
PROCESSES OF GLOBALIZATION

GLOBALIZATION AND SOVEREIGNTY: WHY DO STATES ABANDON THEIR SOVEREIGN PREROGATIVES?

Leonid E. Grinin

Volgograd Center for Social Research

Introduction

The problems of national sovereignty in political science have always played the essential role since Jan Bodin's times. However, in the late 20th – early 21st century there appeared new aspects in this field, especially in the context of discussing the issues of globalization and new world order. In the world political science the subject of change, 'diffusion', or 'disappearing' etc. of national sovereignty started to be raised more actively¹. Generally speaking, notwithstanding an avalanche of works devoted to the transformation of sovereignty, some topical aspects of the problem mentioned appear to have been disregarded. The present article is devoted to the analysis of one of such insufficiently investigated aspects – the deliberate voluntary reduction of sovereign prerogatives.

In the present paper we have tried to prove that on the whole globalization contributes to the change and reduction of nomenclature and scope of state sovereign powers, and besides it is a bilateral process: on the one hand, the factors are strengthening that fairly undermine the countries' sovereignty, on the other – most states voluntarily and deliberately limit the scope of their sovereignty. Naturally, one can also speak about the whole range of important directions, tendencies and processes, which constitute manifold complicated and in many respects contradictory dynamics of world political processes; and, as a consequence, they do not only limit sovereignty but also, in some way, evidently consolidate it. Later, we will return to this point. But naturally, it is absolutely impossible to give the whole picture of all processes in one article, so our main task is to investigate the tendency of changing and reducing of the modern prerogatives, especially in view of voluntary actions of the owners of those prerogatives.

In our opinion, the processes of changing of sovereignty nowadays are among those of much significance. Presumably, if such processes (of course with much fluctuation) gain strength it will surely affect all spheres of life, including change of ideology and social psychology (the moment which is still underestimated by many analysts).

On the Notion of Sovereignty

In political science sovereignty is usually defined as the most essential attribute of the state in the form of its complete self-sufficiency in the frames of a certain territory *i.e.*, its supremacy in the domestic policy and independence in the foreign one. This notion be-

¹ The substantial survey of these works until 2001 can be found in the following announcement: International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. The Responsibility to Protect: Research, Bibliography, Background. Supplementary volume to the report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. – December 2001. – Ottawa.

came widespread in the 19th century. But already at the beginning of the Modern Age it got quite a definite interpretation in the works by Machiavelli, Bodin, Hobbs and others.

Within the Westphalian system of international relations, (it formed after the Thirty Year War and 1648 Peace Treaties of Westphalia), the principles of state sovereignty gradually obtained the all-European, and then universal appreciation. However, it is important to note that this 'normative trajectory' of international law was fully described only by the end of the 18th – early 19th century, this was especially connected to the events of the Great French Revolution, and also with Napoleon Wars and a new order established after the Vienna Congress in 1815. At present the UN Charter and some other international agreements contain regulations on sovereign equality of states and nations' right to self-determination which together with the increasing degree of external security of most countries, in our view has sufficiently contributed to the consolidation of the idea of national sovereignty in international affairs in the second half of the 20th century. Indeed, as we will see further, the tendency toward the recognition of the sovereign rights is combined with the tendency toward their voluntarily constraint by the sovereigns themselves.

However, the notion of sovereignty is one of the most difficult and ambiguous² and its content has constantly changed and continues changing in connection with the transformations of international relations and characteristics of the states themselves, even in connection with complexity of definition of the notion of state. This content also changed depending on who is implied as the supreme sovereign: a feudal monarch having the right to grant or split states when sharing the inheritance, an enlightened absolute monarch who acts on behalf of people, or the nation itself. Besides, the sovereignty that is absolute in theory of states was always strongly and even fatally limited by different factors (and analysts had mentioned this fact long before the study of the globalization processes began). Sovereignty can be regarded in different aspects and versions³.

In other words, the notion of sovereignty is not univocal and indisputable but provokes numerous debates and, thus, demands a considerable elaboration, including various approaches to the classification of the states themselves possessing sovereignty. Thus, A. Giddens, for example, distinguishes state-nations and nation-states correspondingly as typologically earlier and later⁴. There is a multitude of other theories, *e.g.*, of quasi-states.

