STEPHEN DKRASNER CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: AN ANALYSIS (2015)

Dr Vijay Kumar Badetia-Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Janki Devi Memorial College, University of Delhi

According to Krasner, Many current observers believe that sovereignty has never been as robust as many contemporary observers believe it has been. Traditional notions of sovereignty have been brought into question for a long period of time. Historically, just a few states, most notably the United States, have enjoyed autonomy, governance, and recognition, while the vast majority of others have not. Numerous impoverished countries' governments have been repeatedly penetrated, while stronger countries have not been immune to external influence. (Krasner, 1999) China had been vanquished. Following WWII, the US exerted influence over Japan's and Germany's constitutions. The UK is a member of the European Union, notwithstanding its opposition to the euro.

Even weaker countries, whose domestic processes have been impacted by external actors and whose leaders have minimal control over transnational movements or even domestic activities, find sovereignty appealing. While sovereignty entails little more than international recognition, it also entails access to international organisations and, in certain cases, international money. Individuals are promoted to positions of authority. While Europe's great powers have ceded significant portions of their sovereignty, the US, China, and Japan have neither the incentive nor the inclination to relinquish their usually effective claims to domestic autonomy.(Nabulsi,2004)

In many places of the world, national boundaries still exist. Krasner despise conflict fault lines, whether they exist between Israelis and Palestinians over the status of Jerusalem, between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, or between Ethiopia and Eritrea over disputed land. Nevertheless, scholars are growing concerned about the deterioration of national borders as a result of globalisation. According to governments and activists, multilateral institutions such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, and the International Monetary Fund overstep their authority by advocating for universal standards on a range of

issues ranging from human rights and the environment to monetary policy and immigration. However, economic globalisation and transnational standards will have the biggest impact on state authority, rather than providing a fundamentally new method of organising political life.

Sovereignty Means Final Authority

Not in the near future, if ever. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, philosophers such as Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes were concerned with establishing the validity of a single domestic power hierarchy. Despite their acceptance of divine and natural law, Bodin and Hobbes (particularly Hobbes) felt the sovereign's word was law. Subjects lacked the legal capacity to revolt. Bodin and Hobbes were well aware that vesting the sovereign with such broad powers invites tyranny, but they were more concerned with preserving domestic order, which they viewed as necessary for justice. Both authors wrote in a world torn apart by sectarianism. In 1572, religious riots in France came dangerously close to assassinating Bodin. Hobbes' magnum opus, Leviathan, was published only a few years after parliament (made up of members of Britain's emerging wealthy middle class) killed Charles I in a civil war aimed at reclaiming state control from the king.(Karp,2008)

While the concept of total power sounded appealing at the time, it proved untenable in practise. At the end of the 17th century, Britain's political power was shared between the king and parliament. The Founding Fathers of the United States constructed a system of checks and balances, as well as several sovereignties, to distribute authority among local and national interests, an arrangement that was incompatible with hierarchy and supremacy. Modern democratic republics, whose organisational principles are incompatible with the assumption that sovereignty entails unbridled domestic power, have best embodied the Bodinian and Hobbesian virtues of justice and, in particular, order.

What does sovereignty mean if it does not involve a domestic order or a centralised hierarchical power structure? In today's world, sovereignty is frequently related with the concept of states being autonomous and self-sufficient. Members of a polity have the freedom to choose their own form of governance inside their own borders. The apparent implication of this proposition is non-intervention: no state has the authority to intervene in another's internal affairs.

Recently, sovereignty has been associated with the concept of regulating cross-border mobility. When contemporary pundits declare that the sovereign state is on the point of extinction, they do not include the formation of constitutional frameworks in their assessment. (Bickerton,CunliffeandGourevitch,2007)Rather than that, they demonstrate how technological innovation has made it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for governments to restrict the movement of all forms of material (from coffee to cocaine) and non-material objects across borders (from Holly wood movies to capital flows).

Finally, sovereignty conferred authority on political authorities to sign international treaties. They have the right to veto any deal that they find objectionable. Any pact between states is legal as long as no one is compelled into signing it.

