

INVESTIGATING THE EFFECT OF GLOBALIZATION ON THE POLITICAL SOVEREIGNTY OF STATES BASED ON THE NEOREALISM PARADIGM: THE CASE STUDY OF AUTHORITARIAN COUNTRIES AND USA

AMIN NAVAKHTI MOGADAM^{1*}, JAVAD MALAHATJOO²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran.

²B.A., Political Sciences, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Globalization has significantly affected and will affect all aspects of human life. This paper aimed to propose and investigate the globalization effects on the political sovereignty of states. In recent decades, the development of technology and human ingenuity has been led to the increase and facilitation of international relations with the informatics' revolution, expansion of satellite and internet networks, the creation of international economics, and codification of international law. In comparison to the common theories which believe the disappearance and instability of the political sovereignty of national states by emerging the globalization process, this research agreed that states are the most important actors in the international sphere currently, and the world without sovereignty cannot be found soon according to the theories of neorealism school and also the case study of authoritarian countries and USA in the political context. The data collection method of this research was documentary-library one.

Keywords: *Globalization, Sovereignty, Neorealism, authoritarian Countries, Politics and Government in USA.*

INTRODUCTION

Globalization is a phenomenon which has affected and will affect many important aspects of human life. Therefore, the studies associated with the effect of globalization on political, social, and economic life has been drawn the scholars of politics, international relations, and international economics, so that each of the so-called branches of science considers globalization as the main spheres of their study. The scale and scope of this phenomenon are extremely wide that some theorists regard it as the greatest and most important contemporary event of human. Bashiriyeh believed that "Globalization is the most comprehensive concept encompassing the most significant and vital global changes in the sphere of technology, economics, politics, communication, and culture" (Bashiriyeh, 2018).

Clearly, globalization has remarkable influence on the political sphere of human life and causes the developments. In this research, the effect of globalization on the sovereignty of states has been investigated as the important concept of the political sphere. The current research investigated the effects of globalization on the sovereignty of states in the political context.

The theories associated with these effects can be classified into two primary classifications. The first class is the people who believe that globalization causes the disappearance of the sovereignty of states. Accordingly, we will see the vanishing of the sovereignty of states in the international sphere. The second class of theorists is completely against the opinions of the first class, and they believe that even with the spread of globalization phenomenon in the international sphere, the

sovereignty of states will still remain powerful; therefore, the vanishing of the sovereignty of states will not occur.

The writers of this research supported the ideas of the second group and believed that the sovereignty of states will not vanish. Then, the case study of authoritarian countries, especially the USA, was carried out to prove that the states are the major actors of the international sphere even in terms of the spread of the globalization phenomenon. Particularly, in order to respond to the main question “what are the effects of the globalization on the sovereignty of states in the international sphere?”, the hypothesis of the research can be formulated as “although globalization has been dramatically affected different aspects of human life, states are still considered as the key actors of the international sphere in the globalization era, and it does not seem that globalization leads to the vanishing of the political sovereignty of states”. To prove the hypothesis, the opinions of neorealism and the major theorists of this school such as Kenneth Waltz, Stephen D. Krasner, Robert Gilpin, who undoubtedly had the most scientific interpretations on global evolutions, have been mainly used in this paper. It is clear that the theoretical strategies of the research are necessary before proposing the mentioned contents.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Regarding the history of globalization, it should be said that interdependency and collaboration have been a popular motto in the prolonged conflict of human. Furthermore, it has been taken into consideration by celestial religions and scholars such as xenon, and politicians like Willy Brandt and Jawaharlal Nehru. Marxism was the contender of global thinking in the 20th century. Obviously, the term globalization has been entered into the literature of politics and economics since 1960 (Waters, 2000), and it has been hastened afterward. Globalization is "the integration of time and place in different cultural, economic, political, communication, and environmental scales resulting from science and technology with the dominance of governments around the world."

Critics have been come up with many criticisms by emerging theories based on the disappearance of the sovereignty of states. Accordingly, it will be referred to some of them.

