

An Assessment of the Impact of Globalisation on the Sovereignty of the New States in Global Affairs

Dolapo Michael Oyedokun

Abstract

This study analysed the concept of globalisation with a view to investigating the various ways in which globalisation has affected the sovereignty of new states within the global system. The study employed desk review method to generate relevant information. Globalisation was found in this study to be beneficial in terms of trade openness, provision of economic assistance to the poor countries, humanitarian intervention and many more. The study also reveals that globalisation has affected the new states' economy, politics, culture, education, communication technology, and justified use of the armed forces. The study concludes that, although globalisation is beneficial, to the developing world, the negative globalisation proffer surpasses the advantages as most policies are made by the World Powers to fulfil their national interests. The study then recommends that leaders of emerging nations should not expect developed countries to quickly transmit the necessary technology to allow for efficient global competitiveness; instead, they should embark on industrialisation, self-technological innovations and research to break the milieu of dependency.

Keywords: Globalisation, International organisations, New States, Sovereignty, World Politics

Introduction

The international system, also known as "international politics" or "global affairs" is a competition ground where the forces of states (both the old and new) engage in the exploitation of world mineral resources in a conflicting manner. This competitive dynamic rekindles the international system's anarchy and permeates the master-slave relationship between and among states (Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014). The antagonistic method of resources exploitation is what some scholars believed to have been fashioned into the concept of globalisation.

The word "globalisation" refers to the integration of different local economies into an internationally unified political, economic, and cultural order. It is not a single phenomenon, but rather a term to represent the forces that transform an economy into a single characterised body by embracing the free movement of trade, investment, labour, and capital (Awdel, et al., 2020). As opined by Modelski (2007), "globalisation is a four-dimensional process that includes economic globalisation, world opinion creation, democratisation, and political globalisation." Al-Rodhan and Stoudmann, (2006) rounded globalisation off with the assertion that changes in one of these dimensions (for example, economic globalisation) will result in changes in the others" Awdel et al., (2020) further argued that globalisation is an inevitable phenomenon that combines almost every aspect of modern life. This movement, fueled primarily by quick and mostly unrestrained flows of information, products, ideas, cultural values, capital, services, and people, is welcoming in a more interconnected global economy than ever before.

At the centre of globalisation are international organisations and other non-state actors in the international system which has taken over the affairs of states at the international level. An international organisation is a type of unification of efforts by select governments aimed at achieving international collaboration, for which the stated states have established a legal institutional structure or institutions with permanent authority (Purdă, 2012). For a country to be part of an international body requires the signing of treaties which gives the organisations some legal rights. These legal rights of such institutions have reduced the sovereignty of states in

decision making on issues relating to them within the international system. For example, to be part of free trade agreements requires countries to free up their borders and soften migration policies to allow unrestricted in and outflow for humans, goods and services.

Sovereign states are increasingly measuring their fragility to factors outside their control, rather than to one another (Marsonet, 2017). The consensus in globalisation is that nations must be willing to cede some sovereignty to world organisations for the international system to work.

Statement of the Problem

Globalisation has control over states' economies, foreign policies, and communities. Nations (particularly developing countries) cannot fight globalisation since the entire world is dealing with it, and if a country prevents its entry, that country will be excluded from the contemporary international community, particularly in economic terms. As a result of globalisation, sovereignty is not only getting weaker in fact, but it also needs to grow weaker. States would be sensible to reduce their sovereignty to defend themselves because they cannot be isolated from what is happening elsewhere. When a government is unable to provide the fundamental requirements of its population, whether due to a lack of competence or deliberate policy, the need may lead to a reduction, or even elimination of sovereignty (Marsonet, 2017).

The involvement of NATO in Kosovo was an example of some governments choosing to breach the sovereignty of another government to halt ethnic cleansing and genocide. In contrast, the mass killings in Rwanda and Darfur, Sudan, show the tremendous cost of believing that sovereignty is ultimate and so doing little to prevent the death of innocent people.

Many believe that globalisation helps everyone. It creates and distributes wealth, provides cheaper and more diverse goods and services, and promotes democratisation. Despite these statements, which are supported by the huge increase in foreign investment over the last decade, the largest portion of international investments continues to take place between the world's richest nations. Even within the developing globe, the stronger nations continue to get the majority of international investment. Most new states think that globalisation has resulted in the affluent and powerful governments dominating the weak (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011).

