withoutithappening.However,ifthisistobeatrend of the future, a set of four recommendations are proposed in order to better accommodate African countries and their people. Firstly, a regulatory framework or set of international laws must be created and practiced, that serve to regulate deals between donor countries and investors. These laws must substantially limit the amount of land that can be transferred and the duration of loans. Secondly, proper land registration laws must be implemented in all African countries, to better protect rural inhabitants and smallholders from their land being claimed by donor governments and sold. Thirdly, before projects are approved they must guarantee and follow through with sufficient, long term job creation programs for local residents. Lastly, a higher percentage of food produced within donor countries must stay within them in order to tackle food insecurity, rather than being exported.

In a world full of climate change, population growth, war, and food insecurity it is impossible to know what role the global land grab will play in the future. However through examining the lack of transparency in land deals, issues surrounding food security, the displacement of smallholders, limited job creation, and the long term effects of monocultures, it becomes apparent that despite potential benefits, the land grab presents an immense threat to rural livelihoods in African countries. It has been suggested the global land grab exhibits a form of neo-colonialism whereby rich countries are exploiting poor countries.[65] With respect to Africa, the global land grab has even been described as the "Second Scramble for Africa."[66] That is part of a whole other debate, however though this paper one thing has become clear: without significant changes in the way land deals are currently being implemented, they will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the future of African countries and their people.

[65] Mounia BEN AÏSSA, "Land for grabs: Win-win or neo-colonialism?," *Food Crisis and the Global Land Grab website*, December 25, 2009, http://farmlandgrab.org/10001

[66] Julio Godoy, "The Second Scramble For Africa Starts," *IPS news*, April 20, 2009, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=46557

Decaying Sovereignty

Gregory L. Sharp

"Of all the rights that can belong to a nation, sovereignty is doubtless the most precious."

-Emerich de Vattel

The central cornerstones of world politics, sovereign states, have dominated the political arena ever since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. However, in this global era, sovereign nations and their constructed national identities are under attack. The pillars of state sovereignty – non-intervention, policy autonomy, internal authority, and border control – are being eroded by the relentless forces of globalization. As Kenichi Ohmae argues, "the modern nation state itself – that artefact of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – has begun to crumble."[1] As the process of economic, cultural, and political integration accelerates worldwide the fundamental structure of the world system is changing.

NON-INTERVENTION

An integral part of a sovereign nation is the recognition that a state is independent and free from any outside intervention. However, the reality of modern politics has evolved into a situation where this is no longer the case. All nations, spanning the spectrum from rich to poor, are susceptible to foreign intervention. These interventions manifest themselves in many different ways – ranging from austerity packages to military actions – depending on the context.

Recently, Iceland and Ireland were forced to undergo economic reforms after fears about their unstable economies spread across Europe. The austerity programs, accepted under pressure from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the

[1] Kenichi Ohmae, "The End of the Nation State," in *The Globalization Reader*, ed. Frank F. Lechner and John Boli (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 224.

European Union (EU), have resulted in drastic cuts to social spending. In essence, the sovereign right of a state to decide upon national matters of economic policy has been taken away. Ireland and Iceland are unique situations as they willingly yielded some of their sovereignty by joining the European Community.[2] Conversely, many other nations outside of the EU (for example, Indonesia during the 1997 financial crisis) have undergone these austerity programs without having willingly ceded some of their sovereignty.[3]

The reforms placed upon developing nations by the IMF, as a means to ensure they pay off their debt, are both counterproductive and destructive. These reforms, or austerity measures, can broadly be defined as cutting deficits, lowering spending, and slashing services. Although this may make sense economically, these reforms generally come at a time when the services being cut are needed the most. Countries such as Mexico and Thailand were ravaged by this violation of their sovereignty during times of economic crisis. The measures implemented by the IMF caused wages to fall by up to 40%, in addition to provoking widespread unemployment and societal unrest.[4] Unfortunately, for them, these measures were deemed a necessary precaution to guard the stability of the international market.