In political science one gradually becomes aware of the necessity of re-interpretation and re-appraisal of the notion of 'sovereignty' in connection with the emergence of the world political community, defining boundaries of private sovereignty, principles of their combination with each other and building their hierarchy, and also taking into consideration actions of other different subjects: MNC, numerous non-governmental organizations, multinational structures and arrangements, also considering the development of various global ideologies, for example, Global Civil Society. One can agree with Harry Gelber's conclusion: the last decade of the 20th century showed the incapacity of the national state to solve increasing complexity of problems, having a global character⁵. In particular the 1990s witnessed the appearance of numerous works on comprehension of different aspects of the sovereignty notion because of the events connected with the direct interference and military intervention (including the one sanc-

² See *e.g.*, Stankiewicz, W. J. *The Validity of Sovereignty // In Defense of Sovereignty*. – London; Toronto, 1969. – P. 291.

³ See *e.g.*, Jackson, R. H. *Quasi-states: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*. – Cambridge, 1990.

⁴ Giddens, A. *The Nation-State and Violence*. – Berkeley; Los Angeles, 1985; *Idem. The Consequences of Modernity*. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

⁵ Gelber, H. G. *Sovereignty through Interdependence*. – London; The Hague; Boston, 1997. – P. 12.

tioned by the UN) with respect to particular countries such as Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and others⁶.

Globalization: the Balance of Advantages and Disadvantages

The generally accepted definition of globalization does not exist and presumably it will not appear in the immediate future, as far as it has most diverse meanings. Without any claim to a unequivocal definition, we would determine it in the following way. **Globalization is a process as a result of which the world becomes more connected and more dependent on all its subjects. Both the increase of the quantity of problems common for states and the expansion of the number and types of integrand subjects take place.**

In other words the peculiar system emerges, where the problems of separate countries, nations, regions and other subjects (corporations, different associations, global media holding companies *etc.*) interlace into one tangle. Separate local events and conflicts influence a great number of countries. At the same time decisions in the most significant centers of the world have an effect on all the fates. In general 'the processes of globalization in the broadest sense are characterized by the abrupt intensification and complication of mutual contacts in the basic branches of the economic, political and social life, gaining planetary scales'⁷. Globalization is an exclusively versatile process. Practically all spheres of life experience its impact. Lots of positive as well as negative phenomena also gain a global character *e.g.*, the struggle for the preservation of the environment, the antiglobalistic movement itself, drug mafia *etc.*

Any development always means that a certain part of changes makes the situation sometimes worse in comparison with the previous events. In our opinion the reducing of the scope of sovereign prerogatives leads both to positive and negative consequences. Thus, the greater than before openness of boundaries provides not only the increase of trade but also contributes to the expansion of terrorism and facilitates drug traffic. At the same time the balance of advantages and disadvantages looks different for different countries, regions, territories even different social strata. This implies such an ambiguous perception of globalization. This is not in vain that its critics point at the irregularity in benefiting globalization and the increasing gap in the living standard of different countries⁸. It is important to note that setting up the outlines of the new order, globalization thereby breaks the old one, functioning within the state system's framework, therefore, the speed of the destruction of old relations often exceeds the speed of the formation of the new ones. In particular, in a number of countries this becomes apparent in the destruction of traditional ideology, based on the sacralization of fatherland and nations, and consequently, in the weakening of such earlier highly evaluated qualities as patriotism due to the growth of alternative to the national preferences and identifications. But instead globalization has not created any complete ideology to fascinate masses.

Globalization, Economy and World Policy

Globalization is a result of a very complicated alloy of political, social, economic, civilizational and many other processes of the modern world. But among these numerous factors one should especially mark out the huge changes in modern productive forces,

⁶ See *e.g.*, Regan, P. M. Conditions of Successful Third-Party Intervention in Intrastate Conflicts // The Journal of Conflict Resolution. – 1996. – № 40(2).

⁷ Ivanov, N. P. Human Capital and Globalization (in Russian) // Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. – 2004. – № 9. – P. 19.