The foregoing stimulates the interest of this study to discuss the concept of globalisation, and examine the impact of globalisation on the sovereignty of the new states in global affairs.

Methodology

This study follows the conceptual research approach which focuses on examining the existing data established by seasoned academics on the issue under evaluation. The author examines the impact of globalisation on the sovereignty of the new states in global affairs while reviewing previous literature.

Literature Review

Conceptualising Globalisation

Globalisation is the result of a convergence of economic, technology, socio-cultural, and political factors. It refers to the global integration of mankind and the compression of both the temporal and spatial aspects of global human interaction in general. Globalisation has a lengthy history; it began when European major economic powers conquered Asia, Africa, and America. Globalisation emerged in the twentieth century, but it was only around three decades ago that it was recognised as a research study, as its political and economic implications began to be explored (Odel, 2016).

According to the political realists, the core meaning of globalisation entails an increase in the volume, velocity, and importance of flows within and across borders of goods, services, money, people, ideas, drugs, viruses, emails, weapons, and much more, calling into question one of the sovereignty's fundamental principles: the ability to control what crosses borders in either direction.

According to Eric (2010), globalisation examines and assesses the influence of economic globalisation on sovereignty, the worldwide distribution of wealth, and global commerce. It may also be anarchic national economies; it changes sovereignty and ownership rights in free commerce. Finally, it blends economic policies, corporate relationships, and political dissatisfaction. Globalisation, according to Beeson (2003), is an essential component of national rule, describing it as a process that signifies a conversion in a high-value group of public relations and international trades. Globalisation attempts to erase national borders, economies, and societies between countries and territories, and it destroys barriers between markets by connecting countries' geographical borders, disconnecting national and global trade, and strengthening trade relations for assets, wealth, and quality service (Mostert, 2003).

Review of Previous Empirical Studies

Ibrahim and Ainuddin (2017) investigated the effects of globalisation on African culture and politics. The study employed a content analysis research technique. The study shows that globalisation and modernity have a negative influence on African culture and politics in areas such as its political system, economics, education, religion, and cultural systems. To confront the problems of globalisation, the study recommends that Africans preserve their culture, customs, and values while strengthening national boundaries and sovereignty.

Sivakumar and Baskaran (2014) in a study titled “globalization and nation-state” outlined how globalisation affects state sovereignty. The study reveals that globalisation contributes to the transformation and narrowing of the extent of national sovereignty. Due to international agreements such as global financial flows, activities of international organisations and multinational corporations, information and communication technology, and issues concerning human rights, as well as already formed models and traditions of state behaviour, the scope of inner sovereignty has been legally narrowed to a large extent. At the same time, a rising number of governments willingly give up part of their sovereign rights for a variety of reasons.

Ejikeme and Ugwueze (2014) studied the challenges and opportunities presented by new states in global politics. The study was mostly qualitative, with the aim of emphasising the potential and problems of emerging nations in global politics. The study found that globalisation in the world political system did not benefit poor nations. It is a contemporary colonialism strategy designed to keep certain countries underdeveloped. The study recommends that sophisticated technologically developed countries should aid emerging governments in eliminating global poverty, which is a major global security concern. It also recommends that the new states' political leaders work hard to secure a significant reduction in bad governance and corruption to aid development.

Omagu (2012) researched the state, politics, and globalisation. This study provides a critical assessment of globalisation's influence on African states. While conceding some of the gains of globalisation, the study sees the link between the state and globalisation as a type of entrapment for Africa, resulting in reliance, vulnerability, manipulation, and, eventually, the undermining of the State's power. This unwholesome growth has generated a legitimacy dilemma for most African administrations, transforming them into states that are always in need of direction. It begins by examining globalisation and the African state; violations of state sovereignty are investigated through the interaction between African nations with important components of economic globalisation such as production, commerce, and finance. The study concludes that globalisation in Africa has resulted in denationalisation and the partial erosion of components of state sovereignty through international, regional, and other sub-national institutions.

