

PERO MALDINI

The Nation-State and Global Surroundings: The Issue of Sovereignty

Under the increasing impact of globalization, classic forms of political community are transformed and position of the nation-state is amended. It is visible through the objectively reduced (divided) and substantially different form of sovereignty, through the forming of new political identity and legitimacy, and through new relationships on an international level (a “new world order”). On the one hand, the political decision-making processes, guidance and control over the national economies are no longer the exclusive right of nation-states. On the other, the growth of new forms of civic organization expands political participation and civil society action outside the nation-state, and vice versa. Changes caused by globalization transform well known forms of democracy and its political perspective (e.g. cosmopolitan democracy as a more participative democracy at the local level as an addition to political relationships within the global order). However, the creation of a global democracy includes problems of political identity, constitution of political community, legitimacy, constitution of government and making of collectively binding decisions as well as commitments to be subjected to them. Therefore it is not possible to think sovereignty to be in decline or even questionable, but only that it has to be redefined in terms of its enhancement, i.e. its adjustment to new social and political conditions that are in many aspects defined at the level beyond the nation-state. Hence, this study advocates a dynamic approach and reconceptualization of these concepts by avoiding pervasive use of simplified dichotomies in explanations of their relationship, and proposes its functional understanding in terms of its efficiency, i.e. as dependent on system’s output and state capacity. An effective system and capacity of the state to regulate society, distribute common goods, and have an efficient institutional structure capable of realizing it – are crucial both to sustain an adequate level of nation-state sovereignty in the globalized world and support a stable democracy, which, if it is substantive, has the political mechanisms to maintain a balance between national interests and global impacts.

Key words: nation-state; sovereignty; globalization; democracy; legitimacy; state/system capacity

Introduction

The sovereignty of the nation state, which implies the supremacy of state authority within its territorial borders, territorial integrity and internationally guaranteed/recognized independence, have marked the traditional understanding of the term. Emerged yet on Peace of Westphalia

foundations, such a classic sovereignty has characterized modern world nation-state system for a long time. However, political, economic and technological changes by the end of the last century, globalization processes, collapse of the bipolar Cold War world after the fall of communism, and development of information and communication technologies – have significantly changed the political, economic and social image of the world. Globalization processes are increasingly influencing political processes within nation states and changing the traditional relations of political power, both at the level of nation-states and the level of international relations. The discontinuity in development – which, among the others, is reflected in dissolution of traditional social and political categories (family, class, community, nation, society, state), in putting the individual and civil rights into focus, in change of cultural paradigm, and in significantly changed socio-economic and political context – leads to the need to redefine the concept of sovereignty in such a new (global) environment.

On the one hand, globalization is considered as a process that will lead to the disappearance of the sovereignty of nation states. Facts of real reduction of its sovereignty, diminishing the ability of national governments to regulate inland political space, the expansion of international rules of regulation, the dominance of global governance institutions and multinational companies, rule of (neo)liberal doctrine, and insisting on the universal rights of an individual – support that standpoint. On the other hand, it is clear that nation-state still remains the main political subject (especially at the level of political identification and political loyalty), warranty of process regulation at the social level of single nation-state, and major factor of international relations. In this context, this study examines the main factors in relationship between globalization processes and issues of sovereignty of the nation-state.

Regarding the study structure; it first considers key aspects of globalization, particularly economic, socio-cultural and political, and the changes they cause in the functioning of classical political structures and political entities – as the context in which it considers the underlying theme. Then, there is a notion of sovereignty, which is analyzed in both the classical and the modern sense; it tries to show the limitations and inoperability of using the term in its classical meaning in contemporary global context in which many (f)actors act outside and beyond the nation-state. However, despite the widespread claims of decline of sovereignty, and different theoretical concepts which try to substitute it with different forms, this study argues that – despite the need to redefine sovereignty, both in its content and form – the nation-state still essentially determines modern political community. In doing so, it shows that state and institutional capacity of individual nation-states to subsistence of their own society is essential for sustainability of sovereignty, i.e. a sufficient degree of autonomy of essential state functions, regardless of the external (global) influences. In this context, it analyzes the status and prospects of the modern nation-state under conditions of establishment of a global governance system, and aims to offer a different, functional understanding of sovereignty, closely tied to the efficiency of the system output and development of democracy.

On some aspects of globalization and the changes it causes

Globalization is a complex social process that encompasses a wide set of different but inter-related social phenomena, both at the level of relations between different societies and within them. Its main characteristic is relations and forms of transnational linkages that create a greater mutual dependence that goes beyond the framework of national boundaries, political alliances, regions and continents. With no entering into a detailed analysis of this complex phenomenon, nor giving the various definition(s) of the term, here we pay attention only to some of its substantial and general features relevant to this consideration.

Albeit originally economic concept (global economy, economic integration, global market, international trade, global economic interdependence, etc.), globalization should be understood primarily as a direct or indirect influence (not only economic but also cultural, political, religious, social) among societies and social structures at the world's, or – global level. Although it is not only about the one-way impact, it occurs predominantly in the direction from the world most developed societies toward all the others. Extremely fast and comprehensive technological development, especially in information and communication technologies, enabled the broadest circles of citizens in many of world's societies with access to huge amounts of different information and possibility to their exchange, and thus a stronger process of mutual influence and permeation. Hence, the globalization also means the expansion and interpolation of same or similar social structures, patterns, values and norms (economic, political, and social) in other social environments. In this way, globalization processes integrate different societies at the global level.

However, despite their rationally-based efforts for unifying of conditions and standards of the whole social reproduction among different societies and the promotion of democracy as the best political order – globalization processes at the same time impose certain economic, political and cultural patterns, usually those which promote interests and values of the world's socially and economically most developed. Consequence of such effects is suppression or neutralization of local cultures' elements and political traditions, and above all – the erosion of local (national) economies, particularly in the underdeveloped societies which are forced to accept the rules of liberalized global market where the economically strongest dominate. These processes result in a material impoverishment, increasing of economic and political dependency and relativization of cultural identity, which is especially pronounced in small nations and/or underdeveloped societies. Thence derives increasingly expressed opposition to globalization processes. Reduction of long existing gap between the developed and rich North and the underdeveloped and poor South, and the realization of at least approximately equal competitive conditions – are far from realization. On the contrary, universalistic ideas and values promoted by main actors of globalization – because of the way that globalization processes take place and consequences they cause – are being put under the question. Therefore, globalization is a highly contradictory process.