Moreover, these interventions can also manifest themselves in the form of military action. Throughout the Cold War countless nations had their sovereignty denied as the superpowers struggled to dominate the political arena.[5] These interventions manifested themselves in the form of support for rebel movements, proxy wars, and foreign occupations. A modern example could be the American invasion of Iraq in 2003. The US went through the process of appealing to the United Nations hoping to legitimize their invasion of a sovereign state, however, many claim this was merely a façade. When not granted Security Council approval, the US decided to continue with the invasion anyway. In this sense, sovereignty disappeared long ago.

POLICY AUTONOMY

Another important pillar of sovereignty is the ability to autonomously implement domestic and foreign policies. Once again, the forces of globalization have slowly chiselled away at the strength of state sovereignty until nothing is left but a shadow of what was once there. In some cases, for instance the aforementioned economic crises in Ireland and Iceland, the ability to choose is simply taken away. In yet others, the pressure from transnational corporations (TNCs) and special interest groups is so strong that it is tantamount to having no choice.

Around the world, international trade agreements are becoming increasingly popular (for example, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Southern Common Market, etc.). Although these trade agreements have limited jurisdiction they can nevertheless impede a sovereign state's ability to dictate domestic policies. Such was the case with the Canada-US softwood lumber dispute. Due to the fact that lumber is primarily owned by provincial governments in Canada, the price charged to harvest is set administratively instead of in the competitive market. The US viewed this as an unfair government subsidy on the part of the Canadians.[6] In such cases, the World Trade Organization (WTO) is called in to arbitrate. In these situations the ability of a sovereign nation to control its domestic policies is ceded to an inter-governmental organization.

A more extreme case is seen in the EU where nation-states are stripped of many of the rights integral to a sovereign nation. These nations have essentially lost their economic autonomy. For example, now that their currencies are

---

[2] Richard Bellamy and Dario Castiglione, "Building the Union: The Nature of Sovereignty in the Political Architecture of Europe," *Law and Philosophy* 16, no. 4 (Jul., 1997): 422, http://www.jstor.org/stable/350498.

[3] Harm J. de Blij et al., *The World Today: Concepts and Regions in Geography* (New Jersey: Hoboken, 2009), 262.

[4] de Blij et al., *The World Today: Concepts and Regions in Geography*, 322.

[5] Ibid, 92.

[6] Gary C. Hufbauer and Ben Goodrich, "Lessons from NAFTA," in *Free Trade Agreements*, ed. J.J. Shott (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics 2006), 39.

intrinsically linked to the economic well being of other nations, problems spread quickly beyond national borders. This "sovereignty bargain" is deemed an acceptable exchange of autonomy for material benefits.[7] Although they are giving up a degree of control, these nations are willing to take the risk given the potential rewards.

In addition to this loss of control at the hands of supranational agencies, governments are also having their sovereignty clawed from them by market forces. Lobby groups and TNCs – the champions of globalization – are now dictating and influencing policies in a broad spectrum of countries. The reality is "where states were the masters of markets, now it is the markets which, on many crucial issues, are the masters over the governing of states."[8] These corporations are so large, and with such a global reach, that they are beyond the control of any one nation. Furthermore, "the declining authority of states is reflected in a growing diffusion of authority to other institutions, associations, and to local and regional bodies."[9] As states falter, other international actors are stepping up and filling the power vacuum.

NON-CONVENTIONAL ACTORS

As new actors test their agency in world politics they are starting to experiment with rights traditionally reserved for states. In modern politics "sovereign states no longer have a monopoly on the use of violence to achieve political ends."[10] Through armed rebellion, terrorism, the erosion of nationalism, and the perceived vulnerability of a country, various aspects of globalization are preventing states from maintaining their domestic authority. Terrorist groups, insurgencies, and rebellions are all reactions to, and consequences of, globalization. Furthermore, the social contract between state and subject is only effective when citizens place faith in the state; crucial to this process is the construction of a cohesive national identity.