State Sovereignty

Sovereignty is commonly characterised in political science as the most fundamental feature of the state in the form of total self-sufficiency, that is, dominance in domestic policy and independence in foreign policy (Held, 2003). Sovereignty is more precisely defined as the right and authority to make the ultimate or last choice concerning the terms of the existence of an entire territorially based polity. It implies a central core of right and power of self-government, that is, the power to resolve the basic problems of a country internally, rather than at the command of others. No foreign entity has the authority to command or order a sovereign state to behave in a certain manner on issues of fundamental importance to it.

Sovereignty does not simply denote the level or quantity of power, as though the extent to which a state is sovereign can be determined by calculating its relative military and economic might. Sovereignty denotes both the right to act and the authority to act (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). In certain circumstances, a state's authority to act is so constrained and limited that its sovereign right to act is rendered practically useless. Similarly, there are occasions when a state's real power is so immense that, even if its sovereign right to exercise this power is not formally recognised by others, it is tacitly recognised. These are, however, severe examples. Sovereignty is normally defined as the possession of a right and power.

According to Oji and Ozoiko (2011), sovereignty is frequently mistaken with independence, and the definition is correct as long as it is not confused with absolute independence. This is because the claim to sovereignty is predicated on recognition by other sovereigns, and so on some type of interaction with other nations. Northern Cyprus, a self-proclaimed republic, is an example of a state that is not sovereign since it is not widely recognised as such.

The New States in World Politics

A state can be described simply as a community founded by individuals and exercising permanent control over a certain region. The basic notion of a state is "sovereignty," or the power to make choices without intervention from other sources. The core definition of a state is a political society with enough organised authority and ability to administer a specified region and its inhabitants while being independent of other states.

According to these definitions of the state, new states are those that have recently gained exclusive political sovereignty over their affairs (Scott, n.d). This includes the vast majority of Asian and African countries, as well as Latin America, and Oceania that were under some sort of colonial authority before 1945. This definition meets the concept of new states in terms of age to a great extent.

In terms of development, new states include all economically underdeveloped states where poverty, hunger, unemployment, political instability, violence, and a variety of other social vices abound. The new state in this study is synonymous with "Third World" countries. Examples include but are not limited to Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Chad, Comoros, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kiribati, Mali, Sudan, South Sudan, Yemen and Zambia (UN CDP, 2021).

Globalisation Sovereignty and National Sovereignty

The growing importance of non-state organisations such as international NGOs and multinational companies has sparked debate over the role of the state and whether it can function in the face of a broad set of forces. As a result of globalisation, the state and its institutions are increasingly under pressure from both the domestic and global sectors.

Several scholars in the fields of Political Science, Economics, International Relations, and Development Studies, among others, have conducted successful research on the effects of globalisation and concluded that: globalisation has become an important theme of the post-Cold War debate about the nature of the international order. Even though it is rarely linked to a well-established philosophy. Globalisation has become a potent metaphor in the sense that a variety of universal forces are at work, resulting in growing interconnectedness and interdependence between nations and communities. As a result, territorial boundaries are becoming less significant, old notions of sovereignty are being challenged, and local areas must be evaluated within a larger global perspective.

Liberal scholars regard globalisation as a process of liberating economies so that commerce between nations may take place more readily. In this perspective, freedom implies creating unrestricted chances for enterprises to grow between and among states while minimising the state's role in the market. As a result, according to Olisa (1999), cited in Onuoha (2004), globalisation is an ongoing massive trend launched and pushed forward by developed capitalist and industrial western nations.

As the world continued to evolve and develop, international organisations often arose as stakeholders in the international system with significant influence over state activities. As a result, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) became a component of global affairs. International organisations, according to Goldstein (2003), comprise intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) such as the United Nations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as the International Committee of the Red Cross. According to Kegley (2007), there are two sorts of non-state actors: intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) with state members and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) with private persons and groups as members.

Belonging to an international organisation such as the African Union (AU) or the European Union (EU) undermines traditional sovereignty standards. Member states have established supranational entities that can make decisions that some member states disagree with. The European Court of Justice, for example, has direct impact and supremacy within national legal systems, even though these ideas were never formally adopted in any treaty. The European Monetary Union established a central bank, which today oversees the monetary affairs of three of the union's four major members. In some places, the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty allow for the majority of qualified majority vote, but not unanimous voting.