Politics` Context and Governments` Affairs

Many critics have theorized against the theory of the disappearance of sovereignty in the political context, which in the following, the most important theorists have been separately investigated.

- *Robert Gilpin*

According to Robert Gilpin, many people think that the increase and growth of globalization dramatically leads to a decrease in the role, control, and the impacts rate of states and national economies in the international sphere. However, in his opinion, these are driven by the misunderstanding and fallacies of perceiving international issues. States and political and economic requirements still play a key role in formulating the international processes, and the attempts of many countries for accomplishing the development and increase in their economic power are extremely important to adapt and develop the global economic transactions. They have found out that they can achieve the capital, technology, and necessary facilities for development by participating in these processes (Salimi, 2015).

- *Stephen D. Krasner*



Stephen D. Krasner is one of the most famous and prolific theorists of international relations living at the beginning of the 21st century. He is one of the most important critics of the theory of the disappearance of sovereignty. The most significant beliefs of Krasner are as following:

- **State-centered and Sovereignty Hypocrisy:** As a realist, Krasner expressed that states, and particularly state-nations, are always the main actors of international relations, and those who argue the non-state actors and their role have exaggerated the statement. According to Krasner, what has been determinant is states, their interests, power, and preferences even in the interconnected world and in the last decades of the 20th century. What has caused the interconnection in the global era, and even in the global business sphere, is the result of the demand and interest of states (Salami, as quoted by Krasner, 2012). Therefore, state-nations and the available power structure among them are important and determinant in the international sphere.
- **The concept and scope of Globalization:** Krasner claimed that the global interconnectedness was quite clear and undeniable in everyday human life at the beginning of the 21st century. This is apparent at least among people and residents of industrial countries. While Krasner accepts many fundamental changes, he takes a challenge on this belief that the globalization has evolved the essence of human community and socio-political order of human. Krasner is one of the experts who believe that it should not be exaggerated on the importance and position of globalization (Salami, as quoted by Krasner, 2012). Krasner does not refuse the role and influence of the governmental interest groups and multinational corporations, but he considers the domestic political structures of countries especially important and essential regarding the extent and form of their effect. Furthermore, he argued that the existence of non-state actors is due to the space created by decisions of states. The emergence of international organizations, multinational firms, and non-governmental organizations all result from the decisions of national states, especially superpowers (Salimi, 2015). In most cases, the performance type and the domain of their activities are regulated with legal mechanisms of their respective country, and the USA has also approved some rules in this regard (Baylis and Smith, 2014)
- **International Regimes and Globalization:** The creation of worldwide international regimes is one of the important aspects of globalization, establishing for the developments of legal activities in the international system. Krasner has defined international regimes as “Sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given sphere of international relations” (Baylis and Smith, 2014). Regimes create the rules and values which guide the behaviors of international actors or allow providing the exchange, transaction, interaction among them. Regimes are created by a set of states and the interaction among them and their interests and securities. There is no central authority that develops regimes and dictates others. Basically, in the international sphere, there is no possibility of emerging this type of authority and dictating rules from the top. Indeed, a hegemon power has emerged in all historical periods that can play a key role in the creation of regimes. However, it does not mean the existence of central authority, and if hegemon does not accompany the satisfaction and interest of other actors, there will not be the possibility of the existence



and progress. Therefore, according to Krasner, most of the coordination and collaborations results from the existence and development of international regimes in the international sphere, which are not against the survival and major roles of states and power relations in the international sphere.

- ***Kenneth Waltz***

In this section, some claims of radical universalists based on the arguments of Kenneth Waltz, founder of neorealism have been discussed; those who claim the universality of liberal democracy, free market, the gradual disappearance and diminishing of states and vanishing of the sovereignty of national states:

First, Waltz argued that globalization is restricted to a small part of the world. In his opinion, everyone knows that many countries of the world such as most African countries, Latin America, the Middle East except Israel, and a large number of Asian countries are not embedded in the globalization realm and they have stayed away from it. Additionally, in most countries, the collaboration level of their various regions is different in the global economy. For instance, northern Italy is inside the world economy scope but southern Italy is out of it. Globalization is not developed worldwide because it is mainly restricted to the northern regions (Salimi, as quoted by Waltz, 3:1999).

