has done to the movement of money. It is commonly claimed that the market's ability to shift money from one part of the globe to another by the push of a button has changed the rules of policy-making, putting economic decisions much more at the mercy of market forces than before.

According to Karky (2009), economic globalization is a historical process; the result of human innovation and technological progress. It refers to the increasing integration of economies around the world, particularly through trade and financial flows. Now, shifts in economic activity in say, Japan or the United States, are felt in countries all over the globe. The internationalization of financial markets, technologies and services bring with it a new set of limitations upon the freedom of action of nation states. In addition, the emergence of institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF involve new constraints and imperatives.

The globe is in a period of unembedded liberalism as can be seen in the Uruguay GATT agreements concluded in 1994 relating to the so-called Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs) and Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) that circumscribed severely the sovereign rights of all states to regulate foreign investment and external trade in the pursuit of perceived developmental needs. Equally corrosive of the independent sovereign states' actions is the agreement on TRIPS that strengthens the international property rights of foreign investments and extends international patent protection to a whole range of products and processes previously not subject to patent. For instance, generic material collected by agribusiness or pharmaceutical companies which are harnessed to fabricate a particular industrial process or product. These processes or products may now be patented by the corporations and sold back to the country in

which the genetic material originated under international property rights protection. By the WTO provision, the recipient country has to allow a free competitive entry for such processes and products and, furthermore, it must prohibit the development and use by local companies of identical processes and products which amount to an act of unbridled piracy by transnational capital.

Related to this is in the area of debt where Africa's foreign debt gives the international community enormous leverage over the political and economic trajectories of the inflicted countries. They are forced to agree on eligibility criteria for more loan or debt cancellation. These are focused on re-engagement with the global economy through trade related measures and the development of civil society rather than poverty reduction and human development thus, giving a sovereign state a new direction or form of political governance against its will.

In recent years, much attention has been given to prioritizing Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) even though they generally tend to follow rather than lead domestic investment. This explains why there has been limited FDI mainly restricted to the exploitation of mineral and natural resources with limited employments and other benefits. This only enhances the profitability and protection of FDI without necessary enhancing the trickledown benefits to national economies as such enclave investments (Banjo, 2000).

Sovereignty and the Rise of International Organizations

In addition to cross-border trade and capital movements, globalization has prompted the increase in international organizations (IOs) as new key actors in international relations. International organizations are legal entities established by more than one nation-state pursuant to an international agreement. They have a legal personality, which enables them to exercise rights and fulfil duties on the international plane independently. Recognition of this special status in the years after World War II represents a significant shift from Westphalian sovereignty (Oji and Ozioko, nd).

Political Impact of Globalization on the Nation-States

Conditions are set in a straight forward manner in order for the nation-states to sit at the globalization table. Firstly, there is need to liberalize democracy (in a sense they have to subscribe to the capitalist philosophy of governance), which, in turn, would ascertain that the liberalization of the markets becomes a smooth transitional process. Simply put, global changes dictate terms under which the national government should function. As earlier hinted, the formulation of the local administrative policies should be so that they are in line with the prescriptions of globalization. The nation-states have limited powers to challenge the hegemonic, unjust and plethoric economic injustices pursued by institutions such as the IMF, World Bank as well as the WTO.

Under globalization, the nation-states' sovereignty remains in limbo as power steadily shifts to the most powerful financial and corporate institutions. Ganaie and Mohiuddin (2016) argue that globalization has subjected the national governments to an atmosphere where they have seen their sovereignty and control over domestic political and economic affairs rapidly diminish,

whatever sovereignty governments in the developing world managed to obtain with decolonization are now rapidly eroding.

Neoliberalism has smashed and snatched the nation-states' models of development and replaced them with models, which embrace the needs and demands of the supranational organizations. Although, on paper, some of these development models and theories were supposed to reduce dependency, reality has it that those in the Global South have no economic spine to stand on their own, lest they crumble to the ground like an atomic bomb. Ganaie and Mohiuddin (2016) observes that the international environment was imposing some compelling pressure on the Global South to carry out free market reforms and these very reforms often produce social resistance and political turmoil within the nation-states' boundaries. The dilemma here is, how do the nation-states devise strategic economic reform policies at the same time maintain political stability so that democracy and peace are not jeopardized?