Globalization processes taking place simultaneously in the economic, cultural and political area. The effect of global economic actors, the impact of global markets, global migration, widespread access to information, development of communication technologies, emergence of global culture, environmental issues, international crime problems, terrorism, etc. – are just some of the typical processes that increasingly slipping away from national state control and become is-

sues that cannot be solved at the individual states level. All of this in turn directs states to global cooperation and coordination.

The political aspect of globalization certainly is inseparable from the economic one; indeed, former articulates the later. It is just a point where fundamental differences are expressed, both among political concepts and the theoretical approaches in defining the role of nation-states, or states in general. In fact, differences are evident primarily in what is considered as the main political goal. Thus neoliberalism, in the spirit of the classical liberal tradition, besides democracy, political freedom and civil rights, sets up a free market and market based economic processes as the main goal (cf. Pinder, 2011; Stiglitz, 2004). This, in turn, implies deregulation of (welfare) state, especially reduction and/or privatization of its social functions, which is usually reduced on legally-political (formal and institutional) framework necessary just for the unimpeded operation of the free market.

Viewed from classical socio-structural and socio-cultural standpoints (cf. Lipset, 1959; Moore, 1993; Almond & Verba, 2000), globalization is regularly understood as a continuation of modernization. Thus, the theory of globalization appears as a continuation of modernization theory, or as the type neomodernism. In this context, globalization is based on rationalism, the capitalist entrepreneurial system, technological innovation and regulation. Components of this rationalism are faith in science and global secularity, while the capitalist system, besides the classical capital and labor structures, also implies the information capital as a key resource. Technological innovations, in turn, encompasses innovations in field of information and computer technology, telecommunications, and transport, while regulation means the standardization of norms in the international community, regulation and deregulation, human rights and political standards of democracy (cf. Scholte, 2000; Giddens, 1990, 2006; Robertson, 1992; Castells, 1996).

Technological development has actuated changes in social organization, production, trade, consumption and communication. Moreover, it has significantly influenced the change of the way of life and change of social values in the direction toward erosion of traditional forms of life and traditional social and political communities. Under these circumstances the impact of postmaterialistic values getting increasing importance, particularly so called expressive values (the values of self-expression) that emphasizes the importance of quality of life, knowledge, information, symbols and communication. New technologies and the corresponding value change enabled globalization, i.e. the integration of the world as never before, and largely relativized space and time, which confirms the thesis of "compression of space and time" (cf. Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Inglehart, 1995; Inglehart & Abramson, 1994).

Economic development promotes changes in social structure and social values that encourage democratization. Thus, global economic integration and industrial development provide significantly greater resources for distribution and compromise, creating non-governmental sources of wealth and influence, and open society toward impacts of the ideas that prevail in the industrialized world (cf. Huntington, 1991, 65-66). Analyzing this relationship, it could be said that the globalization of production releases mechanisms that create the foundation for development of democracy through technological innovations that accompany global capitalism, through industrialization which brings by itself the growth of professional and middle class as the main

bearer of democracy, through the global growth which undermines the interventionist and non-democratic states and reduced the previously existing gap between industrialized and non-industrialized countries, and through economic and political liberalization which is perhaps the most prominent feature of globalization processes (cf. Schwartzman, 1998, p. 165).

Apart from its encouraging the creation and development of democracy in previously non-democratic societies (democratic transition of post-authoritarian societies), influencing the development of some of the basic preconditions of its creation and subsistence – globalization promotes democracy as a certain above and beyond national (global) order. Globalization also causes significant changes in the traditional understanding of the political community, society, state, borders, territory, and sovereignty.

However, the impact of globalization is not necessarily and always pro-democratic. In fact, globalization is not a homogeneous process, but more a set of processes that are often contradictory in relation to democratic development and with different impact on democratization processes in various societies. Besides the enabling and encouraging democratization processes in many different autocratic societies, globalization has also created a basis for a new international order under domination of capitalism of developed and democratic West. That way, such context makes the process of democratization essentially ambiguous. Namely, while the democratization is taking place as a real struggle for the establishment of democratic forms of decision-making and the establishment of mechanisms of citizens monitoring of government, it is also a reflection of unequal global order imposed by West by its political, economic and cultural superiority.

The main actors of globalization are not nation-states, but rather economic entities, especially multinational corporations. The logic of modern developed economic systems requires the world as an unlimited area of its operations, for their constant expansion and development. Integration processes, particularly those at the economic level, therefore are imposed as a necessity. However, the problems brought by such a global system are manifested primarily as problems of governance at the functional level (the establishment and coordination of numerous international and transnational financial, monetary, technological and other institutions), as well as problems of legitimacy at the political level (absence of democratic procedure, equality and transparency, and lack of control over the activity of supranational corporations). The latter, in turn, is a major democratic deficit that is manifested in the lack of democratic legitimacy of those who manage the processes of globalization as they operate almost entirely outside of democratic control and without any public approval for the implementation of its decisions.

At the practical political level, however, globalization leads to significant changes in the structure and functioning of the nation-state. These changes are reflected primarily in relativization of territoriality, national sovereignty, national legislation, political tradition and political identity. The process of democratization as a global political trend (ambiguous with regard to economic globalization and associated economic interests), questions of cultural identity (caused by the processes of value changes) and questions of political identity and legitimacy (in terms of global democracy) – represent a new context that raises the need to redefine the meaning and functions of national states, and respectively the content, scope and bearer of sovereignty and ways of its implementation.

On sovereignty (classic and contemporary)

In essence, sovereignty means having complete power over the population within own territory. Former principle of sovereignty as unlimited and undivided power of absolute ruler over the subjected residents (Bodin, 2002; Hobbes, 2004) Enlightenment thought, Revolution and liberalism have turned into the principle of popular sovereignty, under which all power derives from the people and belongs to the people (Locke, 1952; Rousseau, 1978), which has authority over the elected representative body, and indirectly over the other organs of the state and the (divided and controlled) government.¹ Practically, the sovereignty is expressed through political, economic and territorial autonomy and independence of the political community (nation) in the form of the nation-state.