These organisations are, in some ways, products of state sovereignty because they were formed through voluntary agreements among their member states. In another sense, however, it profoundly defies traditional notions of sovereignty since these same agreements have weakened the legal autonomy of its members (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). The agreement to delegate sovereign powers to international organisations is not always durable. Nobody can prohibit member nations from rescinding their participation in international organisations to reclaim the sovereign power they have given up (Raustiala, 2003).

International organisations make decisions that were previously thought to be within the purview of states. Inequality among members of international organisations has become the norm. Globalization has led to the rejection of normative principles of universal and equal sovereignty. Unanimity is no longer required for decision making, and veto is also uncommon. Although consensus is frequently utilised, more often than not, proportional voting or a specifically defined functional majority is used, and certain international organisations have the authority to enforce their judgments on nations' (Kingsbury, 1998.) The operation of international economic institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organization, is highly contentious in terms of putting requirements on nations; even governments, with limited scope for national economic policy, want involvement (Held, 1997).

Globalisation as an External Challenge of New States' Sovereignty

States' position in the modern world is primarily influenced by their power, which can be defined in terms of economic resources, military capabilities, or both. Although several African nations such as Egypt, Nigeria, and South Africa satisfy this condition in their respective sub-regions, on a global scale, they (like several other new states) have become progressively marginalised, particularly with the rapid advancement of science and technology. This trend has various political and economic repercussions that political scientists should consider when considering the issues of emerging nations in global politics. Against this backdrop, the new states, particularly those of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, have been subjected to unrestricted political and economic exploitations cloaked in a slew of international diplomatic ties that are frequently antagonistic to both people and the environment.

At first, it was slavery, later to colonialism and neo-colonialism. But globalisation is the most pervasive contemporary version of the World Powers' mechanism of degrading the sovereignty of many new states. Because of these new states' inadequate development of science and technology, they are incapable of negotiating well in the international division of labour and the social riches it generates. (Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014).

The concept of globalisation is a big plan to "villagise" the world to the point that one may access the whole world from the comfort of one's room. Indeed, it seeks to undermine (if not eliminate) conventional and jurisdictional borders and barriers of particular states, to the detriment of new ones. However, while trade liberalisation is the engine that propels globalisation, information and communication technology (ICT) is the gasoline that keeps it running.

As a result, the new states, particularly those that are severely undeveloped or developing, suffer the most from this globalisation initiative; this is because they are primarily technologically inferior and so oriented to consuming rather than producing. Given this, and the monopolisation of the international economy by the developed countries who produce, the trade policies favour the producing countries, and the efforts of some developing new states are frequently sabotaged by the old states. Globalisation is one of the great sabotage techniques employed by the industrialised old powers against the less-industrialised emerging states. Indeed, globalisation encapsulates all of the nemeses of enslavement, imperialism, naked colonialism and neocolonialism. The conclusion is that international politics is still characterised by high-level injustices and exploitations carried out with complete impunity where might is right (Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014).

For example, when Nigeria gained independence in 1960, there was a strong belief that the nation would soon join the world league of developed countries. To make this ambition a reality, the Nigerian government immediately began to pursue forceful foreign policies aimed at realising it, and it was not long before it gained the label "Giant of Africa." However, despite its immense resources, Nigeria is still racked by poverty, starvation, unemployment, political instability, and terrorism after 61 years of independence, and the ambition of becoming a developed country is still in its infancy if at all imagined. In reality, the country is struggling just to reclaim its past greatness, let alone improve on what has come before. The country is heavily reliant on imports, and any country that lives on imports is doomed to be a weak state. Countries that endure such a disaster will almost certainly lose control of any power in the international system. At the moment, Nigeria's major instinct as a superpower to reckon with in Africa (not even the global system) is her terrifying population, which is underutilised.

Areas of Globalisation's Implications on the New States

As discussed earlier, globalisation is simply the internationalisation of most issues that affect humans and states. Below are the areas in which globalisation has affected the autonomy of new states:

Economic Perspective: The internationalisation of financial markets, technology, and some industries and services impose additional constraints on the freedom of action of nations. Furthermore, the creation of institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund introduces additional limits and imperatives.

According to Bush (2008), globalisation brought poverty and inequality to Africa as a result of the continent's participation in the global capitalist economic system. Local industries deteriorated significantly, giving place to multinational corporations. According to Tar (1999), the elimination of indigenous industries prepared the door for multinational corporations from the developed world to invest in Africa's less developed countries. The interdependence of markets, money, products, and services, as well as the networks established by transnational businesses, are the most visible expressions of economic globalisation.