Ganaie and Mohiuddin (2016) make a case that developing countries have sometimes deployed military and police force to deactivate popular sectors and eliminate all forms of autonomous political activity. This generally means suspending the constitution and replacing the rule of law with arbitrary political authority. Authoritarian leaders also move to eliminate other bases of political power: the legislature is shut down, civilian courts disbanded and elections cancelled. Political opponents are typically imprisoned, tortured, executed or forced into exile. To maintain high levels of economic growth and inflows of foreign capital, the state actively intervenes to break up demonstrations, strikes and land seizures. Repression is generally linked to the emergence of a coalition of governmental, industrial and military elites whose preeminent objectives are political stability and rapid economic growth. Popular movements are considered a serious threat to these twin objectives.

The above assertion carries a lot of weight, especially if one looks at the socio-economic and political upheavals which are prevalent in the African continent even in this era of globalization. Globalization is supposed to cushion the socio-economic and political environment and yet it is apparent that the ground for operation is uneven. The political havoc that comes to the fore within the nation-states end up compelling the elites to move their money out of the country - a condition that leads to the germination of appalling economic conditions, as the currency begins to lose value which ultimately leads to economic recession. The responsibilities of the nation-states at the birth of globalization have proved to be oozing into a world of complexity as divided attention on whether to address the liberties and the welfare of the citizens or satisfy the demands of the global village persistently creates an evolving dilemma.

According to Panic (2003), globalization has deprived the nation-states' power and sovereignty in that constitutional where changes are made in lieu of the fear of breaking ranks with the powerful economies. This state of affairs has also created gigantic problems in that the nation-states cannot find convincing reasons to woo their citizens to the reasoning that they can survive independently without reliance on the supranational and political union. The painful truth, though, is that under capitalism, the business of the day is focused on amassing wealth through private initiatives, rather than attaching value to accumulation for the aspirations of all the citizens within the nation-states. Globalization leads to the evolution of weak states which consequently cripples democracy, and in the absence of a strong democracy, we can be rest assured that the civil society will remain in shambles and doomed.

Globalization and Cultural Sovereignty

Culture refers to the patterns of behaviour and thinking that people living in social groups learn, create, and share. Culture distinguishes one human group from others. A people's culture includes their beliefs, rules of behaviour, language, rituals, art, technology, styles of dress, ways of producing and cooking food, religion, political and economic systems. The dialectical relationships that exist between the globalization parameters do not only affect the global economies, but also have immense impact on the ethnic, national and religious identities of the various diverse world cultures.

To argue that globalization has not had profound impact on the nation-states' cultures will definitely be grossly inaccurate, because the world is persistently witnessing the demise of the nation-states' socio-economic and political fiber. Thus, it becomes absolutely rational to contend that in the era of globalization, we are witnessing a clash of cultures. Mazaar (1999, p. 175) warns that looking at globalization in social and political terms, it is a time of renewed search for identity in the ethnic, national and cultural affinities that magnify the differences among people and groups rather than, as in the case of globalism, emphasizing their similarities. The proliferation of groups with which people identify has an effect on their social organization, education, technology and religious beliefs.

Although globalization is supposed to promote the emergence of pluralistic societies, the contrary is the reality on the ground where there is more of cultural assimilation than cultural pluralism. To some degree, one should not be taken aback by these phases of cultural development in that as skewed as they are, it is apparent that the most powerful societies and or cultures set a pace under which other cultures will have to operate. The less powerful become absorbed by the most powerful, thus resulting in advanced cultural homogeneity based on power. The result is a dizzying array of "competing and dying" cultures, which breeds complex problems regarding whose culture should shape the global socialization map.

Cultural fragmentation under the auspices of social transformation perpetuates the problem of lost identities and complex issues of eroding moral codes. The "paradox of globalization" is that apart from creating one big economy or one big polity, it equally divides, fragments and polarizes. Convergence and divergence are two sides of a coin (Mazaar, 1999, p. 187). Finding harmony within this clash of cultures is on its own a giant challenge which ultimately results in sparking explosive socio-economic and political adventures.

This is the process of cultural synchronization which, according to (Ciboh, 2003), implies that a particular type of cultural development in the metropolitan country is persuasively communicated to the receiving countries. It implies that the traffic of cultural products goes massively in one direction and has basically a synchronic mode. The metropolis offers the model with which the receiving parties synchronize. The whole process of local inventiveness and cultural creativity is thrown into confusion or is definitely destroyed. However, the concept of cultural sovereignty is the product of cultural conflicts, especially emphasized by a nation that is comparatively weak in information communication capacity against more powerful countries. The information sovereignty is so important that a third world leader warned that "a nation whose mass media are dominated from the outside is not a nation" (Nordenstreng and Schiller, 1979, p. 128).