⁸ Indeed it is rather an ambiguous conclusion, as in some cases, *e.g.* as regards many African countries, the gap may increase, and at the same time in the Second and Third World countries one can see a much higher than average annual economic growth. This concerns particularly some Asian countries, those of the Eastern Europe and the CIS (see *e.g.*, World Development Indicators 2008. Washington, DC: World Bank).

media, world trade and specialization. It is significant that many researchers first of all point out the economic nature of globalization. But one should bear in mind the significant fundamental idea that we have already maintained to consider economic and technical changes as an 'engine' of globalization means to admit the non-stop character of the process of globalization or the impossibility to break or turn it back, as nowadays it is impossible to stop or hamper the development of new technologies. So to control the process of globalization – and such appeals, and also complaints of its chaotic and unjust character are quite noticeable – one should in the first place control directions and rates of economic and technical development that seems a utopia nowadays⁹.

Technology and trade entangle the world with new network connections and make national boundaries transparent. Such a situation combined with other factors harshly complicates the conditions external towards the society. And, as a result, globalization strongly reduces and changes the scope of national sovereignty and undermines the position of a state as that of the principle subject of international affairs. Thus, changes in production forces in this or that way lead to changes of all other spheres of life including also the political one¹⁰.

This implies an important conclusion that we have already pointed out in other works¹¹: if the inevitable result of globalization appears to be the reduction of sovereignty, then it implies huge changes in behavioral patterns of states, corporations and groups, as well as of ordinary people. And though debates about destinies of a state (whether it is dying or consolidating) are quite frequent, the consequence in question is rarely discussed.

In other works we have already discussed both the above mentioned fact itself and the point that national boundaries become far less serious barrier for modern technical and economic forces than it was earlier. Many factors contribute to this, especially the powerful development of trade, transport, the role of the international capital, MNC etc. It is also worth keeping in mind that in the process of world globalization not only states but more and more territories and regions interact¹². We have also pointed out that the most rapid-growing branches of industry are just supranational in their nature. As a case in point we can mention space technologies or Internet which are more and more actively used for commercial purposes. Figuratively speaking, a person nowadays acquires functions of a mini-station accepting and transmitting different information often leaving aside national boundaries.

Close interconnections of national economies lead to rapid and more over uncontrollable reacting to the local crises in different places of the planet. This fact has been recently confirmed by financial crises that happened in different countries, when the vehement international capital provoked them in a matter of hours. George Soros concludes: Financial markets are unpredictable and unstable in their nature¹³. One of the main reasons of such instability is founded on the fact that political institutes fall behind economy which overgrew national limits and requires supranational planning and some forms of joint control over vibration sources of financial and other markets.

⁹ However, certain obstacles on the path of this progress in the form of different regulations and quotas will probably appear in future, as we prove it in another study of ours (for more details see Grinin, L. E. *Globalization and National Sovereignty* (in Russian) // *Istoria i sovremennost'* – 2005. – № 1. – Pp. 6–31).

¹⁰ See Grinin, L. E. *Modern Productive Forces and the Problems of National Sovereignty* (in Russian) // *Filosofia i obschestvo*. – 1999. – № 4. – Pp. 5–44.

¹¹ Grinin, L. E. *State and Historical Process. Political Cut of Historical Process* (in Russian). – Moscow: KomKniga, 2007.

¹² Grebenshikov, Ye. S. *Russia's Pacific Ocean Region and Japan: The Regionalization of Relationships* (in Russian) // *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*. – 2004. – № 1. – P. 89.

¹³ Soros, G. *The Open Society. Reforming Global Capitalism*. – New York: Public Affairs, 2000.

Thus, a new world order is required. But who will define its basic outlines and rules? In some works globalization (after some American political scientists) is sometimes defined as a process of the USA's will obtrusion to the rest of the world, as a process of establishing new world order, profitable for the USA. Actually, the USA's influence is evidence and quite real¹⁴. But does it mean that exactly *Pax Americana* should be established, as many sincerely believe in the USA?