The Peace of Westphalia Produced the Modern Sovereign State

It was not an instantaneous occurrence. The 1648 Peace of Westphalia (really two treaties, Minster and Osnabruck) is sometimes cited as the political "great bang" that brought in the modern structure of autonomous states by contemporary pundits. The Treaty of Westphalia, which brought an end to the Thirty Years' War against the Holy Roman Empire's hegemony, delegitimized the Catholic Church's already diminishing transnational role and legitimised the notion that international relations should be guided by balance-of-power considerations rather than Christian ideals. (Watts,2001). Westphalia was primarily

concerned with the establishment of a new constitution for the Holy Roman Empire. The empire's principalities retained the right to conclude treaties, but the Treaty of Minster required that "such Alliances be not against the Emperor and the Empire, nor against the Publics Peace, or this Treaty, and without prejudice to the Oath by which everyone is bound to the Emperor and the Empire." The princes' political systems remained inextricably linked to the Holy Roman Empire. The Duke of Saxony, Margrave of Brandenburg, Count of Palatine, and Duke of Bavaria were confirmed as electors (together with the archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne). (BBC,2004)They never claimed to be kings in their own right or established themselves as such. The Treaty of Westphalia, most crucially, established regulations promoting religious tolerance in Germany. The Romans proclaimed (cuius regio, eius religio) that the prince had the authority to determine the religion of his province, but subsequently violated it in a number of ways. The signatories pledged to respect current religious laws. Catholics and Protestants would share offices in mixed-population cities in Germany. Religious matters were to be resolved by a majority of Catholics and Protestants in the empire's diet and courts. While none of Europe's great political leaders advocated religious tolerance in principle, they recognised that religious conflicts were so combustible that sectarian divisions needed to be controlled rather than suppressed. Westphalia is a lovely mediaeval text in general, and its most significant innovation—undermining kings' capacity to control religious matters inside their domains—was diametrically opposite to the principles of national sovereignty later associated with the so-called Westphalian system.

Universal Human Rights Are an Unprecedented Challenge to Sovereignty

Wrong. For a long period of time, leaders have attempted to enact international laws requiring them to treat their subjects a certain way. Over time, the emphasis has changed away from religious tolerance and toward minority rights (typically focusing on specific ethnic groups in particular countries), and lastly toward human rights (emphasizing rights enjoyed by all or broad classes of individuals). Only a few states voluntarily accepted international monitoring, while the weak routinely capitulated to the strong's demands: Following the Napoleonic Wars, the Vienna Treaty guaranteed Catholics in the Netherlands

religious freedom. (Kington, 2010)From 1832 until 1913, all successor states to the Ottoman Empire were forced to implement assurances for religious minority' civic and political equality as a condition of international recognition. Following World War I, peace treaties included rigorous protections protecting minorities. Poland, for example, agreed not to hold elections on Saturday, citing the Jewish Sabbath as a reason. Individuals may lodge grievances against countries with the League of Nations' minority rights organisation.

On the other hand, attempts to impose international constraints on domestic behaviour throughout the interwar period failed miserably, as the Holocaust tragically revealed. Following WWII, human rights became the focus of attention, rather than minority rights. The United Nations Charter upheld both human rights and the traditional ideal of state sovereignty, non-intervention. Over the past half-century, more than 20 human rights treaties have been signed, addressing a broad variety of issues including genocide, torture, slavery, refugees, stateless persons, women's rights, racial discrimination, children's rights, and forced labour. However, these UN agreements lack enforcement tools, and the channels for reporting violations are often ineffectual.(Krasner, 1999; Simpson, 2004)

The tragic and atrocious disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s reignited previous ethnic rights debates. International recognition of the Yugoslav successor republics was conditioned on the nations' approval of minority rights under their constitutions. guaranteeing In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Dayton Accords established internationally regulated authority structures, including a Human Rights Commission (a majority of whose members were appointed by the Western European states). NATO de facto established a protectorate in Kosovo.

The primary objectives for such operations have remained consistent: humanitarianism and national security. Indeed, the circumstances that drew big powers to the Balkans during the 1870s battles were eerily similar to those that drew NATO and Russia to the region in the 1990s.

Globalization Undermines State Control

No, state power can never be assumed. While technological advancements have enhanced the movement of people, products, money, and ideas during the previous 200 years, the issues created by such movements are not new. (as identified byKrasner,1999)States are, in many ways, more capable of responding now than they were earlier.

