

***Reviewing the concept
of sovereignty in light of the new forms of the state***

Hezouat Radia *

University of Jijel-Mohamed Seddik Benyahia -Algeria-

hezouat@univ-jijel.dz

Submission date : 15/10/2024 Acceptance date : 05/12/2024 Publication date: 31/12/2024

Abstract:

The principle of sovereignty is surrounded today by a lot of skepticism by advocates of globalization, regarding its legal ability to confront the challenges facing the state, which force it to accept cases of sharing and participation in tasks, functions, and goals with other non-state actors, which makes this principle subject to a normative review of its pillars, and the limits of its connection to the Westphalian nation-state. A careful study of the nature of the change occurring to the principle of sovereignty indicates that the impact on it first passes through the changes that occurred in the nation-state, which moved away in its structure, relations, and values from the Westphalian model. When the state becomes liberal and coexists with the international community, it is bound by the obligations and treaties imposed, and when it deviates from international legal standards, it is exposed to transgression or direct intervention. Therefore, instead of judging sovereignty as final and disappearing in light of the practices of modern states, we must have sovereignty based on sharing responsibilities and functions to preserve survival and continuity.

key words: Globalization, Sovereignty, Decline of Sovereignty, End of Sovereignty, New Sovereignty.

Introduction:

Behind the escalation of the proposal calling for the transcendence, decline and collapse of sovereignty, and in light of the huge number of studies that have dropped the validity of the principle of sovereignty, and the possibility of working with it today in light of what globalization has changed, the question is being asked about who possesses sovereignty today: the state, the market or international institutions. But the discussion about who possesses sovereignty is a partial and advanced discussion, and the answer to it is analytically superficial because sovereignty today is undergoing a profound change, even if it is still in the process of formation, it has made great strides and moved away from the content it took as a result of the Treaty of Westphalia. Before asking about the possessor of sovereignty in a globalized world, we must ask about the meaning of

* Corresponding Author

sovereignty in today's world, and how can an actor, regardless of his type, gain sovereignty? Is it by insisting on fulfilling its traditional characteristics or by the actor learning which aspects of sovereignty he can embody given the limits of his capabilities?

This change and development are considered a reasonable response to the logic of globalization, unique to some concepts that have proven their resistance to the chances of their extinction. Re-reading and reviewing the concept of sovereignty imposes itself strongly in relation to political necessities that lead us to question the legitimacy of new local and international actors, and the extent of their entitlement to practice and possess this principle, or is it merely scientific endeavors and research that raise this problem due to what they found of a conflict between the characteristics of traditional sovereignty and what the reality of sovereignty has become in the era of globalization? It is difficult to reconcile the idea of the possibility of dividing or sharing sovereignty according to its characteristic based on its "indivisibility", and this has constituted a major obstacle in understanding and realizing the meaning that sovereignty has come to today at a time when states are voluntarily handing over some of their functions to new actors. At the international level, sovereignty also faces a major challenge in various fields and issues in which equality in sovereignty between states is a red line and a strong criterion to curb the ambitions of states when it comes to justifying some practices such as military intervention, humanitarian intervention, and what the requirements of democracy and sustainable development impose. The more international recognition and acknowledgement of these rights increases, the more emphasis there will be on non-state bodies and actors that tend to form a global community parallel to the world of states, capable of organizing power and possessing sovereignty supported by the power and superiority of international law over local law.

On the other hand, many forms of local authority emerge, such as terrorist groups, pressure and interests groups, powerful people, rebels, electronic and criminal networks, and finally market power relations, especially those that support and rely on external sources to help them impose their control. Accordingly, authority has spread in many aspects of society, in institutions, among individuals, and in areas that are sometimes hidden.

Therefore, how can we develop a new concept of sovereignty that enables us to explain this spread that has occurred at the level of political authority among a group of actors?

First chapter: The traditional concept of sovereignty

Before explaining the traditional concept of sovereignty, it must be noted that although the latter was recognized in international relations in conjunction with the emergence of nation-states following the Treaty of Westphalia, we cannot deny the fact that the pre-Westphalian world was not devoid of sovereignty, but rather there were many forms of organizing political authority in societies. Even if they had connotations similar to the concept of sovereignty, they are more than that a background and a realistic, historical and intellectual parturition that led to the birth of the Westphalian concept and the stability of its constants, starting with the natural and physiocratic interpretations and justifications for political authority, passing through religious theocratic interpretations, and reaching the logical, rational and realistic justifications for assigning authority and rule, which supported the idea of stripping sovereignty and considering it a characteristic to rescue the state from the orbit of absolute monarchy and religious tensions towards establishing a strong system within each state. Hence, Jean Bodin, the French thinker who expressed for the first time in the history of political and legal thought the concept of sovereignty in his book *Six Books on the Republic* 1576, about a new concept of political authority based on abstraction and rationality.

It was not possible to reach this concept without reaching strong states and an international system in which all manifestations of monarchy, theology and feudalism would disappear, towards an effective support that imposes itself with the unity of international legitimacy (complete separation between religion and politics). Only here did the size of nation states begin to increase and be supported by the idea of public things, which made sovereignty a space for general agreement between the ruler and the ruled, linked to the state as an institution with a public interest that cannot be competed with or discussed.¹

From the momentum of these signs, the general concept of sovereignty became clear, and its basic rules were formed, which were followed by the modern international system based on sovereign states as effective units based on a fixed principle that has become clearer and more distinct on the internal and external levels, and with the establishment of some elements that make the state established and the principle of sovereignty stable. These elements are:²

- 1- Territorial field: The existence of a specific and declared geographical territory that constitutes a physical space for the exercise of sovereignty.
- 2- The establishment of an official state on this territory with a government

that enjoys full legal and political authority.