Certainly, it is possible. However, is it realistic to keep such an order permanently? This looks rather doubtful. It seems more probable that in the nearest future the alignment of forces in the world will change¹⁵. After all the presence of some tendencies does not mean that the future is already predetermined. On the contrary, the direction, forms and results of the processes will be constantly dependent on the changing balance of the world forces, on the strategy that will be chosen by these or those countries and associations, on different geopolitical factors and combinations. In our opinion, it means that those who are longing for playing a more important role in the integrating and changing world must forecast and foresee the tendencies to use them for their own benefits. Undoubtedly, Russia will be able to play an essential role in the new world order, if it selects the right strategy. Thus, one should not mourn for the globalization passing in the American style, but find a proper place in the stream of global processes without losing one's peculiarities, particularly using common cultural-linguistic traditions in the vast territories of the CIS, and also Russian natural geopolitical and resource advantages (this, by the way, has become apparent in the Russian economic strategy during the last three years).

Globalization and Reducing Sovereignty

As has been stated above, in practice the sovereign rights and powers both of states and nations were always limited by various factors. Nevertheless, in theorists' minds 'Westphalian sovereignty' (*i.e.*, unlimited sovereign rights) still existed. In present days it becomes clearer that Westphalian system with its principles of international relations has fundamentally changed. It is also important to mention that nowadays the idea of states' free play seems wrong even from a merely theoretical point of view. The point is that the scope of the inner sovereignty has legally narrowed to a large degree due to the international agreements including the issues concerning human rights and what is more – actually, in connection with already formed models and traditions of states' behavior. That is why a number of political scientists think the more precise definition or a reconsideration of the notion of sovereignty is needed¹⁶.

As Michael Mann correctly observes, in works dedicated to the transformation of the position and role of a state in the modern world we often, observe a one-sided debate on the issue whether the state system becomes stronger or weaker, meanwhile the process appears to be quite complicated and ambiguous; in some way the positions of the state system are weakening but in other ways they become stronger¹⁷. Thus, Susanne Strange insists that under the influence of intense economic processes the state power

¹⁴ Including the cultural level. One can agree that nowadays the chief 'globalizers' are the Americans (Berger, P. L. Introduction: The Cultural Dynamics of Globalization // *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World* / Ed. by P. L. Berger and S. P. Huntington. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹⁵ Even Zbignev Brzezinski is in some doubt concerning the effectiveness of the USA's modern policy and appeals to a deeper comprehension or reformulating foreign policy goals and the American ideology more precisely, believing that it must determine its security in such categories, which will be able to suit others' interests (see Brzezinski, Z. *The Choice. Global Domination or Global Leadership*. – New York: Basic Books, 2004).

¹⁶ See *e.g.*, Thomson, J. E. *State Sovereignty in International Relations: Bridging the Gap between Theory and Empirical Research* // *International Studies Quarterly*. – 1995. – № 39(2). – Pp. 213–233.

¹⁷ Mann, M. *Has Globalization Ended the Rise and Rise of the Nation-State?* // *Review of International Political Economy*. – 1997. – № 4(3). – Pp. 472–496.

becomes weaker and at the same time surprisingly notes that the state has started regulating the issues, which before people solved themselves without any state involvement, in particular how to build their own house, how to arrange family relations, so that in her point of view there is almost no sphere where the state bureaucracy would not intervene¹⁸. She calls it a paradox though these are quite natural, as such processes never go unilinearly and only in one direction. The general trajectory is always a complicated balance of alternate changes, though at the same time the system's weakening usually combines with strengthening of some its aspects – it occurs at the expense of its components conversion and changes in hierarchy levels.

In connection with what we have mentioned above we would like emphasize especially the definite narrowness of the approaches even in the investigations concerning sovereignty since many authors study the issue only from the angle that powerful world economic supranational and to a great degree anonymous powers influence the transformation of national sovereignty, changing it on the whole as if in spite of or even contrary to the will of the states themselves. At the same time another aspect of the problem is almost unnoticed (or it is not regarded sufficiently important), whereas we consider exactly an exceptionally important one: sovereignty to a large (probably, prevalent) degree is reduced *voluntarily by national states themselves*.¹⁹ We have already pointed out to those aspects and investigated them in a number of works¹⁹.

Refusing Sovereignty Prerogatives: Paradox or Global Tendency?

