

INTERROGATING THE RIVALRY BETWEEN STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND FORCES OF GLOBALIZATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICS AMONG NATIONS

Okibe Hyginus Banko

Department of Political Science
Enugu State University of Science & Technology

Abstract

This paper focuses on the rivalry between sovereignty and globalization in the contemporary world order. It is a comparative study, descriptive in nature and employs secondary data. The study adopts **theory of power by Hans Morgenthau** to explain how differentiated capacities define nations and why globalization seems to supplant sovereignty in response to changes brought about by technological innovations and advancements. As a result, globalization has been in constant rivalry with sovereignty and sometimes violates the rights that nations have over their internal affairs. The study recommends that both sovereignty and globalization, though important in the modern world, should have the mode of their applications and limitations clearly defined in international law and dutifully respected by nation-states.

Key Words: Interrogating, Rivalry, Sovereignty, Globalization, International Relations, Politics

1. Introduction

The principle of sovereignty of nation-states dominated the 18th, 19th and part of 20th century world with preponderance of exclusivity and respect for the conduct of nations. Since its inception, it prevailed and characterized international political arena for decades before the phenomenon suddenly succumbed to the emergent forces of globalization that crumbled the wall of sovereignty and opened access to connectivity among nations, especially in promoting causes, which are of general concern to humanity and overrides national purviews.

Although globalization seems to shatters the barriers that previously secluded national boundaries from external scrutiny, the recurring debates on sovereignty guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations Organization has been a thing of great concern. The parallel objectives of each concept in international relations have become prone to comparative study, to examine how either of the concepts shape or influence nation's attitudes toward one another in international relations, including evaluation of their polarity and what the adherence to one portends for the other. Meanwhile, it has lately become a rallying ground for scholarly debates amid inherent contradictions associated with their interpretations and application based on time and space. The attempt here is to analyze the contradictions.

Remarkably, the world, until lately, operated in a state of utter obscurity without much knowledge about the activities of each national government, what they portend to the global community, the intent of their technological adventures, development strides and attitude towards human rights. The obscurity analogy hinged on the concept of sovereignty, which the United Nations Charter provided in Chapter 1, Articles 1(2) but mainly in 2(4), (UN Charter, 1945; Makinda, 1996). From the dawn of 20th century, therefore, the sovereignty shield that independent nations enjoyed seemed to abate. Thereupon, the world

gravitated to a global village, where human interactions and diplomatic relations among different nations through technology, governance, corporate alliance, economic integration, institutional interdependence, commerce and culture began to blossom with diverse potentials and limited restrictions.

Although national borders, airspaces, information communication technology, including world health, peace and security, buttress and stimulate the relevance of global village phenomenon, it is evident that sometimes, the aforementioned gateways portray a serious challenge to national or international security concerns. They revolve around the inherent widening porosity of international borders and the attendant violation of exclusivity of nations and the right of their sovereignty, particularly in domestic affairs as an independent country. States oftentimes suspect the veil of globalization or global village phenomenon, the threat posed by information communication technology to national security and breach of a nation's dignity through unwarranted interference in her domestic affairs.

In 2015, during presidential election in Nigeria, the government of the U.S led by President Barack Obama and UK led by Prime Minister David William Donald Cameron were alleged to have played key roles in the failure of President Goodluck Jonathan of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). Similarly, they also influenced the victory of the All Progressive Party candidate, Muhammadu Buhari in the election and successful takeover of government (Daniel & Nwabuighogu, 2018).

In 2017, Russia was accused of interfering in the 2016 presidential election process in the U.S, and the disputation presented an increasing version of violation of a country's sovereignty, (Sonam & Natasha, 2017; Masters, 2018; CNN, 2019). In the buildup to presidential election in the U.S in November 2020, there were accusations that Russia, China and Iran were playing obtrusive meddling roles to influence the outcome of the election. It was alleged that Russia was supporting President Donald Trump while China and Iran preferred Joe Biden, the candidate of Democrats, (Breuninger, 2020; Harris, et al, 2020). It is amazing that in some instances, external media platforms other than the national election management bodies presumptively declare election results. There are issues of interferences in the internal affairs of nation states that sometimes result in inimical espionage and hacking.

Several allegations relating to spying and hacking accounts of government institutions and prominent corporations in the U.S. and other countries further highlight the risk factors inherent in a compromised sovereignty hounded by the forces of global village phenomenon. With technological innovations, the pretext for globalization for many reasons has become a gate-pass for nationals of different countries to infiltrate other host country with disguised identity label and veiled mission. The process camouflages military, technological, economic and political superiority rivalry among nations. Even at that, the cases of foreign sponsored espionage soar, and many countries have learned to intensify efforts on local surveillance.

Espionage has taken on different dimensions and the primary goal is to compromise nation's sovereignty. It is committed either by foreigners, some of whom disguise as government or humanitarian workers, investors, researchers and even students, or through some hired local citizens who usurp their nationality to traverse the system unconstrained. Examples are two Iranian citizens that court jailed 10 years in prison for spying for Israel, Germany and the UK (AFP, 2020). An Israeli citizen was indicted for spying for Iran, and two Iranian, were arrested for allegedly spying for Iran in U.S. (Alexander, 2018).The

Agence France-Presse (AFP, 2020), including many other media platforms explicate the spate of espionage across different countries for adventurous reasons and it does appear that national security assets have always been the attraction. The case of Iran where espionage targeted her missile, nuclear, nanotechnology, medical fields, and information on contracts related to the central bank, Melli Bank and the defence ministry, illustrates this point.

Fundamentally, David & Nicole (2020), Nakashima & Dawsey (2020), discussed how the United States leadership enmeshed in contradiction in an attempt to blame or exonerate either Russia or China for the vast hack of the federal government and American industry. However, experts inside and outside the government of U.S. were on consensus that the attack was a cyber-security breach on a scale Washington has never experienced. The consequent finger pointing and blame games provoked mutual distrust and growing tension among the focal nations. It also increased national security alerts, to protect critical assets that anchor state's sovereignty. Meanwhile, the U.S has often vacillated over which direction to point accusing fingers when it reasonably suspects external meddling in her internal affairs. In the 2016 presidential campaign, for example, U.S alleged that the process was hacked. Russia and China became the scapegoat that shared the blames of interfering in the election.

Glaringly, the weird surreptitious activities across national boundaries in violation of states' sovereignty appear to encapsulate the spate of espionage, and disguised war against other nations, erroneously clothed in the regalia of 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P), including several other incessant interferences in domestic affairs of countries. Admittedly, the purposes might not be far from covert intentions shrouded in globalization and smouldering penchant to muzzle national economies and by extension political spaces. Obviously, these acts seem to negate the notion of sovereignty of nation-states in favour of globalization and the ugly trend has become worrisome and seriously debated.

Against this background, some countries sometimes make move to safeguard their sovereignty especially since the coming into effect of social media and even the conventional media. One example suffices in Nigeria. Sequel to the controversies trailing #EndSARS protests and shooting at the Lekki Tollgate on 20th October 2020, a correspondent for the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) and particularly a United States-based Cable Network News (CNN), aired investigative reports that implicated the Nigerian Army and rattled the government. Akpan, et al (2020) reported how Federal Government and other pro-government interest groups that cautioned against external interference in domestic affairs frowned at any instigation of insurrection that portends danger for Nigeria's sovereignty.

Obviously, there are constant interference in domestic affairs of states from within and outside, and promotion of nauseating rebellion against governments in foreign countries by both internal and external media and other collaborative alliances. It inspires sentiments and stakes in enacting or promulgating certain legislations to censor social media operation/application against what government alleges to be breach of sovereign ethical norms. This has happened in China, Indonesia, North Korea, Malaysia and Nigeria where the public criticized, condemned and forced a crackdown on a bill that sought to criminalize some aspects of social media activities. In all these, sovereignty does not seem to address peculiar national questions with the rising culture of impunity in national life of individual nations, nor has globalization addressed the lopsided development index among countries in the globe.