Global media's impact on governmental authority (dubbed the "CNN effect") is negligible in compared to the anarchy that followed the invention of the printing press. Within a decade of supposedly nailing his 95 theses to the Wittenberg church door, Martin Luther's views had spread throughout Europe. Certain political leaders exploited the Protestant Reformation's central concept to legitimise secular political authority. No sovereign king was able to halt the spread of these beliefs, and as a result, some individuals lost their heads as well as their lands. The sectarian debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were arguably more consequential politically than any later international exchange of ideas.

International capital transfers were, in some ways, more significant in the past than they are today. Throughout the nineteenth century, Latin American countries (and to a lesser extent, Canada, the United States, and Europe) suffered from boom-and-bust cycles associated with global financial crises. The Great Depression was caused by a global credit crisis that wreaked havoc on the domestic economy of all major countries. The late-1990s Asian financial crisis was not quite as severe. Indeed, countries' swift recovery from the Asian epidemic demonstrates how improved understanding of economic theories and more effective central banks have made it easier for governments to gain the benefits of global financial markets participation (while avoiding the risks). (as identified byKrasner,1995)

State governments have long sought to regulate the consequences of international trade, as well as the flow of income and ideas(Krasner1999) In the nineteenth century, the expansion

of long-distance trade in bulk products resulted in fundamental schisms in all of the major countries. Due to the depression and falling grain prices, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck convinced landowning aristocrats to form a protectionist alliance with urban heavy industry (this coalition of "iron and rye" dominated German politics for decades). Tariffs were a source of contention in American politics for the majority of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite increased imports and exports since 1950, trade's political significance has diminished as national governments have developed social welfare strategies to mitigate the impact of international competition, and workers with higher skill levels are better equipped to adapt to changing international conditions. States have realised that managing the flow of commodities and services is not more difficult, but rather easier.

Globalization Is Changing the Scope of State Control

Yes. The state's reach has widened in certain areas and shrunk in others. Rulers have recognised that avoiding problems they are incapable of resolving enhances their ability to exercise effective control. For example, beginning with the Treaty of Westphalia, leaders desired to relinquish sovereignty over religion due to its volatility. Maintaining state authority over religion harmed rather than aided political stability. (Krasner 1995)

Monetary policy is an area where state influence has expanded and then receded. Prior to the twentieth century, governments lacked the administrative capability and political will to conduct their own monetary policy. The mid-twentieth-century attempt to govern monetary affairs, which was associated with Keynesian economics, has since been reversed, owing to the magnitude of short-term capital movements and the difficulty of some states in managing inflation. Except for the United Kingdom, all of Europe's main countries have established a single monetary authority. Ecuador denominated its currency in the US dollar in 2000 to combat recurring hyperinflation. Along with the depreciation of national currencies, we are now witnessing the depreciation of national citizenship—the idea that an

individual should be a citizen of just one country and that the state has sole claim to that individual's loyalty. There is no longer a clear separation between citizens and noncitizens in many governments. Even if they are unable to vote, permanent residents, guest workers, refugees, and undocumented immigrants have some rights. The trip example, as well as many governments' need to recruit money or talented persons, have emphasised the importance of making citizenship a more fluid category. (Kington, 2010)While government involvement in religion, money, and loyalty claims has decreased, overall government activity, as measured by taxing and spending, has climbed as a percentage of national GDP in the most economically developed states since the 1950s. The size of a country's social welfare programmes appears to be proportionate to its degree of economic integration with the rest of the world. The most serious crises of power and control have occurred in the most isolated regimes, with Sub-Saharan Africa serving as the most perplexing example.

NGOs Are Nibbling at National Sovereignty

To a certain extent, yeah. There is a lengthy history of transnational nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), particularly when companies are engaged. The East India Company held political clout (and even an expeditionary military force) in the 18th century that rivalled that of many independent governments. International efforts to eliminate slavery, expand women's rights, and improve working conditions occurred throughout the nineteenth century.However, the number of international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) has grown substantially over the last century, from roughly 200 in 1909 to over 17,000 today. Due to the availability of low-cost, high-speed communications technology, such groups may now organise and exert influence over public policy and international law considerably more easily. A more contemporary example is the International Convention on the Prohibition of Land Mines (ICBM). (Krasner, 1999)These organisations raise concerns about sovereignty by threatening the integrity of domestic decision-making. Activists who suffer defeat on their home soil may exert pressure on foreign governments, thereby affecting decision-makers in their home country.