There are two dimensions of sovereignty: internal and external. The first one includes authority over the population and territory within the state borders, independent of any other power, freedom in decision making, and right of undisturbed governance, including the use of force. Second one implies recognition by other countries (international community), which includes territorial integrity and right to participate in international organizations on an equal basis with other countries. In the same time, internal political changes do not require re-recognition of state sovereignty. The state – in order to be sovereign and became the subject of international law and international relations – has to fully control its territory, determine their own citizens (as a members of political community), and be able to establish and maintain internal political and legal

¹ Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War, but also delegitimize transnational paternalistic position of the Catholic Church, created the conditions of establishing the modern sovereign nation-states based on political, territorial and national identity and independence, and equality in relations with other sovereign states. The development of modern thought has established rationalistic natural law founded in the reason. The man is rational being, but also a being of needs. The natural state is not rational; it is state of disorder and does not fit human nature. The transition from this state in a society as a rational state is taking place through the social contract. The social contract, which is the basis of the modern state, is based on the voluntary subordination of citizens to law and political power, assuming the protection of their freedoms and rights that they hasn't in their natural state (cf. Hobbes, 2004, p. 90-113; Rousseau, 1978, p. 94-110; Tadić, 1988, p. 35-40). The state establishes by the will of its citizens (which established a popular sovereignty, which opposes any absolutism) and serves to guarantee freedom, equality and private property of its citizens. The rulers are rulers only by the will of citizens and in their rule they are limited by their will. Because of that, by the Constitution and the laws they have the right to oppose to non-constitutional activities of rulers and replace them with others. Freedom is restricted only so that citizens recant their power to arbitrate in conflicts (as is the natural state) to the government, which is executive on the basis of the law on their behalf. The transition from the natural state in civil one is realized on the basis of the social contract (cf. Locke, 1952, p. 44-72, 96-98). All citizens are equal in their rights because each individual by its free will joins the company for the common good and common interest. Society is so constituted as a social contract based organization (association) of free and independent people (producers, private owners) associated by the market and integrated by the state (sovereign political power and the unique legal system) as a result of the general will of the citizens which guarantee freedom and legal equality of all by its instruments. This way, the sovereignty of the people (demos) is established. Power in the state stems from the people and belongs to the people; popular sovereignty is indivisible and inalienable. The highest ideal of a civil government becomes a democratic republic (cf. Rousseau, 1978, p. 107-112, 126, 146). State, in turn, refers to the political unit of an entire territory. It has three components - a territory, a population, and a government, and it requires loyalty, allegiance, and patriotism as part of its legitimacy (cf. Jackson, 2013, p. 14, 91).

order. Sovereignty, expressed through the independent nation-states in the international context is the central organizational principle of the state system.

Despite its clear definition, in the contemporary political context the concept of sovereignty has caused some confusion. It, in turn, derives from the conflict between its implicit meanings (assumes the existence of nation-state as sovereign political community) and political reality in which this sovereignty is increasingly restricted. Specifically, within the globally interlinked and increasingly interdependent world in which international organizations and institutions have attributes of political power, and international regulations and agreements include commitments of national states as members of the international community – a classic sovereignty becomes increasingly transformed into different forms of non-state, more functional sovereignty. This means that sovereignty can no longer be understood in the absolute sense, but as an integral part of the international system of sovereignty recognition.

While (classic) state sovereignty refers to the status of a territorial administrative system that is not subject to any higher authority either from within its border or from abroad, such sovereignty can be figured in various ways. Thus one interpretation is that of deliberate waiving of the (part of) classic state sovereignty (for example, in the context of international integration such as the European Union); another one within the concept of cosmopolitan democracy and global citizenry that substitutes classic nation-state type of sovereignty in the borderless world (Held, 1996, 1998, 1999); in a term of popular sovereignty which refers to people's capacity for self-determination by constituting such an administrative system or by assisting in steering or transforming it once established (Lupel, 2011, pp. 1-9); as new incoherent sovereignty-territory relationship of which various forms are explained through the classic, imperialist, integrative, and globalist sovereignty regimes (Agnew, 2009, p. 97-142 205-218); or within an international human rights based concept of sovereignty (Cohen, 2012, p. 159-213). Without going into specific explication of these and other related concepts of reduced/changed sovereignty, hereinafter a bit more attention will be put on the cosmopolitan (global) democracy concept, since it is relatively wide (somewhat able to encompass the others) and probably the most influential.

The state and national sovereignty in the age of globalization

In the conditions of a globalized world, the new relations of power are establishing. On the one hand, they are marked up by the redistribution of social wealth in favor of the economically and politically most powerful who dominate on the liberalized world market and dictate terms of the world economy, and indirectly also the so called new world order. On the other hand, pluralization and diversification of power centers occur, where along the national governments (until recently almost the only and certainly the primary holders of political power) appear many others: from the large and powerful multinational corporations, through transnational international organizations, various private groups, non-governmental organizations, to networked civic associations and movements that began to shape a certain global public and global civil society.²

² Cf. Stiglitz, 2004; Schwartzman, 1998; Strange, 1996; Pinder, 2011; Prisecaru, 2011; Jackson, 2013.

At the level of political action, the key changes happened. Until a few decades ago, political and legal regulation occurred primarily and in the largest extent within the institutions of nation-states, where the central government had almost all the jurisdiction. Although the importance of international organizations has increased significantly in the period after World War II, such form of policy has remained the dominant almost until the collapse of communism which marked the end of the Cold War, the opening of formerly authoritarian and totalitarian societies and great momentum of global integration processes. Thus, the present policy is much more than ever before under the influence of institutions and organizations on supranational level, and structurally changed in terms of multi-level governance, decentralization, privatization of state administration segments, etc. Briefly, governing has been transforming from one-dimensional state-level regulation to combination of local, national, regional and global levels. All this, in turn, means substantial change of state sovereignty in its original meaning and scope.³

On the other hand, this situation leads to the reconstruction of collective identity and redefinition of citizenship and democracy concepts. In fact, in the such conditions new forms of association are establishing, which are evident in the formation of transnational and cross-border communities based on political, ideological, religious, ethnic, class, racial, gender, professional, artistic and other identities and preferences. Open borders and transportation have enabled the growth of an extremely large flow of people, while information technology and new forms of communication enabled a huge number of citizens of different societies gathering and public expression in countless virtual places and social networks. This way, a global civil society is structuring, which promotes diversity of identity, awareness of human and political rights, solidarity, and responsibility for sustainable development and awareness of global interdependence – all what encourages more criticism toward the political authorities as well as an appropriate political action. Classical forms of political participation are significantly expanded, and political power at almost all levels is put under increased public control, so it is forced to more responsible behavior, transparent action and greater efficiency.