Second, the current's interdependency has hardly increased statistically in comparison to past times. The statistic of economical interdependency has not exceeded since 1910.

Third, globalization is not united and integrated, and unfortunately, there are huge and considerable differences between north and south inside it and the rules governing the economics of these regions are markedly different. Today, the similarity and resemblance of most economic policies can be found out. The similarity and resemblance of economic policies of German are quite obvious after the war against the USA and the tangible use of the model of German by France. Nevertheless, no country completely wants to copy and create economic globalization because a large amount of economical operations of countries is still carried out inside the political borders. According to Waltz, 90% of goods are still produced for American consumers and Americans themselves produce 88% of goods that they consume.

Fourth, states are the key actors of the international relation sphere yet. Whether domestic issues or international ones and whether the economy or politics are mainly formulated by state-nations. Accordingly, Waltz argued that the 20th century is the century of state-nation and 21st century will be progressed in this vein (Salimi, as quoted by Waltz 6:1999).

The Position of Authoritarian States in the Globalization Process

By detailed and scientific examination of theories which identify the declining role of authoritarian states in the globalization era and deny any position in the political domain in the 21st century, we found out that most of these theorists have exaggerated while expressing their opinions. If we ignore the theories of neorealism, which is the most important and scientific school among political schools while analyzing the global events whose scientific foundation was strengthened after 9/11 attacks, they still play the major role in the international politics. Kenneth Waltz, Gilpin, and Stephen D. Krasner give the main preference to states, even in the liberal-democrat communities, in international politics and determine a lower role for the non-governmental organizations. Although they agree that the globalization process has led to some



evolutions, it is not extremely impressive to cause the disappearance of the sovereignty of states and their function (Salimi, 187: 2015).

Even though many countries introduce themselves as a Democrat, they might occasionally be the worst kind of political systems in essence. Furthermore, although there are fewer countries introducing themselves against democracy explicitly, we know that Hitler seized power with legal mechanism and turned to the most autocratic leader of the century (Harrisinejad, 2015: 74). Therefore, it should be devoted enough attention to the form and contents of states. European kingdoms, especially England and the republics of the third world are remarkably different in terms of essence and performance. According to Huntington, who claims that the democratic wave encompassed the countries of the world, and particularly Asia, Latin America, Southeastern Asia, and Bloc of communist countries naming this wave as “the third wave of democrat” and recognizing it diffusible and expandable, it must be said that the idea of liberalism and democracy has been truly chosen as the pattern of many countries, particularly after the cold war, and the number of democrat countries has been increased twice after world war II (Salimi, 2005: 17). However, along with the globalization pressures, many of these countries have been formally democratized and came up with this exaggerative motto. Nevertheless, they are not democrat due to their nature and essence and they increase the domain of their power, hence, authorities every day. Authoritarian states show hypocrisy when they encounter globalization, and some cases also protect the consequences of their negative global views. The historical experience demonstrated that power and its maintenance is the most significant principal for these regimes. Consequently, when they feel that they lose their power, they withdraw until the last step and show hypocrisy in this context. In order to maintain the essence of power, they give up many principles in the international dimension that they believe in them inside the country, and vice versa. (Ghavam, 2015: 323-343). It seems that the authorization culture has been penetrated into the people of these communities and embedded in them because dictators do not encounter severe problems for pursuing their intentions. On the other hand, the leaders of these countries have fairly understood the lessons of “Machiavelli”, who praised the force and justified undervaluing ethics by politic. Undoubtedly, we are not extremely pessimistic about the globalization importance exposed to the pressure of authorization states. Generally, they have provided the mottos such as feminism, human right, freedom of speech and press, fight against personal and state terrorism, environmental problems to the people around the world, particularly the intelligentsia of the authorization countries; however, these effects are not highly significant to dissolve the sovereignty of the leaders of these countries.