In our opinion there is a whole range of factors which influence the process of changing national sovereignty including, of course, technological and economic changes the aspiration for escaping wars, the presence of global problems uniting countries, the processes of the regional rapprochement, the rapid extension of the scope of contacts of all types and levels among the residents of different countries; the necessity of solving the great number of issues and settling controversial questions, increasing number of democratic regimes in the world, etc.²⁰

However, the factor of voluntariness in reducing the scope of powers for the sake of gaining extra prestige and benefits may be considered among them the most significant, moreover, this very fact, as far as we see, defines the necessity of this movement. Thereupon, we would like to draw attention to the major process lasting since the end of the World War II, as a result of which many countries deliberately start limiting themselves in seemingly most sovereign things²¹.

It is enough even to cast a brief glance at the spheres where sovereignty has reduced to agree with above-said. The right to impose duties and taxation and define their rate; to forbid and reward import and export of goods (capitals) and some types of activity; to issue currency; to borrow; to set the rules of keeping the imprisoned and usage of their

¹⁸ Strange, S. The Declining Authority of States // The Global Transformation Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate / Ed. by D. Held and A. McGrew. – Cambridge, 2003. – P. 128.

¹⁹ Grinin, L. E. Globalization and the Transformation of National Sovereignty // Systemic Development: Local Solutions in a Global Environment / Ed. by J. Sheffield and K. Fielden. – Goodyear: ISCE Publishing, 2007; Idem. Transformation of Sovereignty and Globalization // Hierarchy and Power: Political Aspects of Modernity / Ed. by L. E. Grinin, D. D. Beliaev and A. V. Korotayev. – Moscow, 2008. Forthcoming.

²⁰ The list of threats to the state sovereignty often includes: global financial flows, multinational corporations, global media empires, Internet etc. The globalists maintain that state authority is greatly weakened by these processes which lead to the boundaries transparency – David Held and Anthony McGrew sum up such views (Held, D., McGrew, A. Political Power and Civil Society: A Reconfiguration? // The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate / Ed. by D. Held and A. McGrew. – Cambridge, 2003. – P. 124).

²¹ For more details see Grinin, L. E. Modern Productive Forces and the Problems of National Sovereignty (in Russian). – *Filosofia i obschestvo*. – 1999. – № 4. – Pp. 5–44; Idem. Globalization and the Transformation of National Sovereignty // Systemic Development: Local Solutions in a Global Environment / Ed. by J. Sheffield and K. Fielden. – Goodyear, 2007.

labor; to use the capital punishment; to proclaim these or those politic liberties or restrict them; to define fundamental rules of elections (and to hold them proper) and electoral qualification, and also a great number of other important things have stopped to be defined only by the wishes of a state itself. Not so long ago the Europeans refused the *sanctum sanctorum* – their own national currencies that had been developed for centuries for the sake of one common currency (euro). Finally, what has always been regarded the main thing in sovereignty – the right of war and peace – is under international control. It was only 50 years ago when Russel and Einstein in their famous manifesto wrote that to extirpate war it will require measures for the limitation of the national sovereignty which will wound national pride. Today such a control no longer hurts national pride. World wars and totalitarianism showed that absolute sovereignty including also the right to unleash wars and repressions is dangerous.

Hence it is possible to make an important thought on the whole obvious conclusion: the domestic affairs of a state where nobody intervenes and which are regulated only by national law and traditions, are contracting and at that in many respects a voluntary refusing of sovereign from their sovereign rights and international law or law of a definite community (of a collective participation) is expanding²².

Undoubtedly, in history one can find many cases of voluntary obligations and pacts, which significantly restricted the sovereignty of sovereigns and countries. Take for example the Holy Union and its interventions into the revolutionary countries in the first half of the 19th century, or the customs union of the German States of the first half of the 19th century. The processes of internationalization have started not today but have already been going on for centuries accelerating all the time. But as we have already mentioned, the prevalence and power of these processes yesterday and today are incomparable, in other words at present they have obtained a qualitatively different level in comparison with past epochs. First, they have embraced the whole world. Second, the economic alliances were uncommon before and now they have become the most typical form of associations. And some of the economic organizations (such as WTO, IMF) encompass the majority of countries of the world. The scale and aims of political associations have also changed. Third, the intensity and regularity of state leaders' contacts have grown enormously. And the problems they solve have changed greatly. Fourth, only a few countries are able to carry out an isolationist policy today and avoid any associations (like the policy of 'brilliant isolation' that the Great Britain was carrying out in the 19th century).