War on Terror and the State Sovereignty

The US government declared a war against terrorism in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. The terrorists simultaneously attacked the twin towers, the symbols of US economic strength and the Pentagon, the symbol of its military strength on September 11, 2001. Although the responsibility of the attacks was fixed on Al-Qaeda, the war against terrorism was not to remain limited to this organization given its presence across national boundaries and continents. The US president declared that, “Our war on terror begins with the Al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of the global reach has been found, stopped and defeated” (Bush 2001, p.2). Since then, the US has launched a global campaign against terrorism. The US-led alliance is fighting to do away with terrorism with full strength. They have affirmed that “We will direct every resource at our command- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence and every necessary weapon of the war- to disrupt and defeat the global terror network” (Bush 2000, p.2).

The US Government formed a coalition according to the provisions of the UN Security Council Resolution that was passed on September 28, 2001 (1373, 2001). However, it has been observed that the US government in its war against terrorism has gone to such an extreme that it has forgotten the established rules and norms that command the mutual relations of the nations and states in the civilized world (Yusuf, 2003). It has been reported that following the doctrine of “might is right”, the US government has demoralized the nations and has challenged the states’ sovereignty across the globe.

The state sovereignty based on the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 suggests non-intervention of the nation-states in the internal matters of the others (Benoist, 1999). However, the multilateral treaties in the aftermath of the World War II and the growing role of United Nations in the world politics have made a great impact on the concept of sovereignty. From the outset, it seems that the international obligations have taken the central position and the state sovereignty has lost its primacy. But, the evidence suggests that the state sovereignty was respected to a great extent during the cold war period. However, in the post-cold war era, the concept of sovereignty puts much emphasis on the human security. Unfortunately, the state sovereignty has been challenged in the name of safeguarding human security in several cases. Quite often, the counterterrorism campaigns have dishonored the territorial boundaries of the sovereign states. This is a violation of the international law and the concept of state sovereignty (Tendon, 2005).

Sovereignty and Aid dependency

Another source of external influence on public policy was, and still is, official aid which increasingly has been linked to ‘conditionalities’. Aid is used as a lever to determine domestic government policy. Donors can withdraw vital aid if the neo-colonial governments fail to adopt policies favouring the interests of the donor government or firms based in the donor economy. In this way the donor government secures strategic and diplomatic advantages, as in 1983 when the United States Congress made economic assistance to developing countries conditional upon support for American foreign policy. Economic interests whom the donor represents secure a profitable policy environment.

Special loans from multilateral agencies such as the IMF or the World Bank come with conditions attached, such as a requirement to cut public expenditure programmes, particularly food subsidies and social services. Implementing them can lead to political unrest. Multilateral agencies such as the World Bank enforce ideological objectives in return for development assistance. Other conditions on which bilateral aid is given have included the purchase of arms and the award of contracts to firms in the donor country.

Assessing Globalization and Sovereignty of States

Technological changes over the years have increased the flow of people, goods, capital, and ideas. Monetary policy is an area where state control has contracted. With the exception of Great Britain, the major European states have established a single monetary authority. Along with the erosion of national currencies, we now see the erosion of national citizenship – the notion that an individual should be a citizen of one and only one country, and that the state has exclusive claims to that person's loyalty. For many states, there is no longer a sharp distinction between citizens and non-citizens. Permanent residents, guest workers, refugees, and undocumented immigrants are entitled to some bundle of rights even if they cannot vote (Karky, 2009). The ease of travel and the desire of many countries to attract either capital or skilled workers have increased incentives to make citizenship more flexible.

Treaty is one of the sources of international obligation. There is a basic norm of law that one cannot derive rights and liabilities from a treaty to which he is not party. However, contemporary international law now envisages situations where rights and liabilities are created for states without their being party to such transaction. There are treaties that are assimilable to international executive acts and treaties assimilable to international legislative acts, such as treaties that create objective legal situations like neutralization, demilitarization, internationalization of human rights and conventions codifying existing norms of customary international law (Kudrle, 1999).

Membership to an international organization has tremendous impact on the sovereignty of states. This can be appreciated from four sides. The activities of international organizations can have quasi- legislative, administrative and supervisory, as well as jurisdictional effects. This hinders the freedom of member states to act as they please. The UN Charter, Article 2 (6), states that the organization shall ensure that states that are not members of the UN shall act in accordance with the UN Charter.

Transnational Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have much influence over state activities. Throughout the 19th century, there were transnational movements to abolish slavery, promote the rights of women, and improve conditions for workers. The number of transnational NGOs, however, has grown tremendously today. The availability of inexpensive and very fast communications technology has made it easier for such groups to organize and make an impact on public policy and international law. Such groups prompt questions about sovereignty because they appear to threaten the integrity of domestic decision-making. Activists who lose on their home territory can pressure foreign governments, which may in turn influence decision makers in the activists' own nation.