What information technology has done to the movement of money has expedited economic globalisation. It is frequently asserted that the market's capacity to move money from one region of the world to another with the click of a button has altered the norms of policy-making, leaving economic decisions considerably more at the mercy of market forces than previously.

Political Impact: There is clear evidence that the influence of globalisation is most visible in the extent to which politics throughout the world are now mostly market-driven. Governments are no longer unable to run their states; rather, to remain in power, they must progressively "manage" national politics to adapt them to the pressures of transnational commercial forces (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). Globalisation has reduced national governments' ability to command and influence their economies (particularly in terms of macroeconomic management) and to establish their political systems.

Political globalisation has resulted from the institutionalisation of international political systems, a phenomenon known as "global governance." The League of Nations, which has now been supplanted by the United Nations, is regarded as the most powerful of the general and global organisations that had developed. Regional organisations include the African Union (AU), European Union (EU), Organization of American States (OAS), Arab League, and others. The impact of these organisations is to generate a process of institution-building in which the organisations may control and command what transpires in member states' governance. This is the political globalisation trend. Non-member nations are considered deviants since they are not a part of this collaboration. In the future, more states will be compelled to adhere to the standards established by these organisations (Chase-Dunn, 1999).

The impact is already being noticed in the field of human rights. Because of the globalisation of human rights, a state is no longer free to treat its people and foreigners however it deems appropriate. It must adhere to international norms outlined in several human rights treaties, the majority of which are now considered customary law. The persistent concentration of sovereignty in international organisations will eventually result in political sovereignty being subjugated to the mandates of the institutions. Globalisation contributes to the formation of weak states, which cripples democracy; in the absence of a robust democracy, we may be certain that civil society will stay in shambles and doomed (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011).

Cultural Imperialism: Culture separates one human group from another. A people's culture encompasses their beliefs, behavioural standards, language, rituals, art, technology, clothing styles, food production and cooking methods, religion, and political and economic systems.

The world today has always been and continues to be multicultural, with the rising popularity and acceptance of western values such as rationality, individualism, equality, and efficiency being an important trend of the twentieth century; a trend that has accelerated in both speed and nature. The compression of time and space by

new information technologies is essentially an extension and acceleration of a long-term trend toward acculturation (Meyer, 1999).

The dialectical linkages that exist between globalisation parameters have a significant influence not just on the global economy, but also on the ethnic, national, and religious characteristics of the world's many cultures. Although globalisation is meant to encourage the establishment of diverse communities, the reality on the ground shows that cultural assimilation is more prevalent than cultural pluralism (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). The less powerful are absorbed by the most powerful, culminating in sophisticated power-based cultural uniformity. As a result, there is a dizzying assortment of "competing and dying" cultures, which raises significant questions about which culture should define the global socialisation map (Jotia, 2011).

Since the European Enlightenment, the acceptance of originally Western institutional systems, bureaucratic organisation, and rationality; belief in a law-like natural universe, economic efficiency, and political democracy has expanded throughout the world (Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014).

Use of Force: According to Leander (2004), it is critical to consider states' legitimacy in monopolising the use of justifiable force. In international relations, it is often assumed that the legality of a state's use of foreign force may be questioned both at home and in "international society." The validity of nations in limiting the use of justifiable force "inside" their borders, on the other hand, is largely a question of (specific) national politics. The idea in this part is that knowing how legitimacy is conferred on governments has always been difficult to maintain and is becoming more complex as a result of globalisation. Globalisation blurs the inside/outside logic by situating politics at a transnational level, that is, by denationalising or dislocating politics.

First, a growing number of international and transnational actors are involved in the process of granting states legitimacy to regulate the use of force. Simultaneously, a rising number of apparently external difficulties find their way into the "internal" domain (Leander, 2004).

Right to Development: International developments have an impact on new states' ability to establish and implement policies to realise the right to development in a globalised environment. The principle of globalisation extends the opportunity to enjoy products and services beyond what a country can produce, much as participation in a growing market does for an individual, possibly improving the capacities for exercising the right to development.