Nonetheless, globalization or global village phenomenon finds solace in rallying round nations to seek solutions to problems (natural and artificial) that afflict humanity. Examples include the outbreak of viruses or epidemics, climate change, war, terrorism and banditry, development of nuclear weapons, etc, amid embedded politics of national interests. The issues directly pop economic progression for some countries and retrogression for others. Apart from largely predicating the interventions on the prescient of global unity, the underlining intricate politics crisscrossing centre-periphery stereotype and fierce competition among the developed economies has had far-reaching implications for the sovereign rights conferred on nations. The alliances provide access for some enemy states to hide under the toga of collective responsibility to understudy the military science of another country. Maftai (2015) cites the case of fight against terrorism, to show how the collaboration among countries transcends sovereign state borders. Although cross-border military patrol during such incidences tends to exemplify the notion of interdependence among sovereign states, however, the resultant collapse of national borders weakens security structures and disguises economic cooperation and technological networking for violation of state's sovereignty. It has proven a greater risk to the sanctity of sovereignty as enshrined in the UN Charter.

The foregoing background has brought to the fore, the very essence of examining the sanctity of sovereignty in the era of globalization. The study addresses the question of whether sovereignty of nation-states still matters in the present world order and the implications of globalization in sustaining the statuesque or bracing up with the realities of the new trends marked by brazen interference in the domestic affairs of nations in response to or in defense of explicit economic, strategic and political interests. The rationale is to establish the grounds for explaining why states do what they do and how the choice of what they do conforms to international treaties and conventions. It thus creates an insight into how the misuse of globalization and usurpation of sovereignty conflagrates the cord of sovereignty itself and complicates its legacies for the emerging power blocs in the international political arena.

The issues flood contemporary discourse in the international political scene and most national governments are perturbed that they no longer have control over their domestic affairs but all seems to have transmuted to a village square orchestra, which globalization has come to represent. It tantamount to juxtaposing sovereignty with globalization in incompatible stretches and thus needed a distinction.

2. Methodology

This is a comparative study. It sourced information from secondary data, collected from internet materials, publications such as books, journals, official documents and other unpublished works. The study further used content analysis, based on critical scrutiny of the information gotten from the sources aforementioned; to draw insightful findings and make valuable recommendations. It highlights the trends in the observance of state sovereignty in the contemporary international politics and the threats posed by globalization that anchors global economic interaction in the emergent borderless system. It surveyed how the operations of sovereignty and globalization engage in rivalry and thereby creating conflicting understanding of the concepts.

3. Conceptual Discourse

3.1. Sovereignty

Sovereignty has ubiquitous posture with varied legal connotations, political understanding, global perceptions and national reactions based on the type of actions taken to manifest or undermine it in state's internal and external relations. No particular definition seems to be comprehensive enough to satisfy the various views about sovereignty, thus resulting in a multi-disciplinary approach that recognizes the legal, political, strategic and economic dimensions of sovereignty as often conceived by scholars, diplomatic experts in international relations and officials of national governments. Parmar (2017), Singhal, et al (2013) in separate analysis, x-ray this complex nature of sovereignty and the constraining factors that hinder its exercise in international relations and politics. In furtherance, Bartelson (2006) contends that sovereignty from the lens of international law has become a controversial phenomenon especially from the way it is domesticated and exercised in the contemporary world. It thus railroad scholars to investigate how countries use and abuse it.

The modern state and state system bore sovereignty as a logical consequence of symmetrical valuation of nation's status in authority structure. Merriam (1900), Harrison & Boyd (2018:18) traces the development of sovereignty to the Treaty of Westphalia, which formed the bases for ending both the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) and the wars of religion. Westphalia was thus viewed as being instrumental to the establishment of the key principle of modern statehood, which is predicated on sovereignty. Parmar (2017:33) cites Glanville who reiterated that it "is repeatedly told ...that sovereignty was established sometime around the 17th century (at the Peace of Westphalia...) and, since that time, states have enjoyed 'unfettered' rights to self-government, non-intervention and freedom from interference in internal affairs".

Although the emphasis and application of the concept centered on the state at inception, subsequently, the meaning of sovereignty became susceptible to academic debates. However, Bartelson (2006:463) doubts how the sovereign state would remain the main locus of political authority in the future. The simple reason is that the challenges posed by the recurring rivalry in international relations replicate also in misconceptions of the domestic and the international spheres, which imposes new forms of political life that know nothing of state's sovereignty. It waters down the indivisibility and discreteness that characterize sovereignty and exposes individual nation-states to undeserving breach of its exclusive rights.

As a result, Biersteker & Weber (1996), Bartelson (2006) reemphasized the speedy erosion of sovereign principle in the regulation of most likely incidents of nonconforming state behaviours towards each other in international relations. It underscores the reason that in this era of globalization, which promotes liberal economy, military cooperation and technological integration of global village, many nations foreclose existing barriers to their economic activities and application of technology to undermine another state's seclusion and security. It has significantly compromised sovereignty and induced doubt about its relevance.

The foregoing disjuncture contradicts the assertion by Alain, cited in Kostov a (1999:99-100) that sovereignty applies to supreme public power, which has the right and, in theory, the capacity to impose its authority in the last instance. Undoubtedly, globalization has so much impact on many legitimate power holders, who are recognized to have authority over their definite territory. It is more so in a contemporary world system where the measure

of sovereignty has condensed to military, economic, technological and diplomatic powers that each country wields to prevent any untoward behaviour from its potential rivals at the international political arena. It defines the pattern of cooperation and collaboration.

It has assumed a new measure of authority and very problematic to comprehend despite that Pusca (1999), Parmar (2017); Hauriou & Gicquel (1980) share a dissimilar opinion, which suggests that lopsided partisanship in international relations conforms to the task of limiting state sovereignty or limitation of powers, in favour of international bodies. This also negates the perception of sovereignty by Maftai (2015:54) as the state supremacy and independence of state power in expressing its authority over the areas it has jurisdiction. For this reason, Austin (2017) concludes that sovereignty means independence, i.e. noninterference by external powers in the internal affairs of another state.

Therefore, international norms hinges on the principle of the sovereign equality of independent states, which results in the natural reciprocity whereby international law correspondingly excludes interference in domestic affairs of states and thereby establish universally accepted rules that regulate the mode of engagement between and among nation-states in the international arena(Austin, 2017; Morgenthau, 1948). The essence is to ensure the “existence of legal equality of sovereignty” (Chilea, 2007; Parmar, 2017) by mitigating inordinate competitive power politics and constraining unhealthy rivalry by states from developing into politics of might is right. Equality of sovereign status as guaranteed by law will naturally promote mutual respects for the ideals of sovereign integrity of nation-states.

Based on the foregoing analysis, it is evident that sovereignty of any single state is the logical consequence of the existence of several sovereign states (Austin, 2017); hence, the need to examine not only how globalization wades in to distort the coexistence; or underscore the graduation of world to a global village but also spot its inherent rivalry with sovereignty.

3.2.Globalization

The word “globalization” is derived from “**global**” and synonymous with “**universal**”. Global “concerns all parts of the world”, and universal denotes “what is common to all society; worldwide”. Starting from the etymological roots of the word up to the crystallizing intellectual perceptions underpinning international relations, globalization seems to lack consensus on its approach. It is not easily understood from skewed perspective tailored to underscore economic and trade liberation to which it has often been associated with in many academic analysis. Instead, later developments that characterize the nature of politics among sovereign states justified cognizance of its whole embodiments that transcend economic considerations to include political, strategic, military, technological and socio-cultural issues (Usman, et al, 2014). It works based on the principle of interconnectivity.

From this above cluster comes the conception of globalization as not being limited to commerce and information technology, which is confined to a national territory (Yeates, 2001; in Yalcin, 2018) but as encompassing in-depth comprehension of the dynamic character of the world system and the diverse background of the players (Robertson, 1992; Cuterela, 2012). It does not have any clear border but inclusive of virtually everything (Dwyer, 2015; Albrow & King, 1990), thereby uniting the world as a compact system where barriers to intimate interface among nations and cultures seem to disappear and where people freely contributes to world development without the previously existing national inhibitions.