Belonging to international institutions like the African Union (AU), the European Union (EU) or the Organization of American States (OAS) is inconsistent with conventional sovereignty rules. Member states have created supranational institutions that can make decisions opposed by some member states. For instance, the ruling of The European Court of Justice has direct effect and supremacy within national judicial systems, even though these doctrines were never explicitly endorsed in any treaty. The European Monetary Union created a central bank that now controls monetary affairs for three of the union's four largest states. The Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty provide for majority or qualified majority, but not unanimous voting in some issue areas (Giddens, 1990).

In a sense, these institutions are products of state sovereignty because they were created through voluntary agreements among its member states. But, in another sense, it fundamentally contradicts conventional understandings of sovereignty because these same agreements have undermined the juridical autonomy of its individual members. Thus, the question that must be addressed is; which is superior: sovereignty or political and economic integration? Which should be subject to the other? (Woodley,2015). Human rights have made a significant impact on international law. It has particularly affected the sovereignty of states and the assumption that international law is solely a state-based system and that states are free to treat their nationals the way they please. In Article 56 of the United Nations Charter, all members “pledge themselves to take a joint and separate actions in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of these and related ends”. The notion of human rights is not only individualistic in nature but also protects certain group rights. The idea of peoples' rights is based on the premise that there are certain rights, which are enjoyed commonly by all.

On the economic sphere, there have been allegations that underlying the economic sovereignty debate is a hidden power struggle on the world stage, contested by a number of prominent countries who use the language of globalization in the pursuit of very national agendas. Karky (2009) warns any country opening their economy to the outside world that it is by no means a free lunch. The policy will inevitably come at a cost. The cost can be perceived to be a weakening of the nation's “economic sovereignty”, namely the erosion of permanent and exclusive privileges over its economic activities, wealth, and natural resources. A review of the world's history will find that it is common that the economic sovereignty of an individual member is from time to time influenced by global economic trends. The increase in the number of international organizations and the expansion of their functions has undeniably restricted an individual country's sovereignty to certain extent.

As national barriers to cross-border economic activity have fallen, nation-states have become more vulnerable to global market forces. As international trade becomes a larger and more important part of domestic economic output, nation states that impose significant tariffs or provide large domestic subsidies face the danger of painful retaliation (Dunn, 1999). Anti- globalists suggest that international capital markets prevent nation states from pursuing independent macroeconomic policies. Nation-states, for example, cannot fully control the value of their currencies. Private traders have forced the United Kingdom to allow movement in the pound, though more authoritarian nations like China have maintained a tighter grip (Dunn, 1999). Currency fluctuation, in turn, has limited the ability of nation-states to pursue macroeconomic policies that fuel growth by expanding the money supply. International markets may impose similar constraints on fiscal policy. Because national governments issue bonds on the international

capital markets, they find their ability to set domestic policy constrained by the value of their securities.

The escalation of Ebola virus disease needs global collaboration to prevent them from spreading as well as the inability of a single country to tackle them alone. WHO has led the international community in developing the health strategies and approaches required to control and end this Ebola outbreak. WHO is still engaged on the front line, implementing many of the major health interventions. As of 5th May, 2019, a total of 1,572 EVD cases, including 1,506 confirmed and 66 probable cases were reported in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A total of 1045 deaths were reported (overall case fatality ratio 66%), including 979 deaths among confirmed cases. Of the 1572 confirmed and probable cases with known age and sex, 55% (870) were female, and 28% (445) were children aged less than 18 years. The number of healthcare workers affected has risen to 95 (6% of total cases), including 34 deaths.

Conclusion

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 typical account points to at least three ways that globalization has affected sovereignty. First, the rise of international trade and capital markets has interfered with the ability of nation-states to control their domestic economies. Second, nation-states have responded by delegating authority to international organizations. Third, a 'new' global law, generated in part by these organizations, has placed limitations on the independent conduct of domestic policies. These developments place sovereignty under serious pressure. The above are aided by information and communication technology.

The fundamental policy of globalization that undermines the sovereignty of states is the promotion of universal standard for everything, which, in turn, alters the scope of the state authority. To this end, economic, cultural and information which are the purview of a sovereign state have been eroded.

Recommendations

Globalization in principle expands the opportunities to enjoy goods and services beyond what a country can produce just as participating in an expanding market does for an individual, thus potentially enhancing the capabilities for enjoying the right to development. It must be noted that in practice, for most of the developing countries, globalization has not done so. To translate the potential opportunities into actual capabilities, a country would need to adopt an appropriate set of policies. Thus, even though this interaction continues, countries must select what to accept and what to reject, by adopting appropriate policies that would be to their best benefit. This is a reflection of the sovereignty of such a state.