It should be underlined that, in actuality, globalisation has not done so for the majority of poor nations. A developing state would need to implement an adequate set of policies to convert prospective possibilities into real capabilities. As a result, even as this interaction occurs, governments must choose what to embrace and what to reject by enacting policies that are in their best interests. This is a manifestation of a state's sovereignty.

Educational System: Africans were pushed into menial jobs as a result of the Western educational system. The impact of western education with an emphasis on literacy was to deter Africans from manual labour (Mazrui, 1986). Meanwhile, the curriculum embraced by Africans was a western product that, except in rare instances, did not take into account their cultural values. Instead of allowing Africans to build their indigenous social sciences, they taught them to follow their social sciences. Ake (1985) bemoaned that "western powers' imperialism is our social sciences," even though no standard literature validated or contained African social sciences. This problem prevented Africans from developing curricula that reflected their habits, languages, and traditions. This circumstance contributed to brainwashing Africans into accepting Western beliefs (Mikail & Abdullah, 2017).

Western education has resulted in the migration of African talents. The outflow of African human resources lowered the number of professional skills capable of staffing African institutions, organisations, and agencies in both the public and private sectors. An estimated 30,000 Africans with PhDs worked overseas in 2002, while over 130, 000 studied outside the continent (Okoli, 2012). This figure has risen since Nigerians in the United States number 3-5 million, with 5,000 of them claiming to be medical professionals (Mikail, 2011). This situation is alarming for the African human development index and produces a major vacuum in several professions, particularly in academic, medical, and technical fields, among others.

Challenges of Communication Technology: Globalisation was cemented as a result of the rapid advancement of Information, Communication, and Technology (ICT), which influenced the cultural system. The globalisation of information flow via communications technology outlets such as Facebook Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube and Twitter in the global web of the Internet is intended to foster worldwide social relationships as well as to transmit western culture, movies, pornography, prostitution, and moral decay to developing societies (Ibrahim & Ainuddin, 2017). This phenomenon has eased the system of communication and knowledge transmission in one way while undermining the power of some governments.

Twitter, for example, removed President Muhammadu Buhari's post regarding security difficulties in Nigeria's southeast region on July 2, 2020, citing a violation of the microblogging site's guidelines. Lai Muhammed, the Minister of Information, accused Twitter of double standards and branded their agenda in Nigeria as highly dubious during a news conference. Because Twitter's operations are potential damaging Nigeria's corporate existence, the Nigerian government barred Twitter's access in the nation two days after the removal of the president's post on the platform. Furthermore, Twitter, as a transnational firm operating in the Nigerian market, has avoided paying taxes by establishing its West African headquarters in Ghana, a country whose whole population does not match the number of Twitter users in Nigeria. This culminated in a blockage of the platform in Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

As much as globalisation is unavoidable, the consequences for new states are disastrous. The effect of globalisation suggests that the incorporation of new states through the channel of internalisation has already reduced these states' sovereign. It is widely held that inequality is a feature of the world's capitalism since the past and that its abolition soon is not just gloomy but also unrealistic. It is particularly the wealthy nations and few advanced emerging economies that can harness the benefits of the global economy. Furthermore, globalisation, for the most part, does not help the construction of economic conditions essential for the developing world's genuine development.

Many reasons have contributed to the continuous inequality that characterises the international system, mainly to the detriment of new and emerging countries. Slavery, colonialism, and neocolonialism are examples of these causes. Perhaps it is not in the best interests of this study to revisit these social injustices perpetrated against Third World nations, especially because they have been well-documented in the literature. Rather, the concern is in the inequalities that have been duplicated in the more palatable word "globalisation."

In addition to the aforementioned, leaders of Third World nations (the new states) are not helping the situation by ensuring that the problem of inadequate governance is addressed, increasing the challenges already confronting the new states in the international system.

The most important influence of globalisation on states' sovereignty has been to shift the extent of state power and control rather than to create a fundamentally new way of organising existence. The scope of national sovereignty has been legally reduced to a considerable extent as a result of international accords involving human rights problems, as well as in conjunction with already developed patterns and traditions of state action.

At the same time, a rising number of governments willingly give up part of their sovereign rights for a variety of reasons. The loss in governmental authority and control was not accomplished by coercion, but rather through a reduction in power free will. This is mostly owing to the benefits of globalisation, which include free trade zones, economic support, humanitarian involvement, and many other things. However, the negatives outweigh the benefits. The objective of globalisation should be to redefine sovereignty, that is, to strike a balance between a world of totally autonomous nations and an international system based on either world governance or anarchy.