United States of America, Globalization, and the Practice of Political Sovereignty

Most of the scholars consider the activities of the USA deliberately in the globalization process and interpret the globalization as the project of “globalizing” and “Americanizing” (Nahavandian, 2016: 92). They believe that since globalization is associated with west and these countries possess the efficient tools in international sphere and mainly determine the globalization projects, and pursue it with special plans and goals, globalization cannot lead to the sovereignty threats of these states and it generally provides appropriate opportunities to decision makers of these countries. Clearly, the USA is currently the main dominant authority of this stage of globalization. Samuel P. Huntington, the professor of Harvard University, figures out a future in a paper as “Clash of Civilizations” in which American culture and civilization



have been established in the world. At first, he recognized American civilization as the world's absolute ideological conqueror by proposing that clash between the civilization causes the greatest challenges in the future.

By considering the overall effects in the process of evolutions in the world, the Americanizing is clear because as a country which owes the most advanced technology and a greater interest in the balance of international forces, meanwhile its effects are significant in the world events, USA has been exposed to the least political, economic, and social influences of the world. American culture is being strongly expanding all around the world and causes many countries to prevent its influence and attempt to keep their existing culture. For example, the state of France has passed a rule on which the number of American programs broadcasting on TV must be fewer than 50% of all programs.

In the second half of the 20th century, the USA prepared 22 military attacks against the countries of the world and it has been approximately attacked to one country once in per 2.5 years. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the USA has unilaterally intervened without the authorization of the United Nations Security Council. Moreover, by establishing its missile shields in the eastern Europe, which once belonged to Eastern Bloc and the Soviet Union, USA has proved its military domination to the world, particularly against its old and powerful opponent, namely Russia. According to these evolutions, Henry Kissinger claimed that "globalization is another synonym of USA domination".

NATO is the main mechanism which performs the strategy of the USA in the military and political affairs. This leadership and unilateralism of the USA are against the optimistic views of liberals who traces that the developments and social evolution and democratization will have prevailed because of the globalization. It seems that the 21st century will be the century of conflicts; however, what is evident is that the USA has been proved its superiority in terms of the so-called factors such as economic and military power. Therefore, the USA is invulnerable regarding national sovereignty because it has the whip hand in most evolutions of the world, and it has generally been able to proceed with its intentions. The claim that 21st century is an American century seems rather exaggerated, but it is quite sensible and correct that the USA will play a key role in the evolutions of the world with regard to the current perspective. According to Elmar Alet, the only rational justification of Iraq war is the threats of Iraq governed by Saddam Hussein against world peace, west values, and the safety of USA; however, the second arguments is referred to the USA demand for dominating the oil sources. Presently, there are enough reasons that the threat of Saddam Hussein was insignificant and almost zero, and what is important is the accomplishment of American purposes under the motto of global security and liberal democracy sovereignty. A country which started a unilateral war without the authorization of the UN Security Council and many countries had to inevitably accompany it in spite of their propensity. Developing a capitalist system under neorealism, namely, globalization, is considered as the most significant means of USA to achieve its demands. The USA is the motive of this process and still obtains the most benefits from it. The vulnerability of sovereignty is taken into account as a non-scientific statement (Haydt, 2014: 58-62).

The authors believe that although the interpretation of globalization process might be slightly exaggerated as the globalizing project, especially Americanizing, what is apparent is that globalization has opened up a great opportunity to proceed the globalization policies for development states, particularly Western Europe, Japan, and more importantly the USA.



Therefore, vanishing the sovereignty of states cannot be trustworthy in these countries and the domain of exerting their sovereignty has been reached the global realm despite the geographical borders. If there is a restriction, it is entirely voluntarily and in accordance with pursuing their national interest rather than being a risk for the practice of their sovereignty.