Globalization affects the redistribution of power and influence in the direction from the local communities and nations toward the global arena. Nations lose part of their economic power that they once had, and, as a part of it, the same portion of political power and ascendancy. At the same time, globalization is not only pulls upward, but also pushes downwards, creating new pressures on local autonomy.⁴ In the new social environment a new system of power is shaped, which is marked by plurality of sources of authority and political power, while the national state is only one of the actors. M. Castells argues that in modern societies political will, its organization, processes, and political leadership are shaped by the logic inherent to the media system, especially the electronic media. Progressive development of the Internet and new forms of com-

³ The most characteristic example of the transfer of nation to the supranational community and the transfer of sovereignty to the post-sovereignty (or pseudo-sovereignty) certainly is the European Union as an international and supranational integration created exactly in area that is a birthplace of the nation-state.

⁴ Thus, U. Beck argues that globalization implies processes whose consequence is that transnational actors, their chances of power, orientations, identities and networks undermine the nation-states and their sovereignty, as well as they are mutually interconnected (Beck, 2003, p. 28).

munication have also significantly changed forms of business, and even forms of sociability with major consequences on the overall way of life.⁵ Considering the relationship between sovereignty and information, Castells notes that state sovereignty has always relied on information control, and that the surveillance began, slowly but surely, crumble. Due to the global nature of the Internet, wide and timely availability of information for many, there is a need to work together of the most powerful governments, creating a new global space of regime sustainability. In doing so, these states actually lose their sovereignty, since it must share power and agree to common standards of regulation. That way, they themselves become the network – a network of regulation and law enforcement institutions.

In addition, the political aspect of globalization includes strengthening of the global democracy role, transnational political institutions and a network of national and transnational non-governmental organizations, as well as the transformation of the national states functioning, where the strict boundaries between internal and external policies disappears (Milardović, Riggs & Teun, 2002, p. 93-94). That way, globalization processes accelerate the development of certain forms of transnational democracy. D. Held, by its cosmopolitan democracy model, anticipates the possibility of discovering more intense and much participative democracy at the local level as a supplement to political relations within the global order (democratic associations among the nations, regions, cities). It is based on recognizing of the nature and quality of democracy within specific communities and the nature of democratic relations among communities which are interconnected. This concept promotes the principle of double democratization (the deepening of reforms within the national communities and spread across national borders), stimulation of cosmopolitan citizens capable for mediating between national traditions and transnational relations, and the redesign of political power – below, above and next to the national state, which includes the decentralization of political power, and the right of the international community for intervention in internal affairs to safeguard the democratic rights.⁶

⁵ As M. Castells states, it is about promoting of the Internet galaxy, which determines the strategic settings of the business world. Internet entrepreneurs are people of one-dimensional view of the world: while they getting rich on technology and worship money, they fleeing from society, and their touch with the real world weakens. In the same time, they are artists, prophets and greedy. Castells uses the concept of a network company that says it is not the network of companies, nor the network of organizations within an enterprise. It is actually a flexible operation of economic activities, built around projects that are implemented by and through the networks of different composition and origin – the network is the enterprise (Castells, 2003a, p. 8). The essence of e-business is therefore an interactive network's link of producers, consumers and service suppliers based on the Internet. The new economy powers a very sensitive stock market, which finances high-risk innovations that are in the basis of higher productivity growth. According to this, the new form of sociability in our societies is characterized by network individuality (Castells, 2003a, p. 144).

⁶ The model of cosmopolitan democracy systematically examines the democratic implications of the fact that nation-states are enmeshed today in complex interconnected relations. Today's world is a world of overlapping communities of fate, where the fate of one country and many others are intertwined than ever before. Many problems and issues stretch far beyond the borders and they are challenge to all (e.g. environmental protection from pollution, use of resources, regulation of the global network of trade, finance, etc.), which requires the establishment of collective policies and institutions of international governance and regulation. Thus, the cosmopolitan democracy includes the development of administrative capacity and independent political resources at regional and global level to supplement local and national politics. It is about strengthening the administrative capacity and accountability of regional institutions (such as the European Union) with the development of administrative capacity and accountability form the UN system. Cosmopolitan democracy by itself does not diminish the government and its management capacity, but requires the identification and development of democratic institutions at regional and global levels as necessary complement to those at a national level. Although based

However, to attitudes that consider globalization as a global process of pro-democracy opposes those who possibilities of functioning democracy on a global level keep doubtful. Also, in contrast to the claims which states that globalization process causes the loss of credibility and integrity of nation-states, and consequently the necessary changes and weakening of their sovereignty – stand a numerous positions whose arguments suggest that globalization is indeed threatening the national and state sovereignty, but that does not mean their end.

Rapid technological and communicational development really has done the world much smaller physically and informational more transparent. This, in turn, significantly affects the disintegration of tradition and traditional forms of life, which certainly indicates a strong discontinuity in the development of many modern societies. Thus, for centuries known and unquestionable social groups, such as family, friends, fellow citizens, the nation, are more suppressed in the background before the strong individualization which emphasis the individual as the primary actor in the network society. However, the network society is almost completely depersonalized and highly technologized; it is basically still a virtual, not real society. Therefore, the question arises whether such a virtual society can substitute the real one, inherent to human, the community that has always functioned as the original human need and essential socialization environment. Nevertheless, it is obvious that isolated individuals, mutually interconnected by network technology, cannot produce organic society. In fact, it is pretty certain that virtual society will never be able to replace the real society, but may be only its extension, very important, but certainly not the primary one.