To emphasize the above said it might be mentioned (though it may sound strange) that today the maximum sovereignty (*i.e.*, the minimum restrictions in the use of the sovereign rights) is possessed by the countries that are closed economically and/or ideologically (as North Korea, Cuba, China, Iran, Saudi Arabia and some other Muslim countries), exactly because of their 'sovereign rights' (in particular to create nuclear weapons) sharp conflicts tend to take place. But on the whole even these countries' sovereignty starts to diminish. As for sufficiently open and developed countries, in our point

²² Certainly, it is combined with the imposition, in some cases rather tough, on the countries-disturber (like *e.g.*, Libya) of international rules and agreements, and also with the attempts of a direct interference in the affairs of those countries (like *e.g.*, some republics of former Yugoslavia, Israel, Palestine, a numbers of African and Latin American countries) that turned out to be incapable of solving inner conflicts or restraining political forces beyond control (see *e.g.*, Helman, G. B. and Ratner, S. R. Saving Failed States – Foreign Policy. – 1992–1993. – № 89 [Winter, 1992–1993]). Naturally, such actions of the International Community or separate countries and coalitions (the USA, UNO) also have a great effect on changing sovereignty and establishing precedents for the future. Nevertheless, it may be claimed that just predominant voluntariness in reducing sovereignty essentially contributes to the formation of a tolerant or even approving opinion to such interference on the part of the whole (or majority) of the world public, without which any intervention can neither succeed nor even take place.

of view the tendency to delegate their powers to the international, regional and world organizations and associations is absolutely obvious. The only exception is the USA which at times allow themselves to act regardless of many countries opinion, openly putting their national interests above the world and allied ones. But it seems to us that just in this confrontation of the USA and other countries which express a certain collective opinion, probably roots the main intrigue of the change of the world in the future as well as the transformation of the content of international relations principles.

Thus, there is completely no doubt that today in comparison with the past the sovereignty of completely free and independent countries has become much smaller. And what is extremely important, many countries quite often give away a part of their sovereign powers voluntarily indeed. We think that such an 'altruism' can be seriously explained only by the fact that such a restriction becomes profitable as instead the countries expect to gain quite real advantages. It is quite natural that such an 'exchange' has become possible in principle only as a result of the powerful influence of the described (and many unmentioned but implicit) processes. In our view a kind of world public opinion must be noted as an important cause of sovereignty reduction: the wider is the circle of countries voluntarily limiting their sovereignty the more inferior those states which do not make such restrictions appear.

Subnational, National, Supranational: a Contradictory Tangle of Interests

As has been mentioned above in political science it is realized to a certain degree that the doctrine of national sovereignty has become old-fashioned, moreover, these problems were touched even in the UN Secretaries General Butros Butros-Ghali and Kofi Annan's speeches and articles. However it seems that most researchers (especially in Russia) still underestimate the gravity of changes of sovereignty and the necessity to re-think this notion itself in the context of modern processes, but also a great number of others, connected with it. At the same time we agree that the state still principally remains (and will endure for quite a long time) the superior unit of historical and political life. Moreover, the division of the new and old phenomena is always a crucially important matter and a new order comprises very strong elements of the old one.

However, obviously, the scope of the sovereign rights in the modern world has greatly redistributed, so in the international community there no more exist 'one and indivisible' government and public and national sovereignty. The sovereignty is more often distributed between supranational, national, subnational, and sometimes regional and municipal units. Consequently, as has been mentioned above, new powerful factors have appeared and in the long run these factors gradually lead the state to stop being the principal sovereign and to give this place to larger supranational formations and structures. And in our opinion this tendency will be increasing. On the other hand, we would like without fail add that this is not a one-sided and univocal but a many-sided process: sovereignty will reduce somehow (*e.g.*, in matters concerning economic strategy) but in some way, it will become stronger and even grow. So, *e.g.*, Egbert Yan considers that ethnical-linguistic, cultural and social functions of the state will increase²³. That is why it is dangerous to hurry too much to bury national state, for a long time it will remain the leading player in international affairs (as on the whole one should be cautious enough while forecasting the global political changes). Besides, as some scholars fairly point out, the abrupt reduction of sovereignty and traditional functions of a state may cause chaos.