Despite their growing prominence, non-governmental organisations' ability to influence domestic policy has been restricted in comparison to governments, international organisations, and multinational companies. In the early twentieth century, the United Fruit Company wielded more authority in Central America than any current non-governmental organisation. The International Monetary Fund and other international financing institutions are increasingly regularly drafting conditionality agreements that include not just precise economic aims but also vows to combat corruption and dismantle cartels.

Due to the open nature of the US political system, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) as well as foreign governments can exert some influence over political decisions. Although foreign initiatives to alter internal institutions are most usually directed at smaller, weaker countries, even powerful countries are not immune. (For instance, the Mexican government lobbied extensively for the approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement.) Indeed, the permeability of the American polity makes the US a less threatening partner; countries are more willing to join US-sponsored international agreements if they believe they will have a participation in US governance.

Sovereignty Blocks Conflict Resolution

Yes, on occasion. Even though this condition has been repeatedly contested by competing concepts (such as universal human rights) and breached in practise, rulers and their constituents have a relatively clear understanding of what sovereignty entails—exclusive control inside a particular territory (the U.S.- and British-enforced no-fly zones over Iraq). In practise, the political weight accorded to conventional sovereignty criteria has hampered the resolution of certain conflicts. (Brown,2006)There is no traditional option for sovereignty in Jerusalem, for example, but alternatives are readily available: Create a worldwide authority; delegate jurisdiction over certain issues (religious practises versus taxation, for example) to various authorities. For the majority of Israelis and Palestinians, any of these options would be preferable to the current impasse, but political leaders on

both sides have struggled to reach an agreement due to their vulnerability to counterelites capable of hoisting the sovereignty flag.

Tibet, too, has struggled with established rules. Both the Chinese and Tibetans would benefit from Tibet reclaiming some of its autonomy as a vassal state of the former Chinese empire. Tiber possessed considerable local authority, although symbolically recognising the emperor's dominance (and sometimes through tribute payments). Few people understand what a tributary state is, and even if Tibet's leaders reached an accord giving their country more autonomy, there is no assurance it would be supported by their own people.

However, sovereignty laws can be flouted if leaders can reach mutual agreements, coerce their constituents, or utilise coercion. Following the handover of Hong Kong to the British, the Chinese established an innovative special administrative region, allowed a foreign judge to sit on the Court of Final Appeal, and won acceptance from other countries not only for Hong Kong's membership in a number of international organisations, but also for separate visa agreements and recognition of a distinct Hong Kong passport. (Simpson's 2004) Due to Hong Kong's lack of legal independence, all of these practises violate traditional sovereignty rules. China was able to impose sovereignty while maintaining the trust of the business sector only by inventing a special status for Hong Kong, which demanded the support of other countries.

The European Union Is a New Model for Supranational Governance

Yes, but only for Europeans. The European Union (EU) is a much younger organisation than Hong Kong, with significantly more sovereignty. It is not a conventional international organisation in the conventional sense since its member countries are so inextricably linked that leaving is no longer an option. Due to the disparity in its members' interests, cultures, economy, and domestic institutional structures, it is unlikely to become a "United States of

Europe," a huge federal state like to the United States of America. Extending the EU to former communist states in Central Europe will complicate efforts to establish a political structure matching that of a typical sovereign state.

The EU undermines conventional standards of sovereignty. Its member countries have established supranational organisations (the European Court of Justice, the European Commission, and the Council of Ministers) with the authority to make judgments that may be opposed by certain member countries. Despite the fact that these theories have never been formally approved in a treaty, the court's judgements have immediate and precedential effect within national judicial systems. The European Monetary Union established a central bank, which today supervises the monetary policy of three of the union's four largest members. In certain places, the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty provide majority or qualified majority vote, but not unanimous voting. In some ways, the European Union is a product of state sovereignty, as it was created on voluntary agreements amongst its member states. In another sense, it profoundly defies conventional notions of sovereignty, as these same treaties have eroded its individual members' legal autonomy. (Krasner 1995)

On the other hand, the European Union does not serve as a model for other countries to copy. The initial steps toward integration would not have been possible without the United States' political and economic support, which was far more concerned with establishing a strong alliance capable of effectively opposing the Soviet Union during the early years of the Cold War than with any potential European challenge to US leadership. Germany, as one of the EU's largest members, has been a fervent proponent of an institutional structure that would constrain Belin's freedom of action, reflecting the lessons gained from two terrible wars and the appeal of a European identity for a country still traumatised by Nazi horrors. Other regional powers, let alone the US, are unlikely to be interested in similarly tying their own hands. (Regional trade agreements such as Mercosur and NAFTA have modest supranational ambitions and show no signs of growing into larger monetary or political unions.) Although the IU is a novel and distinctive organisation, it will complement rather than supplant the sovereign state paradigm.