Speaking, in turn, about the possibilities of global civil society and transnational democracy, despite the indisputable potential of these processes for the development of democracy, distinct and serious problems of concept are obvious. Namely, the creation of a global democracy contains a problem of political identity, and shaping the political community (which is still dominantly on a national level), and the problem of legitimacy (normative or instrumental-based), or the problem of collectively binding decisions making process and citizens' commitments to be subjected to them (cf. Vujčić, 2002).

In considering democracy and its spread beyond the borders of nation-states, one should bear in mind the fact that people are not act only rationally and interest-based, but also value-based, and that the identities, not only interests, are very important determinants of their political activities.⁷ That is why the theory of cosmopolitan democracy must seriously face the question of le-

on the recognition of the status of authority and competences of national government, this concept stands simultaneously for a given level of supranational governance, which represents a certain limitation of national sovereignty (cf. Held, 1996, p. 353-357; Held, 1998, p. 24-25; Held, 1999, p. 107).

⁷ In other words, democracy is rooted in the appropriate values and culture. If the culture does not support the political structure, democracy has little chance for survival (cf. Almond and Verba, 2000; Diamond, 1999; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Maldini, 2008; Vujčić, 2001). On the other hand, state institutions, the democratic system, civil rights and liberties – are indispensable, but obviously not sufficient for the constitution of political community. Therefore, for this is necessary the national identity, that can not be replaced or substituted by certain civic identity and legitimacy of (democratic) political order (cf. Kymlicka, 1996; Vujčić, 2002). While the legitimacy is tied up to the political order and political power and is highly dependent on their effectiveness - and as such means a specific form of (conditioned) political support - common symbols and political identity are linked with the political community (state, nation) in which the

gitimacy of cosmopolitan political community, not just a problem of legitimacy of cosmopolitan democratic political order. Consensus on defining the political community always precedes the constitution of political order; political community is an essential prerequisite for the political order. Consequently, legitimacy of the political community precedes the legitimacy of the political order and political authority. Although political pluralism is indispensable prerequisite of democracy, one must not forget that for the constitution and viability of certain political community is necessary a size of cultural and social homogeneity, which is a prerequisite for its functioning. Despite the political pluralism as the assumption of a democratic regime, the question is whether the cultural and social diversity and political pluralism (which is on a global level much higher than on the level of individual nation-states, regions, and cultures) may be sufficient basis for the establishment of transnational political communities that have political support of all or most of its citizens. Global civil society and transnational democracy presuppose the creation of a new political identity, and cosmopolitanism must show how this identity can be achieved without a “democratic deficit” or without “bureaucratic-oligarchic surplus”. It is a complex problem if one has in mind the fact that from the law by itself and legalism do not stem political commitment and loyalty to political decisions.⁸

In this sense, the real achievements and possibilities of transnational democracy and global civil society are not nearly of that kind as advocates of globalization processes deem. Apart from question of legitimacy of such democracy (as a regime), there is primarily the question of legitimacy of political community as a prerequisite of political order – its representation, authority, political loyalties, responsibilities and commitments. Sovereignty means the primary political commitment to the nation-state, or political and/or national identity, where from derives the legitimacy of political power. Suppression of the sovereignty of nation-state raises the issue of a new political authority, i.e. the question of political loyalty and civic obligation that remains undefined in terms of supranational integration. We cannot expect (basically, impersonal and bureaucratic) institutions and international organizations to take over that function and replace the original sovereignty of the nation-state (which is, *nota bene*, the basic legal and political entity of these international integrations). Also, the question is whether transnational democracy was based on the participation of citizens or (national) political elites. Likewise, there is a problem of managing such community, or the issue of decision-making process and possibilities of jeopard-

individual lives and with which identifies himself/herself. They create the basis of social and political community, or basis of individual's belonging to community, and represent a long-term diffuse form (unconditioned) political support that doesn't depend on the current effectiveness of the system or political power (cf. Easton, 1975).

⁸ The political community, regardless of certain differences over its concept, is an indispensable precondition for all other units of the political system. When we analyze the democracy from any aspect, as a form of political cooperation of citizens to address personal and collective interests, as well as participation in public political space or in public culture, as a form of political responsibility of citizens and elites (the consent of the citizens and the responsiveness of elites), or as a way of dealing with human rights, etc. – it shows that none of the aspects or functions of democracy can not be successfully achieved without the political community as a framework for such functioning of democracy. As today the notion of political community is in its clearest outlines tied up to the notion of nation-state, it is clear that without this major political element is unimaginable functioning of democracy without a democratic deficit. Thus, in all forms of macro-regional integration and international organizations, national government will not and can not disappear, it can not be skipped, although the manners of its involvement in various forms of integration and connectivity will become very complex (Vujčić, 2002, p. 90-91).

izing national and local government. Finally, in many Third World countries, where they have already expressed opposition to globalization as it is seen as “westernization” – transnational democracy is considered as a process that will further strengthen and legitimize the hegemony of global capital, not enhance the democratization of their societies.

It is indisputable that the classic nation-state in a globalized and networked world loses its fundamental attributes, especially attributes of sovereignty in its classical conception, i.e. the unlimited power within national borders and independence in the international community. However, despite this, it seems that the national state is not losing its impact. In fact, some key public policies are still the exclusive domain of national government decision-making, and political parties at national level are the main actors of political life. In addition, citizens’ commitment to their own nation is dominant political identification feature which is, *nota bene*, not necessarily (if ever) in conflict with the citizens’ cosmopolitan orientations. Orientation towards the problems and living conditions in their own country dominated in relation to the problems of the world, in spite of much greater sensitivity to them, what is consequence of globalization impact. However, the structures of global civil society have not replaced the old political channels but they rather open some new dimensions of political actions and influences.