Though sovereignty is contracting, we find significant this principle itself (more exactly the appeal to it in certain cases), that will probably long remain one of the most

²³ Yan, E. Democracy and Nationalism: Unanimity or Opposition (in Russian). – Polis. – 1996. – № 1. – P. 49.

important in the international affairs. That is why its open disrespect will continue to provoke condemnation. When old ideas are still alive and the new ones have not become firmly established the collisions may obtain a form of opposition of principles which hides their historical significance. In that case it is difficult to understand who is right, who is wrong. For instance, if one bases oneself on the right of the strong to openly trample on the sovereignty principle even with respect to a dictatorial regime, the sympathy may appear on the *per se* reactionary side. The war in Iraq in 2003 proves this. That is why it appears that in the legal and moral aspects really irreproachable arguments are desirable which would be based on the world organizations decisions (the UN in the first place). That is why to support the actions against the regimes-disturbers the sanctions of exactly this kind are important.

Therefore, as has been shown above, since the end of the Second World War the tendency is more clearly revealed that countries gradually delegate a part of their sovereignty to the world international organizations. Even a larger part of sovereignty passes to regional associations. And the integration of states in suprastate economic associations is becoming more and more important part of globalization. Such supranational formations are present on almost all continents and in some cases a transformation of economic alliances into political ones is outlined. Of course, the process of creating really formed, systematically and profoundly integrated suprastate formations can not be quick. Neither will it be smooth in our opinion, since all its members can not ignore their own interests and in this or that way they will defend their interests against the others. Besides, within the countries themselves different political powers interpret national aims quite in a different way. In other words the adjustment of the supra- and intrastate interests is a difficult problem, and different confrontations are inevitable here. Besides, common aims also may be interpreted in a different way. In this sense, a very significant example is that of the USA which were able to bring together into a tight knot their purely national narrow political problems (such as the coming elections or the necessity to increase the president popularity) with world interests.

Globalization and Nationalism

Globalization as has been proved by different studies including ours²⁴ produces a dual effect with respect to nationalism. On the one hand, there can be observed a tendency to reduction of national sovereignty, on the other – a heavy growth of nationalism and even the smallest nationalities' striving for gaining their own sovereignty. The explanation of the reasons of separatism in the present period, to which we arrived, at first glance may seem paradoxical: **nationalism is gaining strength because states are weakening as systems**. However, there is no real paradox here, especially taking into account that the most states' security is actually provided by the world community and the strongest states. Besides, nations are not eternal essences, but ethnopolitical societies, forming mostly within the state framework and under the influence of technological changes. Under certain conditions their solidarity and homogeneity intensify, and under the others – *vice versa* – weaken. So, creating the supranational systems in the 20th century proceeded parallel with the destruction of colonial empires as well as of the old and newly created states, especially multinational ones, note that some of them looked rather stable (the USSR, and earlier in the beginning of the process, Austria-Hungary). And such a collapse, as we see it, fulfills in a certain sense a progressive role, facilitating regional and world integration. But it is very morbid and destructive progress, which confirms the

²⁴ E.g., Grinin, L. E. Modern Productive Forces...

above-said ideas that a progress and regress are going hand in hand. The matter in fact is in their balance.

Thus, we are inclined to believe that on the one hand, we expect some forthcoming decades when national problems will stand sharply enough in different regions and countries, since the reasons for nationalistic and secessionistic conflicts are very diverse. But, on the other hand, the belief is growing that the national right to the self-determination has turned into the 'opium for peoples'. As Mikhail Ignatieff puts it, the narcissism of small differences between ethnoses start to flourish, and the consolidating ethnic ideology forms almost the main resource for the revival of the violence today²⁵. However, at the same time though inconsistently and with difficulty a negative attitude to the abuse of this right is being formed in the world public opinion. As a consequence, in our opinion the aggressive nationalism splitting gradually up the states and producing a threat to the world order must diminish. The disappearance of nations and national differences is out of question. As we see it, the process will develop in the right direction when national affairs, problems and relations come from the sphere of the highest politics and heated fights to the quieter level, as it happened with the relations among the different directions of Christianity in the majority of European countries.