CONCLUSION

In the present research, by considering the exaggerated theories of advocates of disappearance of sovereignty of states in the international sphere, we sought to prove that states play the main role in the process of international process in the political, economic, and security dimensions, and it does not seem to see the non-state era soon. In order to confirm the validity of the hypothesis, it was referred to the opinions of neorealism and the two examples, namely USA and authoritarian states. It was mentioned that Stephen D. Krasner refers to the undeniable role of states in the international sphere by giving sensible reasons. Many of the world problems like terrorism, human right, global security, and environment, the economic and political crisis cannot be pursued and monitored without the role of states, and those who discuss the disappearance of states resort to the national states in this regard. Krasner fairly declared that definition of sovereignty as a tradition and Westphalian, in which states perform an eminent and definite dominant on the territory, has been in the doctrines and words, and there is not such an interpretation of sovereignty in the history and action. Finally, like most of his colleagues such as Waltz and Gilpin, Krasner recognized states as the most significant actors of global interactions and international organizations have power beyond their constituent members. In the economic dimension, Economists like Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson considered the states as the key actors of the global activities by throwing the assumptions of radical universalists into question yet. They argued that the global economic relations have become international not global and multinational organizations root in their respective country, and states are the most significant players in the economic sphere. In the security dimension, states and their interests have the crucial superiority according to the neorealist theories and the current situation of the world. Therefore, lack of practice and disappearance of sovereignty are not accepted and economic interdependence and democratization are not truly globalized and the international system is anarchic, and the importance of military force is still established. Regarding the two examples, authorization countries cannot be controlled due to communication revolution and globalization wave in spite of the fact that the concepts such as liberal, liberalism thoughts, human right, pluralism, accountable government, and factionalism are entered to these countries. However, there is another reality which does not allow to be optimistic about the disappearance of authorization countries and negation of their sovereignty. These states are strongly reacted to the slightest mistakes of their citizens. They would hardly agree to restrict their sovereignty and they powerfully exert the sovereignty.

By playing a role in the global interactions, USA is one of the main beneficiaries in the globalization process, and globalization provides unique opportunities to the leaders of these countries. The powerful countries of group 8 are even threatened with the existence of reality in the global era and they are pessimistic about it. If the interpretation of globalization is exaggerated as the globalizing or Americanizing, the hegemonic role of this country cannot be overlooked in the world and the powerful countries such as Japan, China, Russia or European



Union might not be a succession of the unparalleled power of USA. Authorization countries cannot be controlled due to communication revolution and globalization wave in spite of the fact that the concepts such as liberal, liberalism thoughts, human right, pluralism, accountable government, and partisanship are entered to these countries. However, there is another reality which does not allow to be optimistic about the disappearance of authorization countries and negation of their sovereignty. These states are strongly reacted to the slightest mistakes of their citizens.

References

- Bashiriyeh H. (2018). *An introduction to the political sociology of Iran: the period of the Islamic republic. (fifth edition)*. Tehran: Negha-e-moaasar.
- Baylis J. & Smith S. (2014). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations. Translator: Rahchamani, A. (first edition)*, Tehran: Abrar Contemporary Institute.
- Ghavam A. (2015). *Globalization and The Third World: Globalization Process and the situation of developing communities in the international system*. Tehran: Office of Political and International Studies
- Harrisinejad K. (2015). *Comparative Constitutional law (parliamentary, presidential, mixed veto), (second edition)*, Tabriz: Aydin publications.
- Haydt C., Wagner J., & Tobias P. (2014). *Globalization and war. Translator: Samino L*. Tehran: Akhtaran Publication.
- Huntington S.P. (1999). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. Translator: Hamid Rafiee, M. A*. Publication of Cultural Research Office
- Krasner S. (2012). *Globalization and the Governance of Space: a Critique of krasner on Sovereignty*. University of Wales.
- Nahavandian M. (2016). *We and globalization*. Tehran: Publication of Humanities and Cultural Studies Institute.
- Salimi H. (2015). *Various theories on globalization*. Tehran: Samt.
- Waters M. (2000). *Globalization. Translator: Mardani Givi, I. and Moridi, S*. Tehran: Industrial Management Institute