Also, the national states still are the basic subject of international relations and all international integrations and organizations. That position and situation direct the construction of political relations, both at national and international level toward development of relations of cooperation and compromises (in terms of individual interests sacrifice in favor of common ones), which are the basic postulates of democracy (a compromise and consensus in mediation of various and mutually conflicted social interests). Right here, it is possible to create a space for the development of democratic relations, organic, rather than the imposition of interests of those most powerful as global goals.⁹ However, some of the most developed countries do not show any serious loss or reduction of its sovereignty, but on the contrary – using the processes of globalization they actually strengthen their political position, both in domestic and foreign policy spheres. And there can be also seen how the sovereignty of nation-states do not disappears, but is transformed, but unequally, depending on economic and political power of individual states.¹⁰

The impact of globalization on the sovereignty of the nation-state is therefore not equal. A particularly important determinant of this impact is the state strength, or state weakness, respectively.¹¹ State weakness is generally reflected in poor state capabilities in the provision of public

⁹ Transnational policy regimes do not replace the nation-state. Moreover, their functionality depends crucially on cooperative capability of nation-states (Grande, 2002, p. 93).

¹⁰ If the crisis of nation-state does exist, it should manifest itself at the center, not on the periphery of world order. Until the most powerful nations of the world show no signs of disintegration or dissolution of sovereignty, the thesis about the crisis has no real base (Matić, 2005, p. 85).

¹¹ State strength could be defined in terms of capacities to penetrate society, regulate social relationships, extract resources, and appropriately use resources in determined ways (Kostovicova & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, 2009a, p. 3). Strength or capacity of the state is expressed through the government’s ability to maintain law and order and protect property rights (Fukuyama, 2004, p. 1). Such a state works as a source of stability for its citizens and for markets to the extent that it can provide predictability in the making of the rules and their enforcement. The state that works for the benefits of rule enforces and creates unpredictability to the rest can only be weak (cf. Kostovicova & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, 2009b, p. 199).

goods, i.e. in system's insufficient output, which causes a decrease of legitimacy which largely depends on system efficiency (particularly in postauthoritarian countries without a democratic tradition and a sufficient reserve of legitimacy in case of crisis and reduced system efficiency). Reasons for state weakness are different, but in most states suffering of that problem they usually stem from historical legacies (whether of communist, colonial or other authoritarian type), political and/or social conflicts, and unsolved post-conflict situations including war legacies, slowed democratization and state building processes, economic deprivation and deep social cleavages that characterize many countries unable to achieve stability (cf. Kostovicova & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, 2009a, p. 3-11; Fukuyama, 2004, p. 1-42, 98-103). The lack of skill, will and capacity of national elites to promote primarily national, instead of their own interests, is another reason for state weakness. The underdevelopment of the civil society sphere and its lack of autonomy cause an absence of popular voice and their ability to even minimally control the government. Another characteristic of the weak states is the inability to provide a sufficient level of security for their citizens, which undermines their legitimacy, but also their accountability within international community. Such states become a concern of the international community and/or prey of global actors, dependent on the resources that they do or don't have, which determines whether they have a progressive or regressive role in relationship to these states. Impact of global actors' policies and norms in these countries – in relation to their ability of autonomous creation and implementation of own public policies – essentially determines the dynamics of the state weakening process, and consequently of nation-state sovereignty.

The nation-state and sovereignty in perspective

From the previously mentioned it is obvious that changes caused by globalization transform known forms of government organization, politics, international relations and democracy by setting up new perspectives of their development. It is clear that no society can live and act within the boundaries of nation-states as there are more and more factors which determine the nature and content of social relations beyond the reach of individual nation-states. Political power and scope of activities that once belonged almost entirely to national governments, under impact of changes brought by globalization – are increasingly reducing and transferring outside the nation-states to supranational political institutions and regulatory mechanisms. The system of national political communities is increasingly articulated by a more complex organizational, administrative, legal and cultural processes mediated by supranational institutions and organizations. They are increasingly setting up as structures that mediate, direct and check the operation of states as global society members.

However, these structures and processes which they are steering and carrying out, in order to be accepted and have legitimacy, they cannot bypass the national governments or diminish their significance. Thereat, it is particularly important position and mode of action of so-called institutions of global governance, i.e., their subjection to a wide democratic control and procedures in making political decisions that have a significant impact on the economies and policies of dif-

ferent nation-states.¹² They should be established as a democratic international system with the task of developing the administrative capacity of independent political resources at the global and regional level as a necessary complement to the policies at the local and national level. This certainly includes the control and responsibility of supranational institutions. Otherwise, these institutions will continue to be experienced as a lever of global neoliberalism, and their action as illegitimate.

None of the political authorities on the nation-state level cannot exist in isolation from the international environment or willfully make and realize political decisions without respect for the interests and relationships of other international community members. Global and regional integration requires modern nation-state a certain departure from the ideals of sovereignty and accept the fact that modern sovereignty is narrowed and restricted. This particularly affects a large number of new nation-states which emerged in post-communist transition process which many of them for the first time achieved state independence and autonomy. However, processes of modernization and democratization in them, encouraged by globalization – although slugged by their socio-economic underdevelopment and authoritarian socio-cultural and political heritage – are increasingly undermining the authoritarian tendencies of political authorities which build their legitimacy primarily on a national basis. The dominance of liberalism and the increasing convergence of political systems and their increasing organic cohesion, development of communication and information technologies and the insistence on human and political rights of citizens, the expansion of international rules of law and regulation – substantially expand the basis of creating and sustaining democracy. That way, authoritarian political authorities are put under the pressure from the international community; while the pro-democratic political forces are strengthened.

It could be concluded that globalization – which increasingly more directly touching and shaping the way of life of many citizens in various societies – leading to overcome the national discourse and the nation-state as the central constituents of modern political history. This is reflected primarily in the transformation of sovereignty as the nation-state original character-

¹² A new architecture of political rule appeared and it can be called a transnational policy regimes, whose, besides the nation-states, include international organizations and regional political, economic and military integrations, but also different kinds of national and transnational interest and non-governmental groups and movements (cf. Grande, 2002). It was a creation of a system that could be called global domination without a global government, which is managed just by these international institutions. It had an impact on the deepening economic disparities and the weakening of support for democracy seen in the shape promoted by these organizations (cf. Stiglitz, 2004, p. 14, 41, 230). It is about the superstructure (the institutions and administration) of international political organizations and integrations (institutions of global governance) as well as about the management of multinational corporations. The International Monetary Fund, World Bank, World Trade Organization, and even the United Nations – as institutions of global governance – act more often as instruments of promoting the interests of most developed Western societies, and much less as promoters and supporters of socio-economic modernization and democracy in developing countries (cf. Prisecaru, 2011, p. 12-16; Jackson, 2013, p. 374). In so doing, democracy is regularly promoted in its minimum requirements, while significantly more are encouraged reforms of state and shifting the flows of distribution of national economic and social resources to the global market. In addition, the activities of multinational corporations – which have an exceptionally strong influence on the global economy and significantly affect the economies and policies of nation-states' governments – are almost entirely outside of democratic and public control and legitimate political structures (without the consent of the public for decisions they make and implement outside of the democratic procedures).

istic from its classical, absolute meaning to a form of non-state, more functional sovereignty. However, we should not have an illusion that the nation-state will disappear due to at least two important reasons.