Looking into the Future

Turning our mind to the integration processes, one inevitably asks a question whether it is possible in any way and if it is, then in what way to reconcile various interests of hundreds of states having not only diverse culture but a great gap in the level of development. After all, the acceleration of development of the world and limited time for solving global and other problems do not allow waiting till the underdeveloped countries find their own way of development, because such a search may take centuries. The opinion makes a certain sense that supporting the advance to the overcoming of the backwardness may be achieved only through creating an effective market and an effective state. And what if the state institution is weak, as in Tropical Africa and some other places? And what should we do if the state is on the contrary strong enough to bar the fairly necessary changes (as in North Korea or Cuba)? And what should be done with the countries whose population and even elite are unable to understand global problems?

Therefore, in our view, the problem passes to the suprastate level and is connected with the transformation of sovereignty and with the external influence on those countries, within which there is no power for independent changes. But we are convinced that whatever mild is such an influence from outside would be, it will somehow affect sovereignty. Its limitation in our opinion has two levels. On the one hand, the developing countries are themselves ready to unite into regional communities to assert their interests together and solve problems. On the other – they are connected with the global confrontation between various developed and developing countries (the North – South problem).

Here is an example of changes at the first level. The regional organizations in Africa, South-East Asia and Asian-Pacific region, as well as in Latin America after the Iraq events accepted a new stricter policy concerning terrorism and the use of weapons of mass destruction. However, they prefer to solve these problems in their own way on

²⁵ Ignatieff, M. *Nationalism and the Narcissism of Minor Differences // Theorizing Nationalism / Ed. by R. Ben-El-Mechaieq*. – Albany, NY : State University of New York Press, 1999.

their own territory and by means of independent peacemaking organizations which they also develop themselves. But at the same time they start to search for the means to minimize the risk of the violent American invasion and also of the USA using the tactics 'share and rule' against the regional members²⁶.

On the second level a dialogue between the countries' communities (e.g., EU and groups of African countries) becomes more active. But the main thing here is that there are significant reasons, which, we believe, can force the developed countries to speed up the development of the most underdeveloped countries of the world more actively in the medium-term perspective.

First of all the matter concerns global problems. They touch the whole World community, therefore, the Western interest in their solution in the underdeveloped countries will be surely increasing. And it seems the latter in their turn will have to limit sovereignty in this or that way to fit general rules. For instance, we take the risk of supposing that as demographic and ecological problems are closely connected, probably, the regulation of population level will gradually become not only national, but also a common matter. But to solve a lot of common problems it is necessary to become aware of the fact that development cannot always widen what requires a voluntary reducing in consumption and also the mechanisms capable of forcing the majority of countries to accept such limitations. As D. Bell figuratively mentions, we have advanced enough to be capable of realizing a new vocabulary, where a key word will be *limit*²⁷. The limits of the rise, plundering of the environment, interference in the animate nature, armament limit etc. It seems quite probable that there will be allocation of rates of the economic growth in future, as without it other limitations seem impossible to reach.

Though globalization has not started today, in general it is a new, unknown, most complicated and in many ways unpredictable process. However, it is difficult to exaggerate a great role of the economy in the transformation of the state. The economy comes forward as the leading factor in this sense only in the long run. We think that some serious changes in other spheres of life are also required for a radical change of sovereignty, just as for the formation of bourgeois society the changes in economy were not enough but required also political revolutions²⁸. That is why in our opinion, the most important problem for a long time will be that of combining national and supranational, group and world interests. After all only an institutionalized solution of this huge problem will finally establish a more or less stable world order. But this will not be the order which is spoken about with confidence in the USA and NATO, but let us hope a system of a more balanced account of interests of different regions and countries. However, the way to such an order is obscure, complicated and discrepant. Naturally it will take some time when there must occur a profound turn in the elites and peoples' outlook, and, as a result, the national problems will start to be considered primarily through the prism of common interests and only next in the context of common (regional and world) tasks and problems.

²⁶ Bayles, A. J. K. The Lessons of the Iraq Crisis (in Russian). – *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*. – 2004. – № 9. – P. 75.

²⁷ Bell, D. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 1979. – P. XXIX.

²⁸ For more details see Grinin, L. E. *Globalization and National Sovereignty* (in Russian). – *Istoria i sovremenost'* – 2005. – № 1. – Pp. 6–31.