What it presupposes is that globalization constitutes a multiplicity of linkages and interconnections that transcend the nation states (and by implication the societies) which make up the modern world system. It further defines a process through which events, decisions and activities in one part of the world can come to have a significant consequence for individuals and communities in quite distant parts of the globe (McGrew, 1992; Kuchta & Sukpen, 2012; Usman, et al, 2014). Similarly, it is a process, which generates flows and connections, not simply across nation-states and national territorial boundaries, but between global regions, continents and civilizations. It also engenders a significant shift in the spatial reach of networks and systems of social relations to transcontinental or interregional patterns of human organization, activity and the exercise of power.

The mere fact that it goes beyond national boundaries drags the question of states' sovereignty into every discourse on globalization and the notion is not entirely new. Retrospectively, the history of globalization is remote in origin and it only changes in dimension and complexity in each era. At inception, the dimension reflects mainly the economic drivers, which attracts prime attention in scholarly works, thereby neutralizing the socio-cultural, technological and political components that affect states' sovereignty in all ramifications. Resurgence of this formerly neglected aspect in academic discourse focuses on assessing the capacity of state authority and sovereignty of states in the era of globalization. Ironically, the fears about the push by globalization to displace sovereignty explain why some scholars make bold to argue that it is the sovereignty, which is most at risk from globalization (Clark, 1999; Mir, Hassan& Qadri, 2014). There is the belief that when forces of globalization displace sovereignty, it will no longer become strategic to occupy prominent space in international relations hinging on globalization but consigned to the periphery.

The interference becomes evident with the politicization of globalization, in which case, there is now political globalization. From this perspective, Steger (2003), Mir, Hassan & Qadri (2014) systematically weaved politics and globalization in an intricate relationship, whereby political globalization was taken to mean the intensification and expansion of political interrelations across the globe. This expansion fuels struggle among nations, which tends to negate the principle of sovereignty. Essentially, similar expansionist appetite originally substantiates the rationale for the European colonization spree in Africa and significantly influences external sponsorship of many uprising campaigns against several national governments, by using and relying on internal collaborators. It also played key roles in the spate of military interventions in civil governance and politics in most developing world, (Africa being the most hit), where the quest to control the political leadership and in extension the economic resources of each country in question were the major triggers.

Another example cited by Cuterela (2012) shows that globalization, in the sense of connectivity to the global economic and cultural life, brings with it a different order than what it was before. Each phase is characterized by changes in the goals of national interest and the developed capacity to pursue it in a state of rivalry with other competitor nations. The new order shields the capitalist vulcanization of economies of Africa and other third world societies on the pretext of globalization without respect of the principle of state sovereignty.

The violation is inherent in globalization, which involves the expansion of economic activities across political boundaries of nation states (Deepali Pal). It has produced quantum evidences to show that globalization endangers the social welfare states since it compromises

states' sovereignty (Deacon, 2007; Yalcin, 2018) and utterly circumscribes its efficacy and relevance in international relations and politics. Prior to globalization, capitalism lacked widespread influence over global economy. It also lacked much political influence over the dominated states, but dwelt on persuasion, which characterized Cold War era.

By implication, state sovereignty commanded huge respects in international relations and politics among nations. More so, states freely implemented national social policies without interference in the form of external impositions. This phase abruptly ended with the rise of globalization. In other words, globalization turned this anterior equilibrium upside down (Yalcin, 2018) and demeaned sovereignty significantly.

From all indications, the contemporary global events clearly amplify globalization and further decrease states' sovereignty and exercise of state authority within national boundaries. It has become worse in developing societies where external influences distort internal economic and development policies. Example is the World Bank, IMF and many donor agencies that determine their mode of financial and or development cooperation and collaboration with many sovereign states. Apart from attaching stringent conditions to their loans, grants, and aids, they also dictate how they participate directly (through Foreign Direct Investment – FDI) in the local economy and they rarely subject themselves to state authority.

A typical example is the case of oil exploration and the environmental degradation in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. This has not witnessed corresponding compensation from the defaulting firms and government has not shown capacity as a sovereign state to take decisive action against any of the multi-national oil firms. It lends credence to the fact that while wealth and power of the multinationals seems to have increased significantly, neither they nor national governments have so much control over macro-economic forces as they would like. Environmental and technological risks have multiplied (Cuterela, 2012).

Meanwhile, the lopsided global economic division that cut across countries has remained important factor for the rivalry between sovereignty and globalization. In addition to the fact that it subjugates most disadvantaged nations without regard for their sovereignty, it explains how globalization fertilizes the operations of multi-national corporations and international capital organizations, and thereby influences the status of state sovereign. It also midwives syndromes of national poverty, dependency and underdevelopment.

It further makes the relationship between the substructure and superstructure shield no doubt that most of the countries in the third world where globalization has become a reformed capitalist system suffer internal dislocation. Once external operations usurp the substructure of the host country to compromise its basic rules, then, the superstructure correspondingly becomes vulnerable and supplanted. The national interest that drives globalization rarely observes or respects restrictions set to protect a states' sovereignty. It negates the essence of jurisdictional boundaries in international relations and lends credence to the fact that globalization flagrantly undermines the provisions of UN Charter and other international legal instruments.

3.3.The Roots of Globalization

At inception, globalization was chiefly associated with economic variables and not with the other emergent components like political, socio-cultural, military and technological factors. The phases of this association cut across the era of imperialism, when European

nations annexed the economies of the third world that were at the rudimentary stages of growth before activating and transiting to capitalism, which tactically integrated global economy into lopsided relationships, ridiculously classified as either **“center–periphery”**, **“developed–developing”** or **“rich–poor”** nations. The harsh effects on the economies of many colonized nations provided perspectives for sharing different views about capitalism and the rationale for globalization. It worsened when most of these nations gained political independence but systematically tied to economic, military and technological dependences.

However, scholars usually trace the root of globalization to two distinct sources. The sources emanate from both the developments in the economy and revolutions in technology (Glazter & Rueschemeyer, 2005; Yalcin, 2018). Thus, globalization that related to technological development shares a tacit link with market economy, while the second aspect of globalization reflects an outcome of the capitalist progress. These sources have their roots entrenched in different historical epochs in human advancement. Essentially, classification of globalization falls under the pre-19th century category and post-19th century typologies. The first category encompassed archaic, proto-globalization and modern globalization. Remarkably, the late 20th century globalization is different from 19th century globalization, which gives five stages of globalization as Archaic, Proto-Globalization, Imperial, Modern and Altermondialist. The altermondialist kind of globalization was advocated in a propositional way by people like Vandana Shiva, with reference to a rural way of life in India, the Barefoot College and others who now extend their original perspectives and action to a global level (Petz, 2013). The essence was to export capital and consolidate monopoly operations through unequalled investment and command of market forces.

This phase of globalization was pronounced during the era of imperialism, thereby making imperial globalization distinctive as revealed with the Scramble for Africa and was focused on extending the concept of the nation states as created in the Peace of Westphalia, into that of Empires. Essentially, Petz (2013) explains that though imperial globalization is similar to proto-globalization, it is distinctive in that during proto-globalization, the concern was to trade and bring contacts together, but not to transform the cultures encountered to be identical to each other. Such a change happened in a “civilizing” process where contacted countries became the same as each other.

Some examples of cultural dislocation include when USA broke from the British Empire, via English democratic principles; the contradiction about France and its francophone Colonial Empire, with overseas Departments, and the Russification in Finland at the end of the 19th Century (Cuterela, 2012; Petz 2013). The *Acquis Communautaire* in the EU was a case of such Imperial Globalization, although Modern and Altermondialist Globalization that happened at the same time also masked it. However, the political, economic, socio-cultural, military and technological roots of globalization emanated from the characteristics of the stages or categories of globalization and their respective influences on nations, either differently or in groups. Among the foregoing considerations, the economic aspect, mainly, necessitated the description of globalization in a narrow economic context.

The prevalent understanding about the dynamics of economic operation and the changing tide at the global level influenced this perspective. It assumed that the seed of globalization sprang up essentially when global economic activities started losing national contour. As a result, it gave way to an emergent economic order, including a new political

orientation. In particular, Mir, Hassan & Qadri (2014), Bairoch & Kozul-Wright (1996) support the economic driver's dimension of globalization. Their emphasis is that production and financial structures of countries became interlinked by an increasing number of cross-border transactions to create an international division of labour in which national wealth creation comes, increasingly, to depend on economic agents in other countries, and the ultimate stage of economic integration where such dependence has reached its spatial limit.

In other words, globalization characterizes an increased integration of international financial market, which is, higher level of foreign investments across borders, capital flow, foreign lending and joint ventures than before (Hebron & Stack, 2013; Marinescu, 2012b). As a predominant commercial concern, economic globalization manifests through increased capital flows, transnational flow of goods and services, a march towards global market and dismantling of national borders (Mir, Hassan, & Qadri, 2014). The above distinctions from differing perceptions depict two schools of thought, which include the proponents of globalization and critics of globalization (Amartya, 1970; Stefan, 2012; Marinescu, 2012a). Proponents see economic growth, expansion and development in general, as a reflex of globalization, which is desirable and necessary for the good of human society, while critics, on the other hand, see globalization as detrimental to social welfare on a global or local scale.

On the part of the critics, globalization brought about an increase in the vulnerability to external fluctuations, shrinkage in the stability of domestic economies, decline in domestic policy autonomy, and restructuring of governance are all accompanied by globalization (Yalcin, 2018). It substantiates the fact that in the sphere of political globalization, "States are changing, but they are not disappearing. State sovereignty has been eroded, but it is still vigorously asserted. Governments are weaker, but they can still throw their weight around" (Rosenau, 1997; Usman, et al, 2014). On the other hand, social globalization takes three forms, which include personal contact, information flows and cultural proximity (Deutsch & Welzel, 2016; Dreher, 2006; Usman, et al, 2014). Technologies have accelerated these new dimensions by dismantling the previous barriers that hindered communication. It is from the foregoing diverse areas that globalization found its present status in international relations and encompasses all manners of human activity in every field of endeavour.

4. Theoretical Framework

Politics among nations in the international arena revolves around struggle for power and balance of power, which defines the deliberate efforts by nations to dominate and control or resist one another, either directly through conquest and colonization or indirectly through technological, trade, military and economic advancements. The theory of power in international relations encapsulates these tendencies. In generality, Morgenthau (1948) surmises the complexity in the "Politics Among Nations". It provides an elaborate explanatory framework that shows how politics among nations denotes struggle for power, or quest for diplomatic, political, military, economic and technological capabilities. Accordingly, international politics denotes "the struggle for power" and "power politics" (Sempa, 2015).

Invariably, the attention to struggle for power and power politics shows how various states value to occupy strategic positions in order to exercise authority with the controlling effects in international relations. It makes the pursuit of political power an end-thing and very critical when tending to consolidate military, economic, technological and diplomatic powers

in international arena. In fact, the role that power play in every aspect of human life has made the struggle for power to become not only universal (Sempa, 2015), it is also compelling, irresistible and seriously sought after. The race for acquisition of power among nation-states for protection of their sovereignty has necessitated the balance of power strategy, adopted to neutralize any established unilateral hegemony. These are the thrust of the emerging trends.

In Europe, the balance of power approach seems to provide buffer against the frequent lust for territorial annexation or colonization. Therefore, balance-of-power theory emerged to explain European dynamics, which historical experiences refresh. In a related development, Paul, et al, (2005) discussed the indirect form of power balancing through internal mobilization that China pursues. The aim is to whittle-down the overwhelming influence of U.S. in global politics but there is doubt if China can build a true anti-U.S. coalition.

The interplay of these forces conforms to the principles of political realism in international relations, which significantly capture the actual behaviours of state actors other than mere speculation on what and how they intend to behave when in confrontation with another state. Interest is core factor in international politics; hence, states spare nothing in pursuit of its national interest, even when apparently opposed to interests of another state. First, it rationalizes globalization, and second, it incubates the negation of sovereignty of states in the supremacist struggle against the well-established international laws.

International law recognizes the disparities in the embodiments of national power such as geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness, population, national character, national morale, the quality of diplomacy, and the quality of government (Deutsch & Welzel, 2016, Marinescu, 2012b; Sempa, 2015). Ideally, these different attributes represent great resource for universal wellness because no single country has the whole gifts. Nevertheless, diplomacy anchors the politics of survival in the midst of troubles. Depending on how countries apply diplomacy in international relations, it has the potential to make or mar national interest and global peace. For that reason, the posture of diplomacy is very important in international relations and for power contestation. Apart from the fact that diplomacy strengthens dialogue, conciliation, cooperation, collaboration and peace building, it as well serves as weapons for preservation of state's sovereignty, or for domination and exploitation of the resources of weaker states.

The reason is that a nation's diplomacy, "combines those different roles into an integrated whole; it gives them direction and weight, and awakens the slumbering potentialities of each state by giving them the breadth of actual power (Sempa, 2015). Diplomacy bolsters national interests while relating with other states. The interests could be either or combinations of economic, technological, strategic, political, military, investments and trade (Stefan, 2012; Stefan, 2012). The goal of each nation is usually to dominate, exploit and expand hegemonic control in violation of states' sovereignty and right of equality with other states. Therefore, the theory of power is apposite for understanding the rivalry between sovereignty and globalization, which concerns national interests and engages state actors in the game of wits. It has remained a decisive factor in international relations and politics.

5. The Multiple Faces of Globalization

Globalization is no longer limited to economic sphere but has become all-inclusive action-plan to reorganize the world order. The economic significance of globalization derives

from the influence of robust economy in boosting a states' ranking in the international competitiveness and the monopolistic power of such economy to dwarf or absorb weaker economies that lack competitiveness. Major competitors in this guise are mainly the developed economies, which the U.S. and China seem to be on the lead. Technological invention and control of its alluring market has become the real driving force. Expansion in investment in technological development beyond border lines, with pools of partnership, collaboration and cooperation across national frontiers have threatened state sovereignty more than ever before and no country is considered to be free from the consequences, as exemplified below.

Sequel to the outbreak of coronavirus and the attendant economic devastations that lowered the flag of global economic prosperity, in which China was at the center of the controversy, the practice of globalization tended to usher a new phase of reordered world economy. The unimaginable effect on the U.S. economy and other European countries, including third world countries that supply raw materials for industrial production, destabilized the interconnectivity. The sudden disruption according to Ishaan (2020) incensed “President Trump and right-wing allies in the West to lambaste China for being the unfair beneficiary of the past couple of decades of globalization”. The deduction attests to the type of expansive economic programmes undertaken by China across the length and breadth of national, regional and continental levels, which in some instances violate a country's sovereignty through subtle control of their government and economy by tying them to conditional grants and partnership.

There is a different variant in the case of U.S and Russia, especially with the frequent allegations that Russia has developed penchant for hacking the American system. The theory is that the Russians were trying to figure out whether they could get into the “supply chain” of software that would give them broad access to the array of systems that make America tick (Schmitt, 2020; David & Nicole, 2020). Meanwhile, a Harvard Law School professor, who worked in the Bush administration, admits that the United States conducts its own spying missions. In other words, America has carried out supply chain attacks, including against Iran's nuclear centrifuges and its missile program. It has been running them against North Korea for years (Goldsmith, 2018). It shows that the U.S. government lacks any basis to complain about the Russia hack, much less retaliate for it with military means, since the U.S. government hacks foreign government networks on a huge scale every day (Schmitt, 2020; David & Nicole, 2020). The rampancy of espionage being committed across nations and among the competing nations in particular, suggests that espionage has become an accepted norm in international relations. The reason is that it presents itself as a universal sin.

In contradistinction, President Joe Biden sees the logic as baseless. The idea, probably might stem from the indelible experience of 9/11 incident or the understanding that global power struggle naturally detests creation of porous security architecture that compromises surveillance over eventualities and possibilities that enemies may explore. For this reason, disrupting and deterring adversaries from undertaking significant cyber-attacks in the first place (Goldsmith, 2018) becomes a proactive strategy. This is because of potential danger that espionage constitutes to America's national security, economy and sovereignty.

The expose provides new vistas in the understanding of globalization and the underlying rivalry among nation-states and thereby challenges the benefits of globalization,

which bedim sovereignty. It portrays how the principle and practice of globalization influences state action and how their defense mechanisms shield degradation of sovereignty. The rivalries among the world economic giants have certainly unmasked the twist and complicity embedded in the practice of globalization. In addition, these rivalries tend to subdue or overwhelm the role of international organizations, as important actors in international relations. Meanwhile, international organizations are governed by international law. Some of those laws include the UNO Declaration on the principles of international law concerning the friendly and cooperation relations between the States, (Session XXV, 1970); the CSCE Final Act of Helsinki, 1975; and Charter of the United Nations (Maftai, 2015).

The lacuna in the exercise of sovereignty by States within international organizations gives a new dimension in the understanding of globalization, where competition between nation-state and organizational entities (Maftai, 2015) masked with globalization, promotes arbitrary norm that stands opposed to state sovereignty. There is increasing disagreements on the misunderstanding about how globalization protects or disparages the observance and respect for sovereignty in a polarized world. It is more so with the absence of mutual respects and extensive rivalry among nations competing for relevance, and often exhibit overzealous proclivity to monopolize the global economy. They usually confront those seeking in the same sequence to emancipate their fragile economy and polity from the cage of globalization.

These rivalries take many dimensions, predicated on the nature of issues forming the cluster. There are rivalries and suspicion between the US and Iran over uranium enrichment for nuclear weapons, the US – China rivalry over power position in international arena; the UK – China rivalry over new alliances in with her former colonies; the US – Russia rivalry over power bloc politics. Others are Palestine – Israeli rivalry over State of Israel and status of Jerusalem; North Korea – South Korea/Japan rivalry over military and economic alliances with some enemy states; and Middle East – Europe/America rivalries over economic control, oil politics and charges related to terrorism. Other forms of rivalries have deepened since the tortuous Brexit campaign; including the developed and developing countries Trojan, etc.

These antagonistic clusters portend economic and political somersault and the ripple effects frequently occur in the forms of diplomatic tussle, sanctions and other trade barriers targeted at weak countries that lack the wherewithal to compete with their foes. In essence, globalization has become a ploy to run down developing economies. Their borders become wide open for external bodies, whose activities undermine any internal stimuli to develop the infrastructure that is the key to sustainable economic development and human empowerment. The scenario is worsened when import substitution is not feasible and isolation from external encroachment relatively untenable. This has been the predicaments of most developing polities and economies that Africa is a good example.

6. Contending Issues Underlining Sovereignty and Globalization

There are phenomenal increases in the breach of the principle of sovereignty in international relations. Hans Morgenthau's power analysis in international relation previously focused on political power merely because it coincided with cold war era. Wide range of issues now preoccupies the world. Political, economic, technological and military powers now aggregate to pose threat to sovereignty. Global advocacy for promotion of sovereignty of states have become the major stake in states' competition to dominate one another in

economic adventurism, military and technological supremacy, territorial annexation for political domination, economic alliances and exploitation. The trend refreshes the old tradition whereby most countries across geopolitical divisions desperately search for these instruments of power as means of establishing and showcasing their strength for eventual intimidation of their rivals. In that order, threats of war and sanctions, which sometimes occasion unwarranted remote control of vulnerable nations, usually end up in demeaning what sovereignty represents.

Sempa (2015) argued that Morgenthau expanded on this geopolitical vision and traced U.S. interests in Asia to the beginning of the 20th century with the Open Door policy that sought to keep China open for the competitive exploitation of all major powers. At first, a commercial policy, the Open Door evolved into a military and political policy that sought to ensure a balance of power in Asia. It dawned upon the American statesmen that any nation, European or Asian, that would add to its power the enormous power potential of China would thereby make itself the prospective master not only of Asia but also of the world. The relocation of the production sector of America to China sowed a new seed of economic competition.

For obvious reasons, this renewed trend in economic and political tussle exemplifies the activities and dispositions of countries branded as world powers, such as U.S., Russia, UK, China, Germany, etc, including the emerging reactionary forces like North Korea, Iran, etc. Their rebellious and aggressive postures tend to compromise states' sovereignty and endanger world peace. Instructively, Sempa (2015); Rasmussen (2014) separately analyzed Russia's military aggression in Ukraine, and the consensus is that it was in blatant breach of its international commitments and it was a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Generally, the quest that manifests in territorial annexation derives from economic expansionist policy. At no time has economic motivations collapsed national boundaries than now and globalization is the driver of this emergent trend lurking the cravings for economic survival among nations of the world.

Aside domestic maladministration that questions the rationale for states' sovereignty, the borderless clause defining globalization threatens strict compliance to state authority. Multi-national corporations and other organizations that engage in international business operate under the cover of international human rights bodies and several conventions/treaties that bind their host national governments and sometimes commit interference in political administration and domestic economic policies set by their host countries. When the affected country takes adverse measure in defense of its sovereignty, it attracts repercussion in the form of external interference, which veil national interests and largely undermines the right that a state has to preside over its internal affairs independent of external dictatorial influence. The case of border breaches leveled against Mexicans by Donald Trump administration and the threat to erect a demarcating wall at the expense of Mexico is an example.

No doubt, the universality of human economic, political, socio-cultural and religious rights and the collective mandate to protect them in any nation have resulted in external intervention in domestic economy and politics of countries against the principle of states' sovereignty. Ironically, most of these interferences occur in defense of national interests, usually defined in political, strategic or economic terms. These were the cases in Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Sudan, Somalia, Liberia, etc. Political leaderships that are not promoting

liberal economic policies that allow external meddling in their political and economic practices are usually the victims. Many times, the accusations for terrorism, development of banned nuclear armament and overbearing national interests, prompting external interference becloud sovereignty. These were evident in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Syria, Crimea, etc.

The strategic national interests of nations are sometimes coloured in these pretenses, which in few cases, featured under the principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) by the United Nations Security Council and the NATO ally. This conforms to the notion that sovereignty has no formal expression from the inception to talk about the exclusivity of a state or its inherent power to act independently. According to Parmar (2017:31), “the international system was not always arranged in terms of sovereign states. The medieval world knew nothing of national sovereignty”. Such obsolete medieval mindset and scenario filters into the argument that the world ought to be a global village where no event is entirely exclusive to a sovereign state. In fact, it makes the idea of global village or globalization becomes a threat to state sovereignty and breaches the United Nations Charter.

It is more so, with the spiraling revolutions in science and technology, especially the information communication technology, which bolsters a state capacity to spy other states, communicate what is happening within their boundary and invoke the angers of global community against the state. This is possible especially when a state (the victim state) is alleged to disrespects human economic rights of all nationals guaranteed by liberal economic policies inherent in the principle of capitalism. Moreover, the tendency for external interference that erodes states’ sovereignty also relates to neglect of security of people under its jurisdiction and commission of unwarranted extra-judicial killings. Added to this is when the leadership of the state harbours or sponsors terrorism within its territory or exports terrorist groups as ploys of war against adversaries. It also includes when a state reneges on the tenets of democracy, ignores international laws, treaties and other acts capable of endangering world peace and security but much so when it affects their economic interests.

7. The Impact of Globalization on the Economy and Sanctity of Sovereignty States

The impacts of globalization on national, regional and global economy are diverse in nature and magnitude. The diverse effects directly associate with economic globalization itself, which is a process of rapid increase in the liberalization of international trade, investment, finance, and technological changes among countries (Torres, 2001; Bukhari & Munir, 2016). This perspective has condensed into contrasting schools of thought under which scholars emphasize the positive and negative impacts of globalization.

For example, Rodrik (1998), James (2005), Cammett & Bhagwats (2005), Milner (2018), Manolica & Roman (2012), Srinivasan (2002) have individually done incisive critique on globalization, with recent efforts based on many changes that frequently occur to further mystify the practice of globalization amid the colourations. The studies catalogued the advantages and disadvantages of globalization, especially the consequences of globalization on the sanctity of sovereignty. Thus, the pro and anti-globalists are lurked in the debate.

In one hand, globalization increases degree of openness of domestic economies, cross-border movement of goods and services, capital and technology, information and people, with an organization of economic activities, which straddles national boundaries. The three broad dimensions are international trade, international investment and international

finance. Three changes impart dynamism in the economy. First, the export earnings through liberalization of tariff and trade tend to develop export-oriented industries. Second, the foreign capital flow, mainly via multinational corporations (MNCs) brings technology to bear and, third, there is deregulation of financial sector so that cross border mobility of resources gets momentum. (<https://www.economicdiscussion.net/globalization/globalizaion-meaning-arguments-for-and-against/14211>).

The apparent silence on the inequities in these core indicators of globalization and the consequences on the disadvantaged economies and societies usually formed the rubrics of the critics. There are issues bordering on lopsided trade balance between the developed and developing societies and the values attached to the stock traded on by the two. The disparity jeopardizes the prospects of growth in the third world. In African economy, for example, multinational corporations with external interests, dominate its operations and policy thrust. It creates wide gap in economic inequality across sectoral divisions, spreading to personal income due to decline in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita.

In consonance, Bukhari & Munir (2016) contend that understanding the nature of, and linkages between, globalization and inequality is crucial because disparities abound in access to needs such as shelter, land, food and clean water, sustainable livelihoods, technology, and information. The assertion lends credence to the fact that many sovereign states are battling to survive amid abundant mineral resources, which external interests exploit at the expense of the natives. Illustrating the enormity of the inequality, Watkins et al., (2005) emphasized that increase in globalization is associated with rising income inequality in the world, where combined incomes of 500 richest individuals in the world are greater than that of the poorest 416 million, and 2.5 billion people (are) living on less than \$2 a day. What it means is that globalization re-distributes wealth and poverty but poverty outweighs wealth in impact.

Globalization also provides room for ruthless exploitation through alliances between the local petty bourgeois and the foreign comprador bourgeois. This exploitation captures the activities of those who brandish Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), including illegal immigrants and foreign economic scavengers who hide under liberal economic policies on trade and investment to undermine regulatory procedures for investment and conduct of business in their host country. One of the many examples in Nigeria is a case where the Zamfara State Police Command arrested two Chinese Nationals for allegedly engaging in illegal mining activities in the state (HassanWuyo, 2020). It is the same with crude oil bunkering and not in conformity with the established respects accorded to states' sovereignty.

In all ramifications, recent past witnessed rapid economic globalization, characterized by the supranational spatial integration of economies and societies (Stiglitz, 2002). This integration opens avenue for exploitation amid macro-economic expansion and declining micro-economic growth. Certainly, the impact of globalization is not evenly distributed among all segments of the society, especially the effect of globalization on employment and income (Watkins et al., 2005). It compromises state security and supports the fact that terrorism, cross-border crimes, smuggling, banditry and trafficking are on the increase because global wealth are in few hands while the greater number languish in abject poverty.

8. Measures Against Globalization

There are emerging approaches adopted to either curtail globalization or inspire outright resistance to its operations. The imperatives of sovereignty might have influenced the growing resolve by governments to safeguard the political, economic, security and technological prowess of their countries and allies alike from external incursion in utter breach of their sovereignty. One of such steps was termed “decoupling” (Tharoor, 2015), which implies that the United States could disentangle itself from reliance on Chinese goods and supply chains by a process. On the other hand, the posture or behaviour of U.S. strategists has also made China to quickly realize the importance of strengthening her internal markets as well as weaning off its reliance on supply chains anchored elsewhere.

In 2017, China was optimistic that it was fast breaking the chain of confinement in application of its blossoming high-tech and economy to push for a prime position in sovereignty state ranking. Consequently, the President of China, Xi, found globalization as a gateway to attaining enviable aspiration of becoming industrial giant in the world. This new awakening made him to portrayed globalization not as a threat, but as an inevitability (Crabtree, 2020). For every nation operating at the global arena, the global economy is the big ocean that one cannot escape from it. China will vigorously foster an external environment of opening-up for common development. Just as Trump was turning against the idea, China would act as steward of the existing global order. It would even help to remedy many of the problems that rapid integration had caused (Crabtree, 2020).

The idea is that China’s economic future would be shaped not on a flat vision of seamless integration with the West, but on two distinct circuits: one domestic, the other globally oriented (Adam, 2020). In essence, the diversification represents a radical new understanding of globalization and of China’s place within it (Crabtree, 2020). This protective and defensive measure is more conspicuous in the U.S, with extended influence on their allies whom they woo in defense of their corporate interests against common adversaries in the political, economic, technological competition and the implied war of supremacy.

Corroborating this counter measure aimed at dwindling trade exploits, Crabtree (2020) reports that back in 2016, President Barack Obama accused ZTE, China’s second-largest telecoms supplier, of selling U.S. technologies to Iran, thereby, crippling the Chinese company in the process. Trump escalated this approach, banning U.S. businesses from trading with dozens of Chinese enterprises, from state-owned giants to niche artificial intelligence providers with links to Xinjiang and its embattled Muslim Uighur minority.

Further measures introduced by government strategically limited China’s technology access, from its 2018 Export Control Reform Act. Many Western governments also acted to stop China from buying up advanced tech companies entirely, while also limiting academic collaborations with Chinese partners. For example, Crabtree, (2020) believes that the battle over TikTok was illustrative of this restrictive measure, which evidences how rapidly the U.S. has lowered the bar on what counts as a national security threat, a category that now includes not just critical 5G telecoms architecture of the sort provided by Huawei, but also jocular teenage social media platforms.

The implication is that the U.S. is strategically building up momentum to contain China the same way it contained the Soviet Union – by committing “the overall power of the United States to the containment of China. By making it clear to China that if it tried to

conquer India, for example, the United States would do whatever was necessary to prevent that from happening, including going to war (Sempa, 2015). Part of the reasons fueling the protective or defensive mechanism is that U.S. strategists are particularly opposed to China's doctrine of "military-civil fusion", which mandates that technologies acquired by China's private sector must be shared with its armed forces. The problem is that under such scheme, almost anything can potentially be seen as a dual-use technology, from nuclear equipment and renewable energy batteries to civilian aircraft, drones and autonomous vehicles (Crabtree, 2020).

It portrays an understanding that the mode of power contestation in international relations (in economic, technological, strategic and political frontiers) has further deepened the vertical and horizontal bifurcations concept of center-center, center-periphery and periphery-periphery groupings and compromised the integrity of sovereignty reserved for independent nations for safeguarding their states' politics, economy, technology, socio-cultural and religious practices from external interference.

It is worse now that globalization has torn the shield covering countries and rendered them vulnerable to external manipulation, if not control. It explains why economic integration under the garb of globalization favours country 'A' and disfavours country 'B', based on their potential for competitiveness. However, the negative influences of integration of global economy under whatever guise manifests mostly in the area of usurping states' sovereignty to advance national interests of one country against the other. Africa is in the midst of this storm; hence, it has preponderance of its stock in raw materials and not commodity products and relies on imports with variegated prices not determined by processes dictated by market forces but by the unilateral discretion of the monopoly firms.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

The foregoing analysis shows that globalization means different thing to different people. While some choose to focus on the economic perspective, others venture into the political dimension. However, each aspect of the discourse appears all-inclusive, thus dragging economic, political, socio-cultural, and technological components along. Support or opposition to globalization is a matter of which side of the coin that is involved in the assessment. For instance, (Stiglitz, 2002) posits that the anti-globalist commentators argued that globalization has adverse effects on particularly poor economies due to the increase in within or between countries income inequality and there is need for government intervention to control the adverse effect of globalization on income. On the contrary, the pro-globalist commentators also argued that increase in income inequality due to globalization is a reasonable price to pay for the benefits of world integration and generally, it leads to reduce poverty and creating employment (Stiglitz, 2002).

This study went beyond the economic analysis to examine the implications of globalization on states' sovereignty. The essence is to corroborate the arguments by Usman, et al, (2014:611) that "globalization is part and parcel of the process of expansion across continents based on migration, trade, warfare, military alliances, conquest, exploration, colonization and technological advancement. Contacts among states, societies and people from Stone Age until now have knitted the world in the shape of interdependent patterns,

which attenuated and intensified overtime”. Meanwhile, one is quick to add that globalization negates the principle of states’ sovereignty in every ramification.

The findings of the study show that the conduct of globalization violates the principle of states’ sovereignty through many means including espionage, economic sabotage, and subversion of state authority, political conspiracy and meddling roles in election to manipulate the outcome and impose a stooge in leadership. It also involves politicization of stringent unfavourable economic policies, deliberate underdevelopment of the host economy through repatriation of capital, widening of poverty gap in the local economy through racial disparity between locals and foreigners in pay package and sponsorship of assassination and subversive actions against government unyielding to exploitation. It is a worse scenario in third world countries, which Africa is at the center.

It requires that government should intensify efforts in trade regulation to prevent globalization from stampeding their local economies into coma. This regulation implies investing in import substitution locally in partnership with foreign companies, where employment opportunities and distribution of equity share is in favour of the natives. Government should also be wary of loan offers, grants and the type of Direct Foreign Investment (FDI attracted to the country. Every multi-national corporation and businesses controlled by foreigners is driven by exploitation of the host economy. Not every assistance is worth honouring, especially the gambit called technological transfer. Conditional grants and loans tie a government to the dictates of the lenders and place the country in bondage.

In the case of Africa, there is need for economic integration and alliances to create values for their raw materials. Their economy should refrain from being import based and sustainable, their borders should not be too porous, and immigration policies tightened to avoid the continent becoming all-comers-affair for foreigners that are solely interested in digging gold and not sharing in the problems of the host. In addition, capitals should be invested in core infrastructure to boost the production sector, create employment opportunity and thereby reduce poverty margin in the continent.

The prize for liberty is war; it is evident that globalization has declared war against states’ sovereignty. Only proactive actions and stringent conditions that scale down the rampaging forces embedded in rapid technological innovations, and the effects on national security can mitigate its negative consequences. State must exist before globalization thrives and it must be a sovereign state.

References

- Adam, T. (2020). Chartbook Newsletter #9: Reading China’s State Capitalism. Substack Inc, December, 13; <https://www.substack.com>
- Agence France-Presse, “Iran Says 2 Convicted of Spying for Israel, Germany, UK”. August 11, 2020, accessed on <https://courthousenews.com/iran-says-2-convicted-of-spying-for-israel-germany-uk/>
- Akpan, A., Njoku, L., Olumide, S. & Olaniyi, S. (2020). “Unending Search for Balanced Narrative Over #EndSARS Protest”. Guardian Newspapers, 22 November, accessed on <https://m.guardian.ng> and <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2020/11/endsars-cso-flays-cnn-on-lekki-protest-report/>
- Alain de Benoist, (1999). What is Sovereignty? Translated by Julia Kostova from “Qu’est-ce que la souverainete? In Elements, No. 96 (November), pp. 24-35

- Albrow, M. & King, E. (1990). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society* (ed.). London: Sage
- Alexander, D. (2018). “Two arrested for allegedly spying for Iran in U.S”. Reuters, Aug 20, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-iran-spies/two-arrested-for-allegedly-spying-for-iran-in-u-s-idUSKCN1L527X?feedType=RSS&feedName=topNews>
- Amartya, S.K. (1970). *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*. San Francisco, CA: Holden-Day.
- Anghel, I.M. (2002). *Sfarsitul lumii libere/ The End of the Free World*. Bucharest: Aldo Press
- Bairoch, P., & Kozul-Wright, R. (1996). *Globalization Myths: Some Historical Reflections on Integration, Industrialization and Growth in the World Economy*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- Bartelson, J. (2006). The Concept of Sovereignty Revisited. *The European Journal of International Law (EJIL)*, Volume 17, Issue, (April, 1), pp. 463-474, accessed on <http://ejil.oxfordjournals.org/content/17/2/463.full>
- Biersteker, T.J. & Weber, C. (1996). *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Breuninger, K. (2020). U.S. Intelligence Report on Trump-Biden Election Meddling Reveals whom Russia, China and Iran Want to Win. CNBC, August 7, <https://www.cnbc.com>
- Bukhari, M. & Munir, K. (2016). Impact of Globalization on Income Inequality in Selected Asian Countries. MPRA Paper No. 74248, September, 9, pp.1-33; <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/74248/>
- Cammett, M. & Bhagwati, J. (2005). In Defence of Globalization. *International Journal* (Toronto, Ont.), Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 592-595; Sage publications, accessed in <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40204318>
- Chilea, D. (2007). *Drept international public/ Public International Law*. Hamangiu: Bucharest
- Clark, I. (1999). *Globalization and International Relations Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CNN, (2019). Presidential Campaign Hacking Fast Facts. CNN Library, October 31, <https://www.cnn.com>
- Crabtree, J. (2020). China’s Radical New Vision of Globalization – President Xi’s vision of “dual circulation” is a darkly pessimistic economic strategy, fit for a new Cold War. *Noema Magazine*, December, 10; <https://www.noemamag.com/chinas-radical-new-vision-of-globalization>
- Cuterela, S. (2012). “Globalization: Definition, Processes and Concepts”, in *Romanian Statistical Review – Supplement*. International Symposium: “Romanian Economy in the Globalization Conjecture on Crisis Background” (November 15-16). Bucharest, Romania, (pp.137-146), from http://www.revistadestatistica.ro/supliment/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/RRSS_4_2012_1.pdf
- Daniel, S. & Nwabuighogu, L. (2018). Nigeria: How Obama, UK, Defectors Plotted My Defeat in 2015. *Vanguard* (Lagos), 21 November, <https://www.vanguardngr.com>
- David, E.S. & Nicole, P., (2020). Breaking News: Secretary of State Mike Pompeo said Russia was “Pretty Clearly” behind the recent Hacking that Infiltrated Dozens of Government and Private Systems. *The New York Times*, Saturday, December 19; <https://www.nytimes.com>
- Deacon, B.S. (2007). *Global Social Policy and Governance*. England: University of Sheffields: Sage Publications
- Deepali Pal (no date). *Globalization, Meaning, Arguments For and Against*. Accessed from <https://www.economicdiscussion.net/globalization/globalizaion-meaning-arguments-for-and-against/14211>,
- Deutsch, F. & Welzel, C. (2016). *The Diffusion of Values among Democracies and*