The first reason is reflected in the fact that the nation-state still occupies a central position in the system of international relations, organization and integration. It is quite certain that states will survive in multilateral networks with variable geometry tasks, entitlements, alliances and subordination (Castells, 2003b, p. 378). Also, there is no doubt that the state, which has undergone numerous trials, in the future will play an important role of regulatory instrument. Specifically, it is very unlikely that a certain “global” uniformity could overcome all the diversity that is immanent to society, especially in the scale of global society.¹³

Another reason, however, is reflected in the fact that issues of political identity, or the question of establishing a political community, citizenship and political obligation continue to remain almost exclusively in the domain of nation-states. Specifically, formation of political community under circumstances of globalization (since it necessarily implies the question of political identity) will continue to be related exclusively to the nation-state as a classic political community (which, in turn, implies the question of citizenship). Democracy can be (and should be) establish as a rule in international relations and as a criterion in the legitimate activities of international organizations and integrations with respect to certain countries. However, supranational democracy should not go in the direction of the suppression of nation-states as classical forms of political identity, nor aspire to substitute national sovereignty by some supranational institutions, such as bureaucratic forms of political power. There necessarily raises a question of legitimacy (implied question: who are the citizens, who constitutes a community, who has political power, how it is constituted and what entitlement it has), and the question of political (civil) liability (implied political loyalty, commitment, submission to collective binding decisions).

The nation-state, regardless of the substantial reduction of autonomy in conducting of social and political life within its territory, still remains the fundamental political community which, based on legitimate democratic procedures, can “waive” those rights in favor of some common supranational integration. However, the structure of traditional decision-making process, which until now has been reserved exclusively for national political power, now is expanding. On the one hand, it goes toward the supranational integration and impacts of the global environment, and on the other hand, it goes toward citizens that increasingly participate in political processes as globalization opens space of their far greater influence and control to the political power through greater access to information and opportunities to gain influence in the public.

¹³ Globalization undoubtedly affects the political system, but that influence is still limited. It is limited by the ways of mediation of government's effects, hence by political contexts of specific countries and forms of democracy. It seems that globalization will not be able to standardize those forms of system effects mediation, and that means that it will not be able to cancel the variety of political representation forms and diversity of the range of people's attitude towards democracy in action. This, in turn, means that it will not be able to cancel or substantially reduce the role of national states in achieving democracy in supranational integration, in international political space and in connecting of countries and citizens (Vujčić, 2002, p. 106-107).

However, the prerequisite of such a perspective is a functional democratic system and state with sufficient institutional capacity to cope with the impact of globalization. The dilemma of whether or not the globalization affects the process of state weakening shows the ambivalence of this impact. Specifically, it is apparent that state weakness is primarily an internally generated issue, while globalization processes can additionally foster them, either regressively (if the state does not have sufficient capacity to provide public goods and conduct its own public policies) or progressively (when the state is stable and uses global processes in order to impose their national interests at global level).

Thus, the state weakness, i.e. insufficient institutional and political capacity of the state in creating and implementing core public policies in order to deliberately deliver public goods within its political jurisdiction – is the factor that seriously undermines sovereignty of the nation-state in global context. States that have sufficient capacity will preserve an adequate level of national sovereignty, regardless of the global actors' impact. Conversely, those which lack that capacity will be far more susceptible to global influences, to the level of making the national sovereignty almost completely formal, with very little real sovereignty left. Thus, it is possible to conclude that in order to sustain an adequate level of nation states' sovereignty in the globalized world, capacity of the state to regulate society (ensuring freedom, equality, and security), distribute common goods (where are particularly essential functions of the welfare state), and have an appropriate resource management and efficient institutional structure capable to realize it is crucial. Finally, an effective system ensures legitimacy, and thus supports a stable democracy which, if sufficiently developed, has the political mechanisms to maintain a balance between national interests and global influences.

Final remarks

Previous consideration tried to show the scale, scope, and type of major changes that contemporary nation-state experiencing under conditions of globalization. It certainly requires a re-definition of the concept of sovereignty, which in its classic sense no longer corresponds to the political reality. Without repeating the aforementioned conclusions related to various aspects of this complex relationship, but based upon them – a revised definition (understanding) of the nation-state in the age of globalization should be proposed, as well as an understanding of sovereignty in a new and different social and political environment.

First, from the previous it is clear that it is not advisable or useful to simply oppose sovereignty and the nation-state to actors of globalization and its impact, since they are ambiguous terms, and not necessarily competing entities. In fact, globalization doesn't necessarily wipe out the sovereignty, as well as it doesn't necessarily encourage democracy. This relationship is, as we have seen, a lot more complex. Challenges which globalization poses to the nation-states have very diverse consequences. The impact of globalization on the sovereignty of the nation-state and the development of democracy is, to say the least, ambiguous, and in many respects dependent on the political and institutional structures of the individual states. The comprehension of sovereignty therefore cannot be static and subjected to a priori assumptions; it should be functional, in terms of its consideration in the context of the effectiveness of government structures

and entire system output in achieving stability of the nation-state (and thus the appropriate level of sovereignty), and the legitimacy of the political system (and thus the development of democracy). In this sense, sovereignty no longer has the classical (legalistic-political) meaning (except in the framework of international relations and institutions), but rather a meaning in terms of efficiency. It is not a static, monolithic attribute, but a dynamic and segmented one, fundamentally tied to the overall output of the system. Precisely in this context, it is necessary to consider the status and prospects of the nation-state in its interaction with the global environment. This way, it is possible to properly understand the different consequences of the impact of globalization processes on the sovereignty of individual nation-states.