Thus, by identifying the various aspects of sovereignty and acknowledging that sovereignty continues to play a critical role in international relations, given that all states rely on or desire it, it is possible to argue that sovereignty is not dead. However, when considering Krasner's (1999) and Simpson's (2004) claims, it can be demonstrated that powerful states almost certainly did not use sovereignty as a straw man (as that would be too naive), but rather as a political tool to justify actions that would not have been accepted under normal international law. While the concept of sovereignty has evolved and continues to evolve, its contentious and dubious nature has not changed, as the world witnesses the same disasters and usurpations of power by the most powerful against weaker states.

References

BBC(2004)'Gibraltar: the struggle for the Rock', *BBC News,*2nd March 2004.[online] Availablefrom:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/3521675.stm>[Accessed11[th]December2010].

BBC (2010) "Liu Xiaobo must be freed' – Nobel prize committee',*BBC News,* 10[th]December 2010.[online] Availablefrom:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-pacific-11966449>[Accessed11[th]December2010].

Bickerton, C. J., Cunliffe, P. and Gourevitch, A. (2007) 'Introduction: the unholy alliance against sovereignty'. In:Bickerton, C. J., Cunliffe, P. and Gourevitch, A. (eds.) *Politics without sovereignty: a critique of contemporary international relations*. London: UCL Press,pp.1-19.

Brown,C.(2006)*Sovereignty, Rights and Justice*.London:Polity.

Cohen,J.L.(2004)'Who sesovereignty ? Empire versus international law', *Ethics and International Affairs, 18*(3)1-24.

Gourdault-Montagne ,M.andIschinger ,W.(2008)'Unity and Sovereignty', *The Guardian,*22^nd^January 2008. [online] Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentis free/ 2008/jan/ 22/politics.eu? INTCMP=SRCH>[Accessed11^th^December2010].

Hoffman,J. and Graham,P .(2006)*Introductionto Political Theory*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Joffe,J.(1999)'RethinkingtheNation-State: The Many Meanings of Sovereignty', *Foreign Affairs*. [online] Available from :<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/ articles/ 55618/ josef-joffe/rethinking-the-nation-state-the-many-meanings-of-sovereignty?page=show>[Accessed8^th^December2010].

Karp,D.J.(2008)'The utopiaandreality of sovereignty: social reality ,normativeIR and' Organized Hypocrisy'',
Review of International Studies,34(2),313-335.

Kington,T.(2010)'Vatican reaction to WikiLeaks claims',*The Guardian,*12th December2010.[online] Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/12/vatican-reaction-wikileaks -claims? INTCMP =SRCH>[Accessedon12^th^December2010].

Krasner, S. D. (1995) 'Compromising Westphalia', *International Security,*
20 (3) 115-151.Krasner, S.D.(1999) *Sovereignty :organized hypocrisy*.
Chichester: Princeton University Press.
Nabulsi, K.(2004)' The struggle for sovereignty' ,*The Guardian,* 23^rd^June 2004.[online] Available from:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/jun/23/iraq.comment?INTCMP=SRCH>[Accessed on12^th^December2010].

Simpson, G. (2004) *Great Powers and Outlaw States. Unequal Sovereigns in the International Legal Order* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Economist (2010) 'In quite a state',*The Economist* , 4[th]April 2010. [online] Available from:

<http://www.economist.com/node/15868439>[Accessed12[th]December2010].

United Nations (1945) 'Charter of the United Nations', *United Nations.* [online] Available from:

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>[Accessedon12[th]December2010].

Watts,A.(2001)'The Importance of International Law'. In:Byers ,M.(ed.) *The Role of International Law in Internationa lPolitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,pp.5-17.