Finally, the Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP) of the Bretton Woods institutions (World Bank and IMF) are also examples of the detrimental outcomes of globalisation to the new states. The policies outlined that indebted state governments reduce social spending, liberate the market to allow foreign investment, devalue national currencies and spend more on the proliferation of arms. These policies ensure the new state remains dependent on the developed nations in terms of importation and economic assistance.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Globalisation is a complex result of a combination of political, social, economic, and civilisational forces, among many others, that characterises the modern world. However, it is important to remember that globalisation plays an important role in the relationship between nation-states. As noted in this research, state sovereignty (particularly that of the Third World) is undermined and challenged by the products of globalisation such as human rights, multinational enterprises, non-governmental organisations, supranational organisations, and so on.

The extent of sovereignty has been legally reduced to a considerable extent as a result of international treaties involving human rights problems, as well as in relation to already developed patterns and traditions of state behaviour. At the same time, these states frequently give up part of their sovereign rights voluntarily for a variety of reasons (in most cases to collectively solve global issues and challenges). Globalisation is a complex result of a combination of political, social, economic, and civilisational forces, among many others, that characterises the modern world. However, it is important to remember that globalisation plays an important role in the relationship between nation-states. As noted in this research, state sovereignty (particularly that of the Third World) is undermined and challenged by the products of globalisation such as human rights, multinational enterprises, non-governmental organisations, supranational organisations, and so on.

The extent of sovereignty has been legally reduced to a considerable extent as a result of international treaties involving human rights problems, as well as concerning already developed patterns and traditions of state behaviour. At the same time, these states frequently give up part of their sovereign rights voluntarily for a variety of reasons (in most cases to collectively solve global issues and challenges).

This study, however, indicates that in a globalised world, practising Westphalian sovereignty, which provides states entire authority within their territory and economic policies, is extremely difficult.

Based on the findings and conclusion, this study recommends the following:

1. Although it will not be an easy task for the new states to break free from their position as slaves in international politics, they can establish themselves through organised and administrative commitment by leaders capable of distancing the new states from dependency.
2. Leaders of emerging nations should not expect developed countries to quickly transmit the necessary technology to allow for efficient global competitiveness; instead, they should embark on self-technological innovations.
3. Scholars are fully aware of the industrialised countries' hypocritical involvement in the continuously crushing of the new states. According to this view, scholars should speed up their research to bring the

prospective consequences of pursuing a simple development model to the attention of leaders of the new states.

4. Leaders and scholars should cease blaming advanced nations for the issues that evolved through years of slavery and colonialism, and instead plan how to combat the pervasiveness of these social vices with the development of globalisation through industrialisation and research.
5. Finally, even if the world powers cannot directly support the emerging governments, they should not undermine their development efforts.