Pleading for such a dynamic approach and reconceptualization of the nation-state and sovereignty concepts, this study avoiding pervasive use of simplified (and in that sense very limited) dichotomies in explanations of the relationship between sovereignty and nation-state, and globalization. It also seeks to show the ambiguous nature of globalization (related both to sovereignty and democracy) whose effects are contingent, i.e. dependent on system's output and state capacity.

References

- AGNEW, J. (2009) *Globalization and Sovereignty* (Plymouth UK, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers)
- ALMOND, G. & VERBA, S. (2000) *Civilna kultura: politički stavovi i demokracija u pet zemalja*, (Zagreb, Politička kultura)
- BECK, U. (2003) *Što je globalizacija?* (Zagreb, Vizura)
- BODIN, J. (2002) *Šest knjiga o republici* (Zagreb, Politička kultura)
- CASTELLS, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers)
- CASTELLS, M. (2003a) *Internet galaksija. Razmišljanja o Internetu, poslovanju i društvu* (Zagreb, Naklada Jesenski i Turk)
- CASTELLS, M. (2003b) *Kraj tisućljeća* (Zagreb, Golden Marketing)
- COHEN, J. L. (2012) *Globalization and Sovereignty: Rethinking Legality, Legitimacy, and Constitutionalism*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- DIAMOND, L. (1999) *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press)
- EASTON, D. (1975) A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support, *British Journal of Political Science*, 5, 4, pp. 435-457
- FUKUYAMA, F. (2004) *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century* (Ithaca NY, Cornell University Press)
- GRANDE, E. (2002) Od nacionalne države do transnacionalnoga režima politike – državna upravljačka sposobnost u globalizacijskome razdoblju, *Politička misao*, 39, 2, pp. 92-105
- GIDDENS, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- GIDDENS, A. (2006) *Sociology* (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- HELD, D. (1996) *Models of Democracy* (Stanford, CA, Polity Press, Cambridge and Stanford University Press)

HELD, D. (1998) Democracy and Globalization, in: Archibugi, D., Held, D. & Köhler, M. (eds.) *Re-Imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Stanford, Stanford University Press), pp. 11-27

HELD, D. (1999) The transformation of political community: rethinking democracy in the context of globalization, in: Shapiro, I. & Hacker-Cordon, C. (eds.) *Democracy's Edges*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), pp. 84-111

HOBBS, T. (2004) *Levijatan ili građa, lik i moć crkvene i građanske države* (Zagreb, Jesenski i Turk)

HUNTINGTON, S. (1991) *The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman & London, University of Oklahoma Press)

INGLEHART, R. (1995) Changing values, Economic Development and Political Change, *International Social Science Journal*, 47, 3, pp. 379-403

INGLEHART, R. & ABRAMSON, P. R. (1994) Economic security and value change, *American Political Science Journal*, 88, 2, pp. 336-354

INGLEHART, R. & WELZEL, C. (2005) *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy. The Human Development Sequence* (New York, Cambridge University Press)

JACKSON, R. J. (2013) *Global Politics in the 21st Century* (New York, Cambridge University Press)

KOSTOVICOVA, D. & BOJICIC-DZELILOVIC, V. (2009a): Introduction: State Weakening and Globalization, in: Kostovicova, D. & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, V. (eds.) *Persistent State Weakness in the Global Age* (Farnham UK/Burlington US, Ashgate, pp. 1-16)

KOSTOVICOVA, D. & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, V. (2009b): Conclusion: Persistent State Weakness and Issues for Research, Methodology and Policy, in: Kostovicova, D. & Bojicic-Dzelilovic, V. (eds.) *Persistent State Weakness in the Global Age* (Farnham UK/Burlington US, Ashgate, pp. 197-206)

LOCKE, J. (1952) *The Second Treatise of Government*, (ed. and introduction by Thomas P. Peardon) (New York, Prentice Hall & The Liberal Arts Press)

LUPEL, A. (2011) *Globalization and Popular Sovereignty: Democracy's Transnational Dilemma* (New York, Routledge)

KYMLICKA, W. (1996) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (New York, Oxford University Press)

LIPSET, S. M. (1959) Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy, *American Political Science Review*, 53, 1, pp. 69-105

MALDINI, P. (2008) *Demokracija i demokratizacija* (Dubrovnik, Sveučilište u Dubrovniku)

MATIĆ, D. (2005) Nacionalizam, nacija i nacionalna država: imaju li budućnost?, *Socijalna ekologija*, 14, 1-2, pp. 75.-92

MILARDOVIĆ, A., Riggs, F. W. & Teune, H. (2002) *Mali leksikon globalizacije* (Zagreb, Centar za politološka istraživanja)

MOORE, B. (1993) *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston, Beacon Press)

PINDER, Sherrow O. (2011) The Nation State in the Era of Globalization: Some Challenges, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1, 2, pp. 139-148

PRISECARU, Petre (2011) Globalisation – between the national and global governance, *Journal of European Studies and International Relations*, 2, 1, pp. 9-16

- ROBERTSON, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London, Sage Publications)
- ROUSSEAU, J. J. (1978) *Društveni ugovor* (Zagreb, Školska knjiga)
- SCHOLTE, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (London, Palgrave Macmillan)
- SCHWARTZMAN, K. C. (1998) *Globalization and Democracy*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1, pp. 159-181
- STIGLITZ, J. (2004) *Globalizacija i dvojbe koje izaziva*, (Zagreb, Algoritam)
- STRANGE, S. (1996) *The Erosion of the State*, *Current History*, 96, 623, pp. 365-369
- TADIĆ, Lj. (1988) *Nauka o politici* (Beograd, Rad)
- VUJČIĆ, V. (2001) *Politička kultura demokracije* (Zagreb, Panliber)
- VUJČIĆ, V. (2002) *Globalizacija i problem političke legitimacije*, *Politička misao*, 39, 4, pp. 87-109