The decline of national sovereignty is neither inevitable nor obviously desirable. Nation-states maintain the current world order. Sovereignty allows nations to protect democratic decision-making and individual liberties. Nor does robust respect for sovereignty demand the rejection of globalization or international cooperation. Rather than reject international law, or conjure forth the demise of the nation-state, the paper recommends a middle way. Popular sovereignty establishes

the constitution as the authoritative mechanism for the generation and enforcement of national law. The constitution's structural provisions, such as the separation of powers, set the stage for making international law and institutions compatible with sovereignty and democratic government, and thereby allow the states to reconcile their position on sovereignty and globalization.

References

- Akindede, S.T. (1990). Colonization and Economic Dependence: The case of Nigeria. In O.A Bamişaye and M.O Egbuwalo (eds.), *Readings on the political economy of Nigeria since independence*. Lagos ventures Ltd.
- Banjo, L. (2000). IMF, World Bank, WTO; The wicked Machines of the Imperialist. *Sunday Tribune*, 23 April; p.19
- Benoist, A. (1999). What is Racism. *Telos*. 114: 11-48
- Bush, G. (2001). Transcript of President Bush's Address to a Joint Session of the Congress on September 21, 2001 accessed @ edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/
- Cerry, P.G. (1994). The Dynamics of Financial Globalization, Technology, Market Structure, and Policy Response. *Policy Sciences*. 27: 317-342. Retrieved on 28/5/2019
- Ciboh R. (2003). International Information flow and Cultural Imperialism in the age of Globalization. *Journal of globalization and international studies*. Volume 1. Number 1.
- Dizard, W. (2000). *Old Media, New Media: Mass Communication in the Information Age*, New York; Longman
- Dunn, C. C. (1999). Globalisation: A World Systems Perspective. *Journal of World-systems Research*. 2: 187–215, <http://jwsr.ucr.edu>. Retrieved on 28/5/2019
- Elwell, F. L. (2013). *Sociocultural Systems: Principles of Structure and Change*. Alberta: Athabasca University Press.
- Ganaie, M.A.& Mohiuddin, S. (2016). Globalization and State Sovereignty. *International Journal of Political Science Development*. 4(2). Retrieved on 28/5/2019.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Globalization NOMADAS 4: 1-12.
- Karky, R. (2009). Globalization and Less Developed Countries. In C.C Nweze (ed) *Contemporary Issues on Public International and Comparative Law: Essays in honor of Professor Christian Nwachukwu Okeke*. USA, Vandepias Publishing
- Kudrle, T. R. (1999.) Three Types of Globalization: Communication, Market and Direct. In R. Vayrynen (ed.) *Globalization and Global Governance*. Lanham; Rowman& Littlefield.

- Mazarr, M. (1999). *Global Trends 2005: An owner's manual for the next decade*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Nordenstreng, K. and Schiller, H.I. (eds.) (1979). *National Sovereignty and International Communication*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co. p. 129.
- Ohuabunwa, S.I. (1999). The Challenges of Globalization to the Nigerian Industrial Sector *Nigerian Tribune*. December 14
- Oji, E. and Ozioko, M. (nd). Effect of Globalization on Sovereignty of States. In *The Legislative and Institutional Framework of Environmental Protection in the Oil*. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State. Retrieved on 28/5/2019
- Onyemelukwe, C. C. (2005). *The Science of Economic Development and Growth; the theory of factor proportions* London M. E. Sharpe
- Panic, M. (2003). *Globalization and National Economic Welfare*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reyes, G. E. (2001). *Theory of Globalization: Fundamental Basis*. Sincronia Spring.
- Szymanski, A. (1982). *The Socialist World-System: Socialist States in the World-System* C. K. Chase-Dunn.
- Tendon, Y. (2005). Globalization and Africa's Options (Part Three) *AAPS Newsletter*, Harare African, University of Ibadan
- The Charter of the United Nations, Article 2
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). The rise and future demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative studies in society and history* 16(4): 387-415.
- _____. (1979). *The capitalist World-Economy: Essays* London, Cambridge University Press.
- Woodley, D. (2015). *Globalization and Capitalist Geopolitics Sovereignty and State Power in a Multi-Polar World*. London; Routledge
- Yusuf, A.R. (2003). Globalization and Nigerian Economic Development. A Paper Presented at the 4th Annual National Conference of the Social Studies Association of Nigeria (SOSAN), Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan.