The Real Face of the New World Order
Sovereignty and International Security in the Age of Globalization

Qerim Qerimi

Previously studied at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, Qerim Qerimi is studying both Law and Political Science at the University of Prishtina in Kosovo; He is also a freelance journalist and is a regular contributor to some journals and magazines in Kosovo and abroad.

ABSTRACT: The paper examines the main themes of the connections between globalization and terrorism that appeared in academic literature since the attacks of the September 11, 2001. The events of September 11, 2001 have had profound and far-reaching effects on the world. The fundamental issues about sovereignty and the consequences that the event of September 11th has brought to a crisis are to be addressed. The methodological principles arrived at through the discussion of contemporary theory and practice of the International Relations, which combines textual interpretation with the reference to the contemporary political developments in the world affairs. In concluding, it asserts that global terrorism depends on the success of globalization. International cooperation and multilateral efforts, however, must remain the spirit of the world to come.

Introduction: The Global "Polis"

What is the state of international relations today? Will people finally succeed in the 21st century in securing the "eternal peace" between countries with democratic constitutions that Immanuel Kant suggested two hundred years ago? Or will the future of world politics be shaped instead by a new clash, between different cultures and civilizations, between the West, Islam and the Chinese society, as American political scientist Samuel Huntington wrote?

In the 1990s, specialists concentrated on the partial disintegration of the global order's traditional foundations: states. During that decade, many countries, often those born of decolonization, revealed themselves to be no more than pseudo-states, without solid institutions, internal cohesion, or national consciousness. The end of communist coercion in the former Soviet Union and in the former Yugoslavia also revealed long-hidden ethnic tensions. Minorities that were or considered themselves oppressed demanded independence. In Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan, and Haiti, rulers waged open warfare against their subjects. These wars increased the importance of humanitarian interventions, which came at the expense of the hallowed principles of national sovereignty and non-intervention. Thus the dominant tension of the decade was the clash between the fragmentation of states (and the state system) and the progress of economic, cultural, and political integration - in other words, globalization[1].

[1] "Globalization" is a term that came into popular usage in the 1980's to describe the increased movement of people, knowledge and ideas, and goods and money across national borders that have led to increased *interconnectedness* among the world's populations, economically, politically, socially and culturally. Although globalization is often thought of in economic terms (i.e., "the global

In the nineteen eighties as international theorists realized the growing power of economic interdependence they began to theorize what would happen to the anarchic nature of global politics with the increased economic cooperation between nations. Liberals argued that international institutions created to facilitate global cooperation and manage interdependence would eliminate anarchy. The realists however maintained that economic cooperation was not a guarantor of security and therefore we would live in a world that was economically orderly but politically anarchic. Neoliberals and neorealists agreed to describe this condition as a state of cooperation under anarchy[2].

Everybody has understood the events of September 11 as the beginning of a new era. But what does this break mean? In the conventional approach to international relations, war took place among states. But in September, poorly armed individuals suddenly challenged, surprised, and wounded the world's dominant superpower. The attacks also showed that, for all its accomplishments, globalization makes an awful form of violence easily accessible to hopeless fanatics. Terrorism is the bloody link between interstate relations and global society. As countless individuals and groups are becoming global actors along with states, insecurity and vulnerability are rising. To assess today's bleak state of affairs, therefore, several questions are necessary. What concepts help explain the new global order? What is the condition of the interstate part of international relations? And what does the emerging global civil society contribute to world order?[3]

Two models made a great deal of noise in the 1990s. The first one - Francis Fukuyama's "End of History" thesis - was not vindicated by events. To be sure, his argument predicted the end of ideological conflicts, not history itself, and the triumph of political and economic liberalism. That point is correct in a narrow sense: the "secular religions" that fought each other so bloodily in the last century are now dead. But Fukuyama failed to note that

marketplace"), this process has many social and political implications as well. Many in local communities associate globalization with *modernization* (i.e., the transformation of "traditional" societies into "Western" industrialized ones). At the global level, globalization is thought of in terms of the challenges it poses to the role of governments in international affairs and the global economy. In Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira words, "globalization is not precisely an uncontrolled phenomenon, but a set of economic relations, institutions, and ideologies that are rather controlled by the rich countries. Globalization is a fact, but 'globalism' is an ideology that asserts, first, that there is today an international community that would be independent of nation-states, and, second, that nation-states have lost the autonomy to define their national policies and have no other alternative but to follow the rules and restrictions imposed by the global market". In the simplest sense, as Kenneth Waltz (1999) one stated, "Globalization means homogenization. Prices, products, wages, wealth, and rates of interest and profit tend to become the same all over the world". For a collection of readings on globalization, *see:* David Held and Anthony G. McGrew, *Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate,* Blackwell Publishers, 2000. For difficulties to define the "globalization", see: Adrian Wooldridge and John Micklethwait, *A Future Perfect: The Challenge and Hidden Promise of Globalization*, Crown Business, 2000.

[2] Muqtedar Khan, "Column on Global Affairs", *GlocalEye*. The online text can be found at: http://www.glocaleye.org/terglo.htm/

[3] *See*: Stanley Hoffmann, "Clash of Globalizations", *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2002.

nationalism remains very much alive. Moreover, he ignored the explosive potential of religious wars that has extended to a large part of the Islamic world[4].

Fukuyama's academic mentor, the political scientist Samuel Huntington, provided a few years later a gloomier account that saw a very different world. Huntington predicted that violence resulting from international anarchy and the absence of common values and institutions would erupt among civilizations rather than among states or ideologies. But Huntington's conception of what constitutes a civilization was hazy. He failed to take into account sufficiently conflicts within each so-called civilization, and he overestimated the importance of religion in the behavior of non-Western elites, who are often secularized and Westernized. Hence he could not clearly define the link between a civilization and the foreign policies of its member states[5]. A detailed discussion of views and theories on the topic of world order after the Cold War, including Huntington's theory of "the clash of civilizations" is to be found under: "Theories on World Order after September 11".

The People and Sovereignty
A Historical Account

In the context of the History of (Western European) political thought, sovereign power, understood as the absolute right (or power) to rule and to be obeyed or served, has not always been attached to the nation-state, let alone to its representatives but rather, successively, to such entities or beings as "God", the "Roman Catholic Emperor", the "Absolutist Monarch" and, -since St. Thomas Aquinas asserted that "all power comes from God, but through the people"—"The People"[6]. For instance, according to Locke, "God created man and we are, in effect, God's property"[7].

In *The Second Treatise* Locke describes the state in which there is no government with real political power. This is the state of nature. It is sometimes assumed that the state of nature is a state in which there is no government at all. This is only partially true. It is possible to have in the state of nature either no government, illegitimate government, or legitimate government with less than full political power. If we consider the state of nature before there was government, it is a state of political equality in which there is no natural superior or inferior. From this equality flows the obligation to mutual love and the duties that people owe one another, and the great maxims of justice and charity. Was there ever such a state? There has been considerable debate about this. Still, it is plain that both Hobbes and Locke would answer this question affirmatively. Whenever people have not agreed to establish a common political authority, they remain in the state of nature[8].

[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

[6] *See:* Jean-Mathieu C. Essis, "National sovereignty/globalization", *The Institute of Public Policy - George Mason University* (In: http://csf.colorado.edu/forums/ipe/96/jul96/0007.html/).
[7] *See:* "John Locke", *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
[8] "John Locke", *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. *See* also: Nicholas Jolley. *Locke, His Philosophical Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999; John Dunn. *The Political Thought of John Locke*, Cambridge

After the constitution of the Western European nation-states, national sovereignty came to be defined as the political and legal freedom of decision and action that comes from the capacity of the State to protect its territorial integrity, and to isolate its citizens from the rule of extraneous powers. Hugo Grotius, who is considered by many as the father of international law, asserted that sovereignty was an attribute of the State, with the implication that it was symbolized by, or embodied in, "The Sovereign", that is, whoever was the actual ruler of the (nation-)State[9]. Grotius denies that all human power is established in favor of the governed.

J.J. Rousseau radically and eloquently opposed this position, and derided Grotius for trading his intellectual honesty in exchange for political asylum at the court of various European kings, and the material comfort which ensued. Rousseau argued that sovereignty was inalienable and indivisible, and that it "always" remained with "the collectivity of citizens", in other words, "The People", which only could exercise it[10].

However, since Grotius, national sovereignty has been commonly considered as an attribute of national "governments", and the substance of sovereignty is the right and power to enact and enforce the nation-state's Defense, Economic, and Foreign policies. In this context, any international regulation or obligation, which is "freely" accepted by the "legitimate representatives" of a nation-state, in exchange for "the guarantee of reciprocal treatment" by other nation-state, constitutes an exercise of national sovereignty, regardless of which nation-state actually wins or loses something in the exchange[11].

This leads to the discussion of globalization. As Hans Morgenthau noted, the current structure and practice of international relations, and the theoretical and policy discourse that emerges from its workings, both tend to overlook the simple fact that the collusion of "national [or merely any collective] interest" and the nation-state is "a product of history" and, as such, is bound to disappear in the course of history[12].

A very valuable argument - with regard to sovereignty - on this point is also to be found in the work of Morgenthau (1973):

Sovereignty is not freedom from legal restraint. The quantity of legal obligations by which the nation limits its freedom of action does not, as such, limit its sovereignty. The oft-heard argument that a certain treaty would impose upon a nation obligations so onerous as to destroy its sovereignty is, therefore, meaningless. It is not the quantity of legal restraints that effects sovereignty, but their quality. A nation can take upon itself any quantity of

---

University Press, 1969; Richard Aaron. *John Locke*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.

[9] *Supra* note 6.

[10] *See:* Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*, 1762 (translated by G.D.H. Cole). In the *Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau had tried to explain the human invention of government as a kind of contract between the governed and the authorities that governed them. The only reason human beings were willing to give up individual freedom and be ruled by others was that they saw that their rights, happiness, and property would be better protected under a formal government rather than an anarchic, every-person-for-themselves type of society.

[11] *Supra* note 7.

[12] Ibid.

legal restraint and still remain sovereign, provided those legal restraints do not affect its quality as the supreme law-giving and law-enforcing authority[13].

It is clear that the process of globalization has transformed the traditional understandings of sovereignty and its embranglement with specific and exclusive jurisdiction over a given territorial area. The main contention of this paper is that globalization transforms, not dissolves or erodes, the way in which sovereignty is produced. As such, this argument can be distinguished from a formalist analysis as well as from cosmopolitan accounts of sovereignty. The former seeks to understand the increasing gap between formal sovereignty and its practical effect through the proliferation of conceptual terms such as "quasi-sovereignty"[14], whereas the latter moves beyond sovereignty through the construction of different kinds of political communities. Both perspectives are, however, trapped within a fixed notion of sovereignty as territory. The alternative offered in this Article proposes a structural understanding of the sovereign form by suggesting that sovereignty in the Westphalian phase, stimulated by the expansion of capitalism on a national scale, was governed by underlying changes in the distribution of social power. Hence, it is the shift toward a global rather than international economy that has set in motion significant changes in the form of sovereignty. In a nutshell, the assertion is that form of sovereignty is not fixed or immutable, but contingent on the underlying structures of economic and social relations[15].

The erosion of the internal sovereignty of the State is perhaps the first noticeable manifestation of the transformation of sovereignty. This is particularly the case because a key feature of the Westphalian model (and critical to the separation of the public and private in capitalism) is the internal unity of the State, which in turn implies a monistic legal order. Increasingly, globalization fragments this model of internal sovereignty by creating multiple centers of governance around autonomous national and supranational agencies. The emergent multilevel governance of the EU is a good exemplar of this fragmentation of the internal sovereignty of the State. An important ramification of this change in the form of internal sovereignty within the State has been the emergence of a polycentric legal order, which has substantially broken down the boundaries between international and domestic law. In fact, it is these changes in the internal architecture of the State that have enabled the nationalization of international law that are so critical to the constitution of global systems of governance[16].

---

[13] *See:* Hans J. Morgenthau. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (5th revised edition) New York: Knopf, 1973.

[14] See generally Robert Jackson, *Quasi States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World* (1990).

[15] Kanishka Jayasuriya, "Globalization, Las, and the Transformation of Sovereignty: The Emergence of Global Regulatory Governance", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*.

[16] Ibid.

Sovereignty, Globalization, and Interdependence

An essential link between globalization and the nation state is the concept of sovereignty, a term dating back several centuries, well before the nation-state system was established in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia[17]. Originally intended in reference to the establishment of order within a state, sovereignty has since been interpreted by some as a legal quality that places the state above the authority of all external laws. Yet whenever a state exercises its sovereign right to sign a treaty, it is also willfully limiting that right by the very act of undertaking an international legal obligation. States are also bound by other rules, such as customary international law. With these formal legal limitations, sovereignty stubbornly persists even in an age of globalization - and is manifested in such functions as the coining of money, the gathering of taxes, the promulgation of domestic law, the conduct of foreign policy, the regulation of commerce, and the maintenance of domestic order. These are all functions that are reserved exclusively to the state, a condition that the European Union is challenging today in many dimensions of governance, but has by no means overcome[18].

States have, over the years, discovered that their interests are better advanced within a broader system of binding rules than without such a system. Rules help to define rights, including property rights, as well as duties, including duties to do and not to do certain things. What precisely these rights and obligations are depends on a whole complex of circumstances: political, economic, cultural, and technological. In our current age, globalization is having a profound effect upon national and international rules - it is, for example, influencing the norms that govern world commerce, transportation, environmental protection, to name only a few. There is, however, no universally-agreed definition of this term. It made its debut in western public policy circles in the mid-1980s - replacing "interdependence" - and was at the time generally viewed in an economic context. Globalization simply referred to a largely commercial process involving

[17] By using the words of Martin van Creveld (1996), "the State, which since the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) has been the most important and most characteristic of all modern institutions, is dying. Wherever we look, existing states are either combining into larger communities or falling apart; wherever we look, organizations that are not states are taking their place. On the international level, we are moving away from a system of separate, sovereign, states toward less distinct, more hierarchical, and in many ways more complex structures. Inside their borders, it seems that many states will soon no longer be able to protect the political, military, economic, social, and cultural life of their citizens. These developments may lead to upheavals as profound as those that took humanity out of the Middle Ages and into the Modern World. Whether the direction of change is desirable, as some hope, or undesirable, as others fear, remains to be seen". In contrary to Creveld, Michael Löwy (2001) think that "in the discussion of the future of nation states there are two mistakes that must be avoided: the first is to consider nation states as institutions that are in decline or disappearing, or that they are losing all political or economic power as a consequence of the process of capitalist globalization; and the second is to believe that the defense of a nation and of national sovereignty is the only, or the principle, line of defense against the catastrophes brought on by the globalized market".

[18] Jayantha Dhanapala, "Globalization and the Nation State, A Cartography of Governance: Exploring the Role of Environmental NGOs", *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*, April 7, 2001.

process involving rapid increases in the exchange of goods, capital, and services across national frontiers. It figured particularly in writings about the role of multinational corporations, with their global networks of vertically-integrated subsidiaries and affiliates[19].

Expanded flows of commerce across borders had, to be sure, many benefits. They provided profits, jobs, efficiencies of scale, lowered unit costs, and increased the variety of goods available for everyone to buy. This commerce was facilitated by important technological trends, like the increased speed and declining cost of long-distance transportation (both of passengers and of cargo) and similar developments in the field of telecommunications. Simply put, it was not just getting easier to do business across national borders, but highly desirable to the growing numbers of potential beneficiaries of this commerce.

Some commentators over the ages have even written that unfettered trade would be the key to world peace, since states - and the large economic interests within them - would be most reluctant to let wars interfere with the cool logic of mutual economic gain. Journalists, social scientists, and political leaders joined their economist friends in heralding a new age of interdependence, one that promised a more rational way of going about the world's business, one less influenced by unilateral actions by nation states, including the use of force. Many of these writers were also keenly aware of another dimension of interdependence - namely, its potential to make armed conflicts much more devastating. Distinguished observers like Norman Angell, Leonard Wolf, Francis Delaisi, and Ramsey Muir wrote extensively on this theme and questioned the adequacy of the nation state in meeting the economic and security challenges of the new century. In short, the close interdependence of the world's economies did not only offer great benefits, but also entailed great risks, and great responsibilities for governmental reform. The capacity to generate wealth clearly did not come with any guarantees that this new wealth would be distributed equitably, as recent economic trends show clearly that the gap between the rich and poor - both within and between nations - has widened even in the generally prosperous decade of the 1990s.

Interdependence also entails cross-border exchanges of what are called, negative externalities, including environmental pollution, risks of international pandemics, and thriving clandestine markets for arms, components of weapons of mass destruction, narcotics, and even illicit transfers of various forms of industrial wastes[20].

Interdependence, in contrast to integration, is "the mere mutualism" of states, as Emile Durkheim put it[21].

Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in their 1977 book, *Power and Interdependence*, strengthened the notion that interdependence promotes peace and limits the use of force by arguing that simple interdependence had become complex interdependence, binding the economic and hence the political interests of states ever more tightly together. Now, we hear from many sides

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] *See:* Keneth N. Waltz, Globalization and Governance, Columbia University, *PS Online*, December 1999.

that interdependence has reached yet another height, transcending states and making *The Borderless World*, which is the title and theme of Kenichi Ohmae's 1990 book. People, firms, markets matter more; states matter less. Each tightening of the economic screw raises the benefits of economic exchange and makes war among the more advanced states increasingly costly. The simple and plausible propositions are that as the benefits of peace rise, so do the costs of war. When states perceive wars to be immensely costly, they will be disinclined to fight them. War becomes rare, but is not abolished because even the strongest economic forces cannot conquer fear or eliminate concern for national honor[22].

The Nation State

Many of the brightest prospects, as well as the worst potential risks, of globalization stem from the fate of the nation, in particular its association with the administrative structure known as the state. The idea that each state should have, or coincide with, its underlying nation goes back many years before the doctrine of national self-determination was enshrined - albeit selectively - in the Versailles Treaty after World War I. Though there is considerable disagreement over the formal definition of the term, the communitarian nation differs from the administrative machinery of the state much as the human spirit differs from the bones and muscles of one's body. The nation is not an administrative contrivance, but a form of collective social identity, one that is based on a common historical, linguistic, or cultural heritage[23].

Historical sociology has defined states as more or less territorially-based quasi-monopolists of legitimate violence (Weber, as refined by Mann), with a dual projection of power, over society within their territory and vis-à-vis other centers of state power. In this tradition of thought, the character of particular states, or kinds of state, depends on these two mutually conditioning sets of social relations[24]. The state, as Treitschke tells us, is the scale (of justice) and the sword (of war). But it is above all the sword, since it can only impose justice once the state is assured, by the sword, that it can enforce obedience[25].

Historically, the leaders of states have relied upon nations as a base of support for official laws and policies, indeed, as a basis for their own legitimacy. As the backbone of political power of the administrative state, the nation has rallied behind many great causes, including many of the progressive reforms in social, economic, and environmental policy of the 20th century. Yet since Napoleonic times, the nation has also been associated with the age of total war, of horrific conflicts between the peoples of the world rather than just their armies. This unfettered spirit of the nation, when

[22] Ibid.

[23] Jayantha Dhanapala, "Globalization and the Nation State, A Cartography of Governance: Exploring the Role of Environmental NGOs", *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*, April 7, 2001.

[24] Martin Shaw, "Kosova: Transformations of State and Warfare in the Global Revolution", *Sussex*.

[25] *See:* Raymond Aaron, *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1966, pp. 591-600.

combined with the revolutionary advances in military technology in the 19th and 20th century, has led to the bloodiest years in the history of humanity. Even today, the nation, and its associated ideology - nationalism - continue to provide a formidable obstacle to constructive international cooperation on an enormous variety of common global problems[26].

In an age of total war, of instant global communications and fast, cheap travel, the nation state has appeared to many observers as a quaint, even dangerous anachronism. Even a hard-core realist like Hans Morgenthau was drawn to declare thirty-five years ago that - in his words - Modern technology has rendered the nation state obsolete as a principle of political organization; for the nation state is no longer able to perform what is the elementary function of any political organization: to protect the lives of its members and their way of life… The modern technologies of transportation, communications, and warfare, and the resultant feasibility of all-out atomic war, have completely destroyed this protective function of the nation state[27].

Contemporary observers and leaders alike have devoted considerable effort throughout the postwar years in the pursuit of measures to go - in the popular parlance – "beyond the nation state". The functionalist approach of Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman - the pioneers of the European Union - sought to tackle this problem by building habits of cooperation in relatively non-sensitive areas of economic and cultural activity in the belief that, in due course, these habits of cooperation would spill over into more sensitive areas. Habits can be powerful political forces indeed. As Samuel Johnson once said, "The chains of habit are too weak to be felt until they are too strong to be broken". Obsolete though it may be in many ways, the nation state nevertheless persists as do, quite obviously, a multitude of nations. Indeed, many of the legal and political principles of exclusivity commonly associated with the nation state are enshrined in the great treaty linking all countries, the Charter of the United Nations. Yet, at the start of the new millennium, we are also seeing the gradual emergence of awareness throughout the world of our common humanity and the planet as a whole rather than simply the sum of its parts.

This synthesis of the globe and the nation state as the fundamental units of sustained political activity is but another way of thinking about the process of globalization. The idea here is not to replace the nation state but to adapt it to be more responsive to human needs in new global conditions. Without a doubt the best expression of the synthesis that is now underway can be found in a historic document that was issued last September after the Millennium Summit at the United Nations, the largest-ever gathering of world leaders. This document, called the Millennium Declaration, consists of a statement of common values and principles, as well as a list of specific common objectives. Specific initiatives are outlined in the areas of peace, security, and disarmament; development and poverty eradication; protecting the environment; human rights, democracy, and good governance; protecting the vulnerable; meeting the

[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.

special needs of Africa; and strengthening the United Nations. It is noteworthy that the primary agent for pursuing these common, global goals remains the state. The declaration itself, for example, was, unlike the Charter, a statement by "heads of State and Government" not their peoples. In this document, these leaders emphatically rededicated themselves "to uphold the sovereign equality of all States", to respect their "territorial integrity and political independence", and to reaffirm their commitment of "non-interference in the internal affairs of States". It is hard to read this language and conclude that the state is obsolete[28].

Ernet Gellner concludes that the modern state developed to meet the needs of industrial society. Gellner proposes that the nation-state exists primarily because of the need of industrial societies for economic integration and cultural homogeneity; furthermore, he says, the medium through which this integration and homogenization is accomplished is through education. According to Gellner, instead of using a monopoly on force to accomplish integration, the modern state uses its monopoly on education[29].

On the other hand, there is some thought that the future of the nation-state is insecure. Some point to the increase in migration in the world, others to the rise of the transnational corporations, yet others to the increasing importance of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in delivering services to people.

Globalization has dissolved national boundaries as more and more people migrate in search of employment. As Anuk Ride points out, almost everyone has to sell something to survive, and often the only thing they have to sell is their labor. But as boundaries dissolve, borders, as Richard Kearney has explained, have been reinforced. That is as more and more people migrate from poor countries to rich countries in search of work, governments in rich countries have been urged by their citizens to strengthen borders to prevent immigration. To some, immigrants pose a threat to the economy, to the social fabric of the country, even, some argue, to the environment. But migrants, as Ride explains, contribute far more to national economies than they receive, a fact explainable, in part, because they are willing to work for far less than citizens[30].

Olin Robison argues that the nation-state, while not disappearing, will suffer erosion from above from multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, and NGOs, and erosion from below from groups within their borders demanding a greater say in their own governance[31]. However, - as Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira has stated, - global governance is not yet a reality, but it has ceased to be a utopia[32].

To sum up, the nation-state has been weakened, but it is not a spent force[33].

---

[28] *Supra* note 15.

[29] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.

[30] *See*: Anuk Ride, "Maps, Myths & Migrants", *New Internationalist Magazine*, Issue 305.

[31] Olin C. Robinson, "The Decline of the Nation State", *Vermont Public Radio Commentary Archive*, (In: http://www.salzburgseminar.org/orcomments/template.cfm?id=159/)

[32] Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira, "Beyond Conflicting Powers' Politics", *Social Science Research Council*.

[33] *See:* David Rieff, The False Dawn of Civil Society, *The Nation*, February 22, 1999. The online article can be found at:

Globalization *vs.* National Governments

As in the context of the world economy, the decline of national sovereignty corresponds to the increase in the power of the market, and unelected global institutions such as WTO that has the power to undo national and regional legislation aimed at erecting some barriers over environmental and social issues so in the context of the European union, the decline of national sovereignty corresponding to the increase in the power of the European commission to deal with commercial policy without even the need to consult the European Parliament. Yet, even the European commissioner knows that there is a danger in this decline in national sovereignty.

As globalization proceeds, as supranational institutions converge and as European integration develops, it is more than ever important that electorates do not feel that they have been cheated of their own power to influence decision-makers. This requires a more subtle division of labor between different centers of power and political institutions. Decisions should be made at their most appropriate level[34].

In other words, the process of globalization disempowers national governments, that is reduces the ability for national government to enter into negotiation with social movements and claims of various "interest groups". People may feel cheated about this, and of course a problem of legitimacy may follow. What to do? Brittan suggests the formula of the "pooling of national sovereignty", a formula borrowed by Ferdinand Mount (quoted by Brittan): ... *authority must reside and be seen to reside where it is, in theory, supposed to reside. A headmaster should be allowed to act like one. A manager should be left to get on with managing. Similarly, local communities should not feel that local decisions are unnecessarily dictated by national or international structures. The necessary degree of pooling of sovereignty will only be acceptable if people are confident that their Governments will always be vigilant to ensure that there really is something to be gained every time a step in the direction of further integration is taken. Governments entering into international commitments must consider carefully whether the effects of those commitments will not intrude unnecessarily into the minutiae of regional or national practices*[35].

Nye and Robert Keohane argue that the old model of the state-based international system does not capture the new reality of a decentralized, heterogeneous, and networked world. The result is neither anarchy nor world government but "networked minimalism" - i.e., nonhierarchical arrays of governmental units, private firms, and nongovernmental organizations focused on specific problems. New rules and norms of conduct are emerging within these networks and diffusing traditional governmental functions. All the same, the nation-state will not disappear; in the developing world, globalization has even strengthened some governments. Yet despite the nation-state's persistence, problems of

http://www.converge.org.nz/lac/articles/news990306a.htm/

[34] Sir Leon Brittan, "Globalization" vs. Sovereignty? The European Response. *Speech, Rede Lecture, Cambridge University*, 20th February, 1997. (In: http://europa.eu.int/).

[35] Ibid.

democratic accountability lurk within this complex system. Hence governments need to develop new methods to coordinate their policies within decentralized transnational settings[36].

The global economy, however, with its transnational corporations, interest groups, and other transnational and supranational trends, has grown beyond the control of individual nation-states[37]. According to Fukuyama, in an age in which big government is under attack, calling for new political institutions on a global scale with enormous legislative and regulatory powers is both hubristic and quixotic. The world is saved from U.N. inefficiency only by the organization's weakness. A functioning world government would quickly become a monstrosity of administrative costs and good intentions gone awry. The result would not be democratic empowerment but a feeling of disenfranchisement at the hands of a new bureaucracy[38].

Terrorism and Globalization

After the September 11th terrorist attacks against the US, the very discourse of international relations and global politics has been transformed. Prior to September 11th, the dominant issues were geo-economics in nature. Globalization and humanitarian issues occupied the agendas of international summits and international organizations. But now geopolitics and security concerns have once again become the central issue and the "old language and institutions" of the cold war are shaping our thinking about global politics[39].

The world was rapidly moving to realizing the idea of a global village as commonalities in terms of economic aspirations and technological progress were emphasized by politicians and opinion makers, over differences such as religion, culture and ethnicity. Globalization of the world was the ultimate celebration of the political, economic and social homogenization of the global populations. On political front there is a consensus that democracy was not only the best but also the only legitimate way of organizing modern polities. On the economic front, the globalization of the economy was a foregone conclusion as nations scrambled to liberalize their economies in order to live up to the new standards set by the World Trade Organization. In the social arena, lifestyle and tastes shaped by multinational consumer corporations such as Nike, Levis, Coke, MTV, were well on the way to Americanizing the global popular culture. But has September 11th changed all that? Globalization as a process was facilitated by the liberalization of trans-border transactions by the dilution sovereignty. Globalization is essentially a measure of the ease with which, labor, ideas, capital, technology and profits can move across borders with minimal governmental interference. This measure of liberalization is also a surrogate measure for security[40].

The great sense of insecurity that terrorism now inspires in the US economy and the government, the two

[36] *See:* Joseph S. Nye and John D. Donahue, *Governance in a Globalizing World*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

[37] Francis Fukuyama, "Political and Legal", *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1996.

[38] Ibid.

[39] *Supra* note 2.

[40] Ibid.

most important forces behind globalization, has resulted in a reassertion of sovereignty by the US and other nations. The fear that liberal standards are facilitating terrorism is causing the US and other European Union members to control trans-border transactions. The efforts to prevent terrorists from moving their resources is leading to greater scrutiny of banks and setting up of new measures that will slow down the flow of capital. The fear that porous borders allow terrorists to enter target countries is leading to new rules about border patrol, VISA regulations, and monitoring of foreign travelers. New security measures at airports have already raised the costs of travel and are affecting the profitability of the airline industry. Governments are increasing international cooperation to monitor the flow of information, people and monies across borders. These heightened measures are a result of the change in priorities. Cost is now second to security and therefore in pursuit of safety, profits are being sacrificed. If this state of affairs persists, globalization be retarded and the very instruments that facilitate and accelerate globalization will be blunted.

It is ironic that global terrorism, the phenomenon of terrorists operating in and against several nations simultaneously, was facilitated by globalization and now it has become the biggest challenge to globalization. Global terrorism depends on the success of globalization[41].

[41] Ibid.

Theories on World Order after September 11

An event as epochal as September 11 is bound to provoke theorists of international relations. Over the past year or so, there has been a race in academia to claim the first prize for the best theory to explain the events before and after September 11. The consensus is that the dominant discourse of realism has won, because it conceives of conflict and destruction as natural in an anarchical world (from Thomas Hobbes' "anarchical state of nature"). It also justifies America's threatening military actions after the terror strikes as a natural form of behavior of strong states, which always bully the weak into compliance to serve the former's selfish interests[42].

Contemporary theorists of world politics face a challenge similar to that of this earlier generation: to understand the nature of world politics, and its connections to domestic politics, when what Herz called the "hard shell" of the state has been shattered[43].

Both the end of the Second World War and the collapse of the Soviet Union caused liberals ("idealists") to assert their view that global cooperative organizations would subsequently play important roles in the world. Some went so far as to suggest that "the era of nation states" was somehow coming to an end — a prediction that remains premature to this date. In 2001, similar claims were made about the

[42] Sreeram Chaulia, "September 11 in International Relations Theory", *Kashmir Herald*, Volume 2, No. 8 - January 2003.

[43] Herz 1959, 22, cited in Robert O. Keohane's "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'", *Dialog-IO* 1 (Spring 2002).

new US-led "Global War on Terrorism," with the question being asked: "Has Global Terrorism Introduced a New Era?" Realists are asserting that "national interests" must be preserved, while idealists are analyzing why the Islamic world feels besieged and unfairly treated in the global community. In each instance, though, the events since September 11, 2001 are seen as a reaffirmation of existing theories and any speculation of a "fundamental shift in international relations" remains just that — hypothetical speculation. However, from a policy perspective, the significance of the terrorist attacks on the United States has being recognized. Bilateral relationships, such as that between the United States and Russia, are being reexamined and developed in ways previously seen as unlikely. Multilateral organizations such as NATO are expanding their areas of operations. And, perhaps most importantly, the vision of an "enemy" has shifted from being an opposing nation-state, or bloc of nations, to a borderless entity: the international terrorist.

Geographical space, which has been seen as a natural *barrier* and a locus for human barriers, now must be seen as a *carrier* as well. The obsolescence of the barrier conception of geographic space has troubling implications for foreign policy. One of the strengths of realism in the United States has always been that it imposed limitations on U.S. intervention abroad. By asking questions about whether vital national interests are involved in a particular situation abroad, realists have sought to counter the moralistic and messianic tendencies that periodically recur in American thinking. For Lippmann, the key to a successful foreign policy was achieving a "balance, with a comfortable surplus of power in re serve, [between] the nation's commitment and the nation's power"[44].

Going abroad "in search of monsters to destroy" upset that balance. Realism provided a rationale for "just saying no" to advocates of intervening, for their own ideological or self-interested reasons, in areas of conflict far from the United States. It is worthwhile to be reminded that Lippmann, Hans J. Morgenthau, and Kenneth N. Waltz were all early opponents of the war in Vietnam. Unfortunately, this realist caution, salutary as it has been, is premised on the barrier conception of geographical space. In the absence of clear and defensible criteria that U.S. leaders can use to distinguish vital from non-vital interests, the United States is at risk of intervening throughout the world in a variety of conflicts bearing only tangential relationships to "terrorism with a global reach." The globalization of informal violence, carried out by networks of non-state actors, defined by commitments rather than by territory, has profoundly changed these fundamental foreign-policy assumptions[45].

Social scientists have offered various theories to explain the current and future world order. In the field of international relations, there are several theories that are well known and relate to discussions following September 11[46]. While some theoreticians aim to

---

[44] Robert O. Keohane, "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'", *Dialog-IO* 1 (Spring 2002): 29-43.

[45] Ibid.

[46] The terrorist attacks on New York and Washington force us to rethink theories of world politics. As Robert O. Keohane puts it,

predict the future world order, others consider what the world *should* look like, and suggest approaches that can be taken to achieve these ends. Below are some examples of different views that scholars of international relations have express on the topic of world order: *Conflicts of culture shaping the world order:*

In his influential and controversial work, *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996), Samuel P. Huntington theorized that in the post-Cold War world order, cultural divides would be the source of conflict in the world. Huntington's core claim is that "clashes of civilizations are the greatest threat to world peace", and that: "In the post-Cold War world the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political, or economic. They are cultural"[47]. He identified eight "civilizations" in the world and argued that the new world order would be threatened by clashes between these groups. Huntington believes that in the short term most states or groups of states can be grouped into eight civilizations: the Western, Sinic, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American, Buddhist, and African[48].

In the context of the September 11 attacks, commentators throughout the world have referred to Huntington's theory. Some have argued that Huntington had predicted this inevitable divide between Islam and the West. However, most social scientists - including Huntington, who clarified his view following the attacks - do not consider that the "clash of civilizations" theory adequately explains September 11 and its aftermath. Many argue instead that radical Islamic movements are more indicative of "clashes" within Islam than between "global" Islam and "western civilization", or within a certain group than within two different civilizational groups, as categorized by Huntington.

A Russet, Oneal and Cox (2000) analyses of states' involvement in militarized interstate disputes, 1950-92, indicate that differences in civilization tell us little about the likelihood that two states will become involved in military conflict: militarized disputes, uses of force, and conflicts involving fatalities are not significantly more common among dyads split across civilizational boundaries than for other pairs of states. Indeed, states in four of the eight civilizations fought more among themselves than with states in other civilizations. The military, political, and economic interests measured by our realist and liberal variables provide a substantially better account of interstate violence than does Huntington's theory. Disputes between the West and the rest of the world were no more common than between or within most other groups. Nor is there evidence of a clash be-

---

globalism should not be equated with economic integration. "The agents of globalization are not simply the high-tech creators of the Internet, or multinational corporations, but also small bands of fanatics, traveling on jet aircraft, and inspired by fundamentalist religion".

[47] Samuel P. Huntington. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996, p. 321. His central theme is that "culture and cultural identities, which at the broadest level are civilizational identities, are shaping patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-Cold War world" (p. 20).

[48] Ibid., at 43.

tween Islam and the West except as it involves Israel[49].

According to Russet, Oneal and Cox, optimism is also justified by the effects of self-interest on the behavior of both citizens and policy-makers. Political leaders in democratic countries will avoid unnecessary wars so that they may retain political office, and commercial interests can be expected to maintain the ties that make them more prosperous—whether these coincide with civilizational boundaries or not[50]. As Immanuel Kant has said, "peace does not depend on moral conversion or common cultural identity when self-interest is involved"[51].

Dominance of western liberalism shaping the world order:

One of the theories that is often cited in opposition to Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" is Francis Fukuyuma's "end of history" as articulated in *The End of History and the Last Man* (1993). Fukuyama considered that the demise of the Soviet Union and the discrediting of communism demonstrated the triumph of western liberalism. He foresees that in time all societies will evolve to a point that they will adopt liberal democratic institutions. In turn, the resulting new world order will be characterized by international cooperation through market economies and liberal democracy[52].

Other social scientists reject Fukuyama's claim that these western values will be accepted universally. Citing the resistance to western ideology exhibited by groups in various parts of the world - of which Al Qaeda is the most visible example - critics argue that Fukuyama's theory oversimplifies the complexity of cultures, values and "evolution" around the world.

Great power states shaping the world order:

John J. Mearsheimer, an expert on security and nuclear policy known for his realist view of international relations, sets forth a theory that applies to great power states, which shape and dominate the world system. It holds that the structure of the world system compels states to fight. States act in their own interests, to preserve their own survival. The best way to ensure survival is to dominate their region. No state can ever perfectly know the intentions of another state, so all are compelled to maintain military capabilities. In the absence of a higher arbiter, Mearsheimer writes, even wealthy and content states can and do attack others when they calculate that warfare can increase their power[53].

Liberals and conservatives will each find reasons to disagree with Mearsheimer's assumptions and conclusions. Liberals will dislike his assertion that efforts to avoid war and

[49] Bruce Russet, John R. Oneal and Michaelene Cox, Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Déjà Vu? Some Evidence, Journal of Peace Research 37: 5 (September 2000), pp. 33 – 34.

[50] Ibid., at. 35-36.

[51] Immanuel Kant. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, in *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 105.

[52] *See*: Francis Fukuyama. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992.

[53] Matthew Foley, "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics by John J. Mearsheimer", *National Strategy Forum Review*, Winter 2001.

promote development abroad are futile and self-defeating. Conservatives will take offense at Mearsheimer's dismissal of the idea that "there are 'good' and 'bad' states in the international system." His conclusions are controversial—even Mearsheimer writes that Americans are likely to "recoil" at his interpretation of the Cold War[54].

Mearsheimer offers a series of predictions for the twenty-first century, which he acknowledges will not be perfectly accurate, and issues recommendations for US policy. First, he predicts that the US will withdraw its troops from Northeast Asia and Europe. Later, there will likely be wars in these regions as states struggle to contain the potential hegemons of Germany, Japan, and China. Mearsheimer argues that the US should allow these wars to happen, first hanging back, then joining in near the end so it can win the war and have a part in dictating the terms of the peace. These actions would be suitable for a US with no economic interests or moral beliefs.

International law and institutions shaping the world order:

Some social scientists, including David Held and Mary Kaldor (whose essays are included in the *Globalization* and *New War?* subject areas, respectively), maintain a cosmopolitan perspective of the way the world can be ordered. Cosmopolitans consider that human well-being is not defined by geographical and cultural locations; that national or other boundaries should not determine the limits of rights or the satisfaction of basic needs; and, that all human beings require equal moral respect and concern. Based on these principles, they call for strengthened international legal and regulatory institutions that would be charged with the responsibility and the means to maintain security around the world through the enforcement of human rights and global justice.

David Held argues that international legal institutions offer an alternative to unilateral military responses to international crimes like those committed on September 11. He and others who share his view look towards the International Criminal Tribunals of Rwanda and Former Yugoslavia, and other criminal cases tried under international law as proof of the international community's capacity to prosecute serious crimes. By relying on these international institutions rather than acting independently, countries like the United States could uphold the principles of universal international law.

Critics of this perspective do not consider that this internationalist vision is a realistic one. They argue that the competing interests that exist among nation-states are too divided, and nation-states' insistence on sovereignty is too strong to allow such a shift of power from nation-states to international institutions. According to some critics, the inadequacies of current institutions, such as ineffective bureaucracy and inefficient spending, are indicative of the flawed nature of international organizations in general. They maintain that this ideal would be impossible to implement.

The nature of the world politics, however, is presented in much more perspectives. Global governance scholars

[54] Ibid.

have posited scenarios on the shape of the post-cold war era from the continuity of the state to its collapse and transformation. These three main scenarios followed by sub-scenarios, have been presented, in order to define the unclear prospectus of the after Cold War world order. The following table attempts to give an idea on the possible processes, discussed by political scientists and different institutions and theories.

Human Security and Global Governance:
A Schematic View of the Post Cold War Future Scenarios[1]

Scenarios	*Sources*
CONTINUITY SCENARIOS	
State System Scenario	
Continuity and restoration of the states system requiring a balance of power through military strength.	*Kissinger, Waltz*
End of History Scenario	
Global triumph of liberal capitalism requiring progressive worldwide democratic and market institutions.	*Fukuyama*
Corporate Hegemony Scenario	
Transnational corporate domination of the world requiring democratic resistance.	*Barnet, Cavanagh*
Regionalist Scenario	
Intraregional cooperation and interregional competition for trade and development requiring such organizations as NATFA, EU, MERCOSUR, ASEAN, APEC, SAARC, CIS, and ECO.	*Fawcett & Hurrel*
COLLAPSE SCENARIOS	
Growing Gaps Scenario	
A widening bifurcation of the world system between rich and poor leading to increasing intrastate and interstate clashes.	*Attali, UNDP*
Clash of Civilizations Scenario	
Future conflicts will be among civilizations, notably between the West and the rest.	*Huntington*
Chaos Scenario	
Disintegration of the world system into anarchy requiring strict anti-terrorist strategies.	*Kaplan*
TRANSFORMATION SCENARIOS	

[1] *See:* "Human Security and Global Governance (HUGG)", *Prospectus for a Project of the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research*. The Prospectus has been drafted by Majid Tehranian on the basis of consultation meetings with members of the Toda Institute's International Advisory Council held in Cambridge (USA), Tehran (IRAN), York (UK), Honolulu (USA), Brisbane (AUSTRALIA), Hiroshima and Tokyo (JAPAN). For a more extensive view of the project, see Majid Tehranian and Laura Reed, *Human Security and Global Governance: The State of the Art*. Honolulu: Toda Institute, 1996.

End of State Scenario Abolition of social classes and withering away of the state requiring revolutionary struggle.	*Marxists*
Anarchist Scenario Dissolution of the state into a libertarian *laissez faire* system requiring progressive devolution of power.	*Anarchists, Libertarians*
World Government Scenario Evolution toward a federal system of world government through a democratic federal constitution.	*Tinbergen, World federalists*
Just World Order Scenario Rule of law and conflict resolution through peaceful means requiring institutionalization of conflict resolution and legal methods of dispensing justice.	*Falk, WOMP*
Communitarian Scenario Cooperation for peace, development, and justice on the basis of shared values and interests requiring world integration and building of dialogical security communities at national, regional, and global levels.	*Deutch, Etzioni,Tehranian*

"Dirty bombs" and Globalization

Tom Clancy's "The Sum of All Fears" came out in 1991. In it, a KGB colonel says, "The Americans and Europeans have been lax in selling nuclear technology to various countries-capitalism at work, there is a huge amount of money involved-but we made the same mistake with China and Germany did we not?" Eleven years later, with the movie version of that book in theaters, we find ourselves more concerned than ever about the way weapons are moving around the world. Globalization is having a huge impact on traditional arms control efforts. Globalization impacts arms (and arms control) in at least two major ways. First, globalization has changed the way weapons are made and sold around the world. Second, globalization is linked to new efforts to put weapons in space[1].

John Herz argued that nuclear weapons forced students of international politics to rethink sovereignty, territoriality, and the protective function of the state: *With the advent of the atomic weapon, whatever remained of the impermeability of states seems to have gone for good . . . Mencius, in ancient China, when asked for guidance in matters of defense and foreign policy by the ruler of a small state, is said to have counseled: "dig deeper your moats; build higher your walls; guard them along with your people." This remained the classical posture up to our age, when a Western sage, Bertrand Russell, could still, even in the interwar period, define power as a force radiating from one center and diminishing with the distance from*

[1] "Globalization and the Sum of All Fears", *Globalization Issues with Keith Porter*. The online article can be found at: http://globalization.about.com/library/weekly/aa071002a.htm/

that center until it finds an equilibrium with that of similar geographically anchored units. Now that power can destroy power from center to center everything is different[2].

The failure to anticipate the impact of terrorist attacks does not derive from a fundamental conceptual failure in thinking about power. On the contrary, the power of terrorists, like that of states, derives from asymmetrical patterns of interdependence. Our fault has rather been our failure to understand that the most powerful state ever to exist on this planet could be vulnerable to small bands of terrorists because of patterns of asymmetrical interdependence. *We have overemphasized states and we have overaggregated power*. Power comes not simply out of the barrel of a gun but from asymmetries in vulnerability interdependence—some of which, it turns out favor certain non-state actors more than most observers anticipated. The networks of interdependence along which power can travel are multiple, and they do not cancel one another out. Even a state that is overwhelmingly powerful on many dimensions can be highly vulnerable on others. This lesson was learned in the 1970s with respect to oil power; we are relearning it now with respect to terrorism[3].

As Keohane points out, most problematic are the assumptions in international relations theory about the roles played by states. There have been too much "international relations," and too little "world politics," not only in work on security but also in much work on international institutions. States no longer have a monopoly on the means of mass destruction: more people died in the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon than in the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Indeed, it would be salutary for us to change the name of our field from "international relations" to "world politics." The language of "international" relations enables us to slip back into state-centric assumptions too easily. Asymmetrical interdependence is not merely an interstate phenomenon.

The global economy is limiting the influence of the nation-state, while transferring power to corporations, financial markets, and multilateral organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the IMF, all of which are incapable of promoting diplomacy and international peace and security. Nations whose economy and sovereignty are weakened by globalization will make great efforts to maintain or regain security and economic development through military spending. Military build-ups could result in regional arms races, or as in the case of India, end in nations "going nuclear". Meanwhile, industrialized countries maintain their technological advantage and high-tech industries through military spending. Domestic weapons corporations aggressively promote the maintenance of existing nuclear war-fighting capability and the development of new nuclear weapons systems to keep lucrative military contracts flowing, regardless of the effect

---

[2] Herz 1959, 107–108.

[3] Robert O. Keohane, "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'", *Dialog-IO* 1 (Spring 2002), p. 7.

of these weapons on international peace and security[4].
At the end, one can say the creation of a single global economy through globalization, with respect to arms of mass destruction, can easily undermine international peace and security.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the process of globalization and the ever increasing interdependence which it fosters, seems to have produced a world system, where in one hand, the nation state for some time to come is likely to remain a prominent reference point in the field of governance, and on the other hand, international organizations and state-like structures can function both within and above the needs of individual states thus undermining the individual nation-state's competence, form, autonomy and its authority and legitimacy. So far, as Christopher Newman wrote in *the Nation-State or Global Civil Society*, it seems that the "*lot*" of the nation-state is not "*a happy one*," but there are those who argue that the process of globalization may be causing countervailing forces which strengthen the nation-state. Gilpin argues that the major problem of the global state system is the maintenance of peace[5]. Therefore, because the state holds the monopoly over the means of violence and consequently the source of power and control, the nation-state is necessary to maintain global order.
When it comes to the threats posed by global terrorism and means of mass destruction, international cooperation is crucial to this respect. As the U.S. Commission on National Security find out in its report "New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century", maintenance of a robust nuclear deterrent remains essential as well as investment in new forms of defense against these threats.
The post-Cold War era is still in the process of evolving and is yet to be given its own name, but the changing relations between and among individual nation-states and international organizations, especially the United Nations, is a central subject of this era. However, the world today needs to address fairly and energetically new governance challenges. Growing interconnectedness has given new meaning to old asymmetries as well as creating new ones. The rising debt, poverty, and disease in the global south are beginning to reach deep into the rich countries. Many of these conditions need the full attention and assistance of the world community of peoples, especially those with a bigger

[4] *See:* Steven Staples, "Nuclear Weapons and Globalization", *International Network on Disarmament and Globalization*, February 2000.

[5] Robert Gilpin argues that the process of globalization is the result of a permissive political order which generates the stability needed to encourage connections, by the exercise of power between hegemonic nation-states. Therefore, the present era of global interconnectedness has been achieved due to the existence of a stable and secure world order in which the hegemonic liberal democracies utilize military power and supremacy for economic and political purposes. Gilpin's primary factor is therefore of a political logic which views the process of globalization as depending upon the rise and decline of hegemonic powers and the existence of a secure world order that political equilibrium produces. Giddens, on the other hand, views the logic of globalization as having interlocking *"institutional dimensions"*, of which the main four are capitalism, the inter-state system, militarism and industrialism, each of these dimensions play a separate role in the production of the global-world.

political and economic potential. The negligence of those factors will produce serious counter-effects to international peace and security. Those issues have also to be addressed through multilateral efforts. National governments will have to get involved along with non-governmental actors and supranational organizations, as unavoidable facilitators of the process.

References:

Aaron, Raymond. 1996. *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Aaron, Richard. 1937. *John Locke*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bresser-Pereira, Luiz Carlos, Beyond Conflicting Powers' Politics, *Social Science Research Council*.

Brittan, Leon. 1997. Globalization vs. Sovereignty? The European Response. *Speech, Rede Lecture, Cambridge University*. (In: http://europa.eu.int/)

Chaulia, Sreeram. 2003. "September 11 in International Relations Theory", *Kashmir Herald*, Volume 2, No. 8.

De Angelis, Massimo. 1998. European Integration in Context: Globalization and the Struggles for a New World, edited transcript of a talk delivered at the Capital and Class conference: "Real People's Europe: Neoliberal Srategies, Social Conflict and Counter-Strategies in the European Union".

Dhanapala, Jayantha. 2001. Globalization and the Nation State, A Cartography of Governance: Exploring the Role of Environmental NGOs, *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*.

Dunn, John. 1969. *The Political Thought of John Locke*, Cambridge University Press.

Essis, Jean-Mathieu C. "National sovereignty/globalization", *The Institute of Public Policy - George Mason University* (In: http://csf.colorado.edu/forums/ipe/96/jul96/0007.html/).

Foley, Matthew. 2001. *"The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* by John J. Mearsheimer", *National Strategy Forum Review.* Winter 2001.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1996. "Political and Legal", *Foreign Affairs*, July/August.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Held, David and Anthony G. McGrew. 2000. *Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate.* Blackwell Publishers.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 2002. Clash of Globalizations, *Foreign Affairs*.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of WorldOrder.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Jackson, Robert. 1990. *Quasi States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*.

Jayasuriya, Kanishka. Globalization, Las, and the Transformation of Sovereignty: The Emergence of Global Regulatory Governance, *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*.

Jolley, Nicholas, 1999. *Locke, His Philosophical Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kant, Immanuel. 1970 [1795]. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, in *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keohane, O. Robert. 2002. "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'". *Dialog-IO* 1.

Khan, Muqtedar, Column on Global Affairs, *Glocal Eye*. The online text can be found at: http://www.glocaleye.org/terglo.htm

Löwy, Michael. 2001. Nation state, nationalism, globalization, internationalism. Text presented at the World Social Forum (In: http://attac.org/fra/list/doc/lowyen.htm/)

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1973. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (5th revised edition) New York: Knopf.

Nye, S. Joseph and John D. Donahue. 2000. *Governance in a Globalizing World*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

Ride, Anuk. Maps, Myths & Migrants. *New Internationalist Magazine.* Issue 305.

Rieff, David. 1999. The False Dawn of Civil Society, *The Nation*. The online article can be found at: http://www.converge.org.nz/lac/articles/news990306a.htm/

Robinson, C. Olin. The Decline of the Nation State. *Vermont Public Radio Commentary Archive*, http://www.salzburgseminar.org/orcomments/template.cfm?id=159/

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. 1762. *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right* (translated by G.D.H. Cole).

Russet, Bruce, John R. Oneal and Michaelene Cox. 2000. Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Déjà Vu? Some Evidence, *Journal of Peace Research* 37: 5.

Staples, Steven. 2000. "Nuclear Weapons and Globalization", *International Network on Disarmament and Globalization*.

Shaw, Martin. Kosova: Transformations of State and Warfare in the Global Revolution. *Sussex*.

Tehranian, Majid and Laura Reed. 1996. *Human Security and Global Governance: The State of the Art*. Honolulu: Toda Institute.

Van Creveld, Martin. 1996. The Fate of the State, *Parameters*, Spring 1996, pp. 4-18.

Waltz, Keneth N. 1999. Globalization and Governance, Columbia University, *PS Online*.

Wooldridge, Adrian and John Micklethwait. 2000. *A Future Perfect: The Challenge and Hidden Promise of Globalization.* Crown Business.

"John Locke", *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
"New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century", U.S. Commission Report on National Security, September 15, 1999.