References

- Ake, C. (1985). *Imperialism as social sciences*. Longman Group Limited, Nigeria Plc.
- Al-Rodhan, N. R., & Stoudmann, G., (2006). Definitions of globalization: A comprehensive overview and a proposed definition. *Program on the Geopolitical Implications of Globalization and Transnational Security*, 6, 1-21.
- Awdel, Z. M., Odel, N. M., & Saadi, Z. F. (2020). The rise of the globalization and its effect on the autonomy of state and political economy. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(6), 998-1000.
- Beeson, M. (2003) Sovereignty under globalisation and southeast siege: The state in southeast Asia. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(2), 357-374.
- Bush, R. (2008). Africa and globalisation. *Leeds African Studies Bulletin*. Retrieved from: <https://lucas.leeds.ac.uk/article/africa-and-globalisation-ray-bush/>
- Chase-Dunn, C. (1999). Globalisation: A world systems perspective. *Journal of World Systems Research*, 2, 187-215.
- Chaturvedi, I. (2012) Globalization and its impact on state sovereignty. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/46e2/b9ff7b8adbc31b62a7f406d8ca5605a8a22c.pdf>
- Ejikeme, J. N., & Ugwueze, M. I. (2014). New states in world politics: Prospects and challenges. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 19(10), 01-11
- Goldstein, J. S. (2003). *International Relations* (Fifth Edition). Delhi: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Held, D. (2003). The changing structure of international law: sovereignty transformed? In Held and McGrew. *The changing structure of international law*, 162-174
- Held, D., (1997.), *Demokratija i globalni poredak, Od moderne države ka kosmopolitskoj vladavini*, Beograd, Filip Višnjić
- Ibrahim, K. M. & Ainuddin, I. L. A. (2017). The impact of globalization on African culture and politics. *Journal of International Studies*, 13, 1-14.
- International Monetary Fund (2002). Globalisation: Threat or Opportunity? Retrieved from <http://imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm>
- Jotia, A. L. (2011). Globalization and the nation-state: Sovereignty and state welfare in jeopardy. *US-China Education Review* 2, 243-250.
- Kegley, C. W. (2007). *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Kingsbury, B., (1998.), Sovereignty and inequality. *European Journal of International Law*, 9, 599-625
- Leander, A (2004). Globalisation and the State monopoly on the legitimate use of force. *Political Science Publications*, 2004(7).
- Marsonet, M. (2017). National sovereignty vs. globalization. *Academicus - International Scientific Journal*, 15, 47-57.
- Mazrui, A. A. (2006). *Islam between globalization and counterterrorism*. James Currey: Oxford.
- Meyer, J. W. (1996). The Changing Cultural Content Of The Nation-State: A World Society Perspective. In George Steinmetz (ed.) *New Approaches to the State in the Social Sciences*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Mikail, I. K. & Abdullah, A. I. (2007). The impact of globalization on African culture and politics. *Journal of International Studies*, 13, 1-14

- Mikail, I. K. (2011). Impact assessment of brain drain on health workers in Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital (ABUTH), Zaria. *Nigeria Educational Forum Journal of the Institute of Education, Special Edition*, 1(1), 35-47.
- Modelski, G. (2007). *Globalization as Evolutionary Process* Routledge.
- Mostert, J. (2003) The impact of globalisation on developing countries. *A paper delivered at the ESSA conference*, 17–19 September 2003 (9). 1–35.
- Odel, N. M., (2016). Gains and Risks of Financial and Economic Globalization for Developing Countries, particularly on a unique poor country as a case study. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(2), 134-139
- Oji, E. A & Ozioko, M.V.C., (2011). Effect of globalization on sovereignty of states. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 2. 256-270.
- Okoli, N. J. (2012). Effects of globalization on education in Africa 1983-2008. *Academic Research International*, 2(1), 10-18.
- Omagu, D. O. (2012). State, politics, and globalisation. *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria*, 21, 70-98.
- Onuoha, J. (2004). Globalization, the State and the Challenges of Unemployment in Nigeria. In J. Onuoha and P.U. Okpoko (eds.) *Ethnic Nationalism and Democratic Consolidation: Perspectives from Nigeria and the United States of America*. Nsukka: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd. 381-391.
- Purdă, N. (2012). Aspects on the international legal personality of international organizations. *Challenges of the Knowledge Society. Legal sciences* 891-900
- Raustiala, K., (2003.), Rethinking the sovereignty debate in international economic law. *Journal of International Economic Law, Oxford University Press*, 6(4), 841-878.
- Scott, R. (n.d). The Politics of New States. Retrieved from: http://www.vanuatu.usp.ac.fj/courses/LA332_Jurisprudence/Articles/Scott.htm.
- Simonovic, I. (2000). State Sovereignty and Globalization: Are Some States More Equal? *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*. 28(3)
- Sivakumar, N. & Baskaran, S. (2014). Globalization and nation state. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 2(8), 81-88
- Tar, U. (1999). Theories of development and under development (Unpublished Lecture Notes). for Undergraduate Students at University of Maiduguri, Nigeria.
- United Nations Committee for Development Policy (2021). List of Least Developed Countries (as of 24 November 2021). Retrieved from: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/publication/ldc_list.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwiJxqXZyPT0AhVGXhoKHcPOD8wQFnoECDUQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1Vo5Jwcv7ATJ-x7FdYw-l4
- Wall, k. (2012). The end of the welfare state? How globalization is affecting state sovereignty. *Global Policy*. Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/17/08/2012/end-welfare-state-how-globalization-affecting-state-sovereignty>