Affecting predominantly developing countries, separatist and insurgency movements are an exceptional challenge to the internal authority of states. If the citizens of a state are beyond the control of the government, or if they are actively rebelling, how can the state itself be seen as a valid entity? Countries mired in combating insurgents – such as the Maoists in Nepal or the civil war in Somalia – struggle to provide for their citizens while trying to reassert their authority. As governments become increasingly ineffective, citizens lose faith in their ability to provide them with basic services. This disenchantment with the sovereign government is compounded when non-governmental organizations step in and fulfil the roles of state. This is the case in Sudan, where aid agencies provide a significant portion of the health and educational services. While these NGO provided services help in the short-term, the long term impacts can lead to the decay of local markets and an increase in unemployment.[11]

This situation manifests itself differently in stronger nation-states. While insurgency is not uncommon those seeking more autonomy resort to terrorist actions. Modern examples have been seen in Canada (Front du libération du Québec), Ireland (Irish Republican Army), and Spain (Basque National Liberation Movement). Despite the fact that none of these movements have achieved success so far, the chaos and strife they cause underscores the fragile nature of sovereign states. When a country is so divided, it is extremely difficult to construct a united national identity. However, without this strong identity, it is difficult to consolidate state power and control.

In addition to the above noted internal dangers, threats to a nation's sovereignty can also come

---

[7] Christopher Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," *International Studies Review* 7, no. 1 (Mar., 2005): 3, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699618.

[8] Susan Strange, "The Declining Authority of States," in *The Globalization Reader*, ed. Frank F. Lechner and John Boli (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 140.

[9] Strange, "The Declining Authority of States," 142.

[10] Richard M. Hare, "On Terrorism," *Value Inquiry* 7, no. 13 (1997): 242.

[11] Tim Brodhead, "If Africa Is the Question, is NGO the Answer?," *International Journal* 41, no. 4, Africa: Crisis and Beyond (Autumn, 1986): 875, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40202413.

from abroad. Globalization has spawned a whole new array of threats that defy traditional defences. It reached the point where, "to some extent terrorism is a substitute for conventional war."[12] When some of the most powerful nations in the world suffer terrorist attacks from international radical groups, citizens begin to question the ability of their government to protect them. This was recently the case in the US (9/11 attacks), the UK (7/7 attacks), and Spain (Madrid train bombings). Although this may prompt a "rally-round-the-flag" effect it also unsettles citizens to see their potential vulnerability.[13] These acts of terror can lead to situations where the public panics, as was the case in the Moscow subway bombings in 2010.[14] In these circumstances it becomes exceedingly difficult for governments to regain internal control and deal with the situation.

BORDER CONTROL

Finally, one of the most evident signs of slipping state sovereignty is the lack of control nations have over their borders. It appears that national borders, originally cracked open under the auspices of trade, are now decreasing in importance.[15] Capital flows around the world in a matter of seconds, beyond the control of any government. Moreover, people are migrating in increasing numbers – both legally and otherwise – simultaneously illuminating the lack of control states have over physical borders and complicating the construction of national identities. For example, even given the comprehensive border controls in Malaysia and Singapore there are still thousands of Indonesian workers illegally moving around each day. Although these governments recognize that this is a problem, all their efforts to halt the flows of Indonesian workers have thus far have been unsuccessful.[16]

Another case of sovereignty being ceded in exchange for perceived benefits is Eastern Europe's eagerness to join the EU. Here "sovereignty is willing[ly] ceded by states to gain economically from increased trade and capital mobility," even given the cost of losing control of their borders.[17] States are being forced to make these "sovereignty bargains" in order to stay competitive in today's global market.[18] For example, Britain's initial trepidation at joining the EU was quickly replaced with fear when its growth drastically fell behind that of the rest of Europe. In 1973 Britain became an EU member amidst these growing worries.[19]

Additionally, sovereignty is frequently undermined by TNCs seeking the best conditions. In the developing world, the considerable amount of uneducated labour available compels governments to concede control of policy to TNCs because if the situation does not work out favourably for the corporation it can easily relocate. These TNCs are highly mobile and are no longer constrained by the policies of nation-states. As Ohmae commented, "reflexive twinges of sovereignty make the desired economic success impossible, because the global economy punishes twinging countries by diverting investment and information elsewhere."[20] Any country that tries to assert control over TNCs operating within its borders does so with the risk of alienating the investment needed to stimulate economic growth.