- Autocracies. *Global Policy*, Volume 7, Issue 4, (November), pp. 563-570; accessed from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1758-5899.12388>
- Dreher, A. (2006). The Influence of Globalization on Taxes and Social Policy: An Empirical Analysis for OECD Countries. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 22(1), 179-201.
- Dwyer, L. (2015). Globalization of Tourism: Drivers and Outcomes. *Tourism Recreation Research*, Volume 40, Issue 3, (20 August), pp. 326-339; accessed from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02508281.2015.1075723>
- Ghai, K.K. (no date). “5 Arguments in Support of Globalization”. Available in <https://www.yoursrticlelibrary.com/globalization/5-arguments-in-support-of-globalization/40330>
- Goldsmith, J. (2020). Self-Delusion on the Russia Hack: The U.S. Regularly Hacks Foreign Governmental Computer Systems on a Massive Scale. *The Dispatch*, Dec 18, accessed from <https://thedispatch.com/p/self-delusion-on-the-russia-hack>
- Harris, S., Nakashima, E. & Dawsey, J. (2020). Russia is to ‘denigrate’ Biden while China Prefers ‘Unpredictable’ Trump not be Relected – Senior U.S. Intelligence Official Says. *The Washington Post*, August 7, <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Harrison, K. & Boyd, T. (2018). The State and Sovereignty in Understanding Political Ideas and Movements, (30 July); accessed from <https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526137951/9781526137951.00005.xml>
- HassanWuyo, I. (2020). Just In: Police Arrest Illegal Chinese Miners in Zamfara. *Vanguard Newspaper*, April, 27; <https://www.vanguardngr.com>
- Hebron, L., & Stack Jr, J. F. (2013). *Globalization: Debunking the myths*. Dorling Kindersley India Pvt. Ltd.
- Ishaan, T. (2020). Xi’s China is preparing for a new World Order. *The Washington Post*, December, 15; <https://www.washingtonpost.com>
- James, P. (2005). “Arguing Globalization: Propositions towards an Investigation of Global Formations”. *Globalization*, Vol. 2, No. 2. Pp. 193-209, (September).
- John Austin’s Theory of Sovereignty. (2017, Jan 17). Retrieved online from <https://newyorkessays.com/essay-john-austins-theory-of-sovereignty/>
- Kuchta, D. & Sukpen, J.U. (2012). Globalization and the Development of Enterprises in Ghana. Accessed from http://zif.wzr.pl/pim/2012_1_3_23.pdf
- Maftai, J. (2015). Sovereignty in International Law. *ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DANUBIUS*, Vol. 11, No. 1, (March), pp. 54-65; accessed from http://evidentacercetare.univ-danubius.ro/Surse/Set_003/LRNZ6FgZnK.pdf
- Makinda, S.M. (1996). Sovereignty and International Security: Challenges for the United Nations. *Global Governance*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (May-August), pp. 149-168
- Manolica, A. & Roman, T. (2012). “Globalization – Advantages and Disadvantages from the Perspective of the Manufacturer”. *CES Working Papers*, pp. 747-757
- Marinescu, R.T. (2012a). “Romania in the Globalization Context”, in *Romanian Statistical Review – Supplement. International Symposium: “Romanian Economy in the Globalization Conjecture on Crisis Background”* (November 15-16). Bucharest, Romania, (pp. 87-93), accessed from http://www.revistadestatistica.ro/supliment/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/RRSS_4_2012_1.pdf
- Marinescu, R.T. (2012b). “The Globalization in the Crisis Context”, in *Romanian Statistical Review – Supplement. International Symposium: “Romanian Economy in the Globalization Conjecture on Crisis Background”* (November 15-16). Bucharest,

- Romania, (pp.127-126), from http://www.revistadestatistica.ro/supliment/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/RRSS_4_2012_1.pdf
- Masters, J. (2018). Russia, Trump, and the 2016 U.S. Election. Council on Foreign Relations, February 26, <https://www.cfr.org>
- McGrew, A. (1992). A Global Society? Modernity and its Future, 61-116.
- McGrew, A. G. (1998). Global Legal Interaction and Present-Day Patterns of Globalization. Emerging Legal Certainty: Empirical Studies on the Globalization of Law, Aldershot and Brookfield: Ashgate and Dartmouth, pp. 325-345.
- Merriam, C. (1900). History of the Theory of Sovereignty since Rousseau (New York: Columbia University Press
- Milner, H.V. (2018). “Globalization and its Political Consequences: The Effects on Party Politics in the West”. https://milner_globalization_political_consequences.pdf
- Mir, U.R; Hassan, S.M. & Qadri, M.M. (2014). Understanding Globalization and its Future: An Analysis. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS), Vol. 34, No. 2 (Jan), pp. 607-624; available in https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274640873_Understanding_Globalization_and_its_Future_An_Analysis
- Morgenthau, H.J. (1948). *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Nakshima, E. & Dawsey, J. (2020). “Trump contradicts Pompeo in bid to downplay massive hack of U.S. government, Russia’s role”. The Washington Post, Dec. 19, 2020, www.washingtonpost.com, accessed in <https://www.techmeme.com/201220/p10>
- Parmar, S.S. (2017). Understanding the Concept of ‘Sovereignty’. International Journal of Law, Volume 3, Issue 1, (January), pp.31-35; <https://www.lawresearchjournal.com>
- Paul, T.V., Wirtz, J.J. & Fortmann, M. (2005). Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century (ed.). Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.
- Petz M. (2013). Altermondialist Globalization – Developing of Taxonomy of Globalization. PDF, (June); <https://images.app.goo.gl/fJA6hTGxkSGcUNoj7>
- Pusca, B. (1999). Drept constitutional si institutii politice/ Constitutional Law and Political Institutions. Braila: Editura Evrika
- Rasmussen, A.F. (2014). “Why NATO Matters to America”, Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the Brookings Institution, March, 19. Online in NATO: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_108087.htm?selectedLocale=ru
- Robertson, R. (1992). Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture (Reprint. ed.). London: Sage
- Rodrik, D. (1988). “The Debate over Globalization: How to move Forward by Looking Backward”. Download from scholar.harvard.edu, in <http://debates-over-globalization.pdf>
- Rosenau, J. N. (1997). Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World (Vol. 53). Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, M. (2020). Top Experts Bachgrounder: Russia’s Solar Winds Operation and International Law. Just Security, December 21, accessed from <https://www.justsecurity.org/73946/russias-solarwinds-operation-and-international-law/>
- Sempa, F. P. (2015). Hans Morgenthau and the Balance of Power in Asia. The Diplomat Media, May 25, accessed from <http://missaodiplomatica.blogspot.com/2015/06/hans-morgenthau-and-balance-of-power-in.html>
- Singhal, A.K., Malik, I., Singh, A.P. (2013). The Concept of Sovereignty in Past and in Present Scenario. Report and Opinion; 5(12), pp. 93-98; accessed on http://www.sciencepub.net/report/report0512/014_22509report0512_93_98.pdf

- Sonam, S. & Natasha, B. (2017). Evidence Mounts that the Russian Government Carried Out an Elaborate Campaign to Interfere in the 2016 Election. Business Insider, July 16, <https://www.businessinsider.com>
- Srinivasan, T.N. (2002). “Globalization: Is it Good or Bad? Policy Brief. Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR); pp. 1-3.
- Stefan, D. (2012). “European Competitiveness in the Context of Globalization”, in Romanian Statistical Review – Supplement. International Symposium: “Romanian Economy in the Globalization Conjecture on Crisis Background” (November 15-16). Bucharest, Romania, (pp. 39-44), accessed from http://www.revistadestatistica.ro/supliment/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/RRSS_4_2012_1.pdf
- Steger, M. B. (2003). Globalization: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). Globalization and Its Discontents. Economic Notes, 32(1), 123-142
- Tharoor, I. (2015). Xi’s China is preparing for a new world order. Accessed from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2020/12/15/xi-china-new-order-trump/>
- Torres, R. (2001). Towards a Socially Sustainable World Economy: An Analysis of the Social Pillars of Globalization. International Labour Office. Retrieved online from http://staging.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2001/101B09_29_engl.
- Understanding the Changing Planet: Strategic Directions for the Geographical Sciences. Consensus Study Report. The National Academies Press, 2010; accessed from <https://www.nap.edu/read/12860/chapter/13>
- United Nations, “Purposes and Principles of the UN, (Chapter 1 of UN Charter)”. United Nations Security Council, <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/purposes-and-principles-un-charter-i-un-charter>
- United Nations, (2016). Speakers in Security Council urge Balance between UN Role in State Sovereignty, Human Rights Protection, but differ over Interpretation of Charter Principles. Security Council (SC/12241) 7621ST Meeting, 15 February, <https://www.un.org>
- Usman, R.M, Syeda, M.H. & Mubashar, M.Q. (2014). Understanding Globalization and its Future: An Analysis. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS), Vol. 34, No. 2, (January); pp. 607-624
- Watkins, K., Fu, H., Fuentes, R., Ghosh, A., Gismberardini, C., Johansson, C., Yaqub, S., (2005). International Cooperation at a Crossroads: Aid, Trade and Security in an Unequal World. Human Development Report. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Wealth Inequalities. Dinks Finance, December 3, 2006, available in <https://www.dinksfinance.com/2006/12/wealth-inequalities/>
- Yalcin, B. (2018). What is Globalization? Essay MSc. Comparative Social Policy Programme, University of Oxford, 2009; Accessed from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324331543_what_is_globalization