Another serious challenge to the legitimacy of borders is the increase in trade occurring outside, or around, official channels. Generally considered one of the last frontiers, international waters remain largely unmonitored, allowing for clandestine exchanges of goods beyond the reach

[12] Hare, "On Terrorism," 241.

[13] Matthew A. Baum, "The Constituent Foundations of the Rally-Round-the-Flag Phenomenon," *International Studies Quarterly* 46, no. 2, (Jun., 2002): 263, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3096071.

[14] "Moscow Metro Hit by Suicide Bombings," BBC March 29, 2010, http://www.bbc.co.uk/

[15] Janet Ceglowski, "Has Globalization Created a Borderless World?," in *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century: a Reader* , ed. Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger, and Matthew Krain (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 101.

[16] Johan A. Lindquist, *The Anxieties of Mobility: Migration and Tourism in the Indonesian Borderlands*. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009).

[17] Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," 5.

[18] Ibid, 4.

[19] de Blij et al., *The World Today: Concepts and Regions in Geography*, 50.

[20] Ohmae, "The End of the Nation State," 225.

of nation-states.[21] Even through legal channels, an "estimated 90 per cent or more of all shipped goods are underdeclared or undeclared."[22] States simply do not know what is entering and exiting through their borders. Globalization has made it next to impossible to control what flows through a nation's borders as the sheer scale of trade outstrips capacity at ports around the world.

Economic transactions are not the sole factors that wear down national borders. The increasing ethnic diversity of nations – especially in the core – is complicating people's identities and erasing traditional borders. As more and more migrants move around the world they are changing the cultural makeup of nations. In turn "these diaspora groups often directly affect the decision making of states" through lobbies, activism, and remittances.[23] By making these voyages, migrants are creating communities that span the globe with no regard to national borders.[24] These migrants leave for a myriad of reasons; however, they all inevitably impact their new locations as well as those they have left behind. Additionally, this injection of new cultural identities impedes the creation of a single homogeneous national identity that is essential for effective government control.

"Even through legal channels, an 'estimated 90 per cent or more of all shipped goods are underdeclared or undeclared.' States simply do not know what is entering and exiting through their borders."

Furthermore, a global elite of urban cosmopolitans are increasingly refusing to be confined by the boundaries of any one country. Instead of being the subject of a sole nation, they are becoming global citizens – born in Cairo, educated in Oxford, and working in Tokyo. This is visible in Europe where the younger generations are increasingly associating themselves as European in addition to their national identity.[25]

Essentially, states have lost the ability to effectively control the flows of anything in or out of their borders.[26] This aspect of sovereignty is forever lost. In this era of interconnectedness, there is no taming the flows of media, ideas, commodities, or people between the varied nodes that compose the global network of nations.[27] Essentially, "these processes of globalization are eroding the fundamental basis of international society – state sovereignty – and that its decline represents a revolutionary transformation in the Westphalian structure of the international system."[28] With the gradual decline of states, which political actors will position themselves as the new dominant players remains to be seen.

CONCLUSION

The modern manifestations of globalization have undeniably revolutionized the workings of the international political arena. The sovereign nation-state, the building block of world politics, is decaying. Actively participating in this process, and assuming the roles vacated by states, are the non-state actors empowered by globalization. Governments can no longer claim that they maintain absolute control over the state – their reignty is vanishing. [29] Perhaps, as this process evolves, a new world with new power-sharing arrangements can be developed between these new international actors.

---

[21] Carolyn Nordstrom, *Global Outlaws: Crime, Money, and Power in the Contemporary World* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2007), 103.

[22] Nordstrom, *Global Outlaws: Crime, Money, and Power in the Contemporary World*, 173.

[23] Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," 12.

[24] Nordstrom, *Global Outlaws: Crime, Money, and Power in the Contemporary World*, 181.

[25] European Commission, "European Citizenship" European Commision, http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_documentation/05/txt_en_2.pdf

[26] Nordstrom, *Global Outlaws: Crime, Money, and Power in the Contemporary World*, 190.

[27] Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," in *The Globalization Reader*, ed. Frank F. Lechner and John Boli (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 401.

[28] Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," 14.

[29] John Keane, *Global Civil Society?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 75.