3- The absolute and supreme authority of the state within its territory, so no authority is above it and no actor shares in governance.

4- Mutual recognition by its counterparts in the international community of the sovereignty of this entity and its official equality with other entities, whereby an international system is established that includes sovereign states that enjoy the characteristics that we know today. From here, the nation-state was established as a single institution with an undisputed right of authority within its specific and known territory, relying on similar recognitions among all states of each other's sovereignty.

If sovereignty expresses the will of the state and its citizens and translates their desire to organize their affairs and settle down by adhering to and rallying around this principle, then it is logical that this sovereignty should be:

A- Permanent: meaning fixed and stable as long as the state exists.

B- Inalienable: Not negotiable by another body as long as it expresses a general will, it cannot be subjected to any party, regardless of its status, and if that happens, the people have expressed the disintegration of their will and entity.

C- Indivisible: This idea is linked to the previous one, as the will of the people that they placed in the hands of a unified state is a general and single will that either exists or does not exist. If a society's desire to belong to a specific entity is proven, then this entity is broad enough to include all wills and rights at once.

D- Absolute: As it is embodied in a legal person that needs from the authority inclusiveness and absolute support in order to be able to manage and work above real people, hence the definition of the state as sovereign regional groups or a group of individuals settled in a specific region with a special organization that gives a specific group in it the authority that enjoys command and coercion.

Thus, Westphalia has defined the size of states, their characteristics, capabilities and powers, and beyond that, the elements of their recognition in the international community, which are:

Territory/ where feudalisms and empires were replaced by states with defined features and borders.

People/ where it defined the legal population belonging to each territory.

Governments/ represented by the people who represent the will of the people and apply the law inside and outside the state.

Sovereignty/ is the criterion that gives the state and the rest of the elements

legitimacy in practice, and from there, sovereignty was a characteristic attached to the state as a political entity and linked to it in existence and nonexistence, as it is a characteristic of political authority, thanks to which the authority within the state can take on the actual sovereign meaning (there are authorities or states that have authority that is not sovereign, including states under guardianship or occupied states, in which authority exists and sovereignty is absent).

According to the aforementioned characteristics, sovereignty establishes for the state legal and political effects by virtue of which states gain all rights recognized at the international level, from concluding international treaties and resorting to international arbitration and judiciary and to the right to dispose of internal property and wealth without the ability to overstep the sovereignty of other states, in accordance with the principle of equality between states and non-interference in the affairs of other states.³

Second chapter: International changes and globalization: What are the necessities that force us to review the principle of sovereignty?

The idea of the state as an independent entity with full sovereignty oscillates between survival and collapse under the pressure of a rampant attack by globalization mechanisms. Instead of discussing the change that has occurred at the level of sovereignty in light of the data of globalization, which works to unify and globalize the values of consumption, economy, legal and rights systems, simplicity and facilitation of understanding pass through examining the changes that have occurred in the nation-state to which this principle is linked in order to be able to extract the sources of globalization's influence on it. Every change in the concept of sovereignty will be preceded first by the change that has occurred in the nature of the state itself. If we accept that the impact of globalization is an inevitable reality, it is true that it has affected certain aspects, but not all the changes that have occurred in sovereignty are a direct impact of globalization. There are cases of direct encroachment on sovereignty and the state without going through the mechanisms of globalization.

1/ The liberal state model: Most countries in the world headed directly after the end of World War II towards a path to reorganize their situations, based on building the economy in the first place. During the Cold War, two economic strategies competed: capitalism and socialism. The superiority of the United States of America and its allies had a clear impact on the formulation and financing of international political and economic institutions and structures, employing liberal policies based on supporting the free market and the tendency towards liberation from state intervention,

and strengthening the role of the global economy. Accordingly, most countries, including former socialists, adopted a set of reforms to be able to keep pace with the strong trend of great development in the levels of international trade, investment and financial markets, such as supporting intellectual property rights, private property, corporate governance and entering into international agreements and treaties. In this regard, David Harvey says: *The neoliberal revolution led to a wave of state privatization. State-owned companies must be dismantled due to the restrictive effects on individuals' freedoms to conduct business. Thus, the market becomes an active and parallel player to the state, as the latter works more and more every day to hand over and distribute some of its functions to market forces that are more efficient in terms of production, marketing and investment.*⁴

The world has thus become the new market. States have begun to accept, learn and distinguish areas that are no longer necessarily within their sphere of competence. In this regard, Ricardo Petrilie says: *We are now witnessing a gradual and increasing separation between a globalized economic authority and a national political authority organized at a strategic level that is not compatible with the global sphere. From this moment on, the state has begun to accept dismantling and rebuilding its form that is compatible with its inability to absorb and manage its functions by itself, giving this part to large companies and international institutions.*

In this context, the state was never asked to give up its sovereignty, but rather to reorganize its areas of sovereignty within the framework of accommodating the sovereignty of other parties working side by side to achieve the public interest of the state. Accordingly, the liberal doctrine adopted by most states today tends to break the regionalism and the long-standing dual relationship between authority and the state. If it is certain that the state still exists and will not disappear, it is certain that today it has become more rational by accepting connections whereby it hands over some of its functions to parties that work with it to manage sovereignty better without giving it up.⁵

What is a problem in this regard is not the issue of sharing powers and roles and allocating the economic aspect to market forces, but rather that these actors, including multinational companies, have begun to aspire to play sensitive roles and exercise, through pressure mechanisms, political tasks that are the exclusive jurisdiction of states, through claims of achieving financial balance or providing the appropriate ground for investment or providing loans.

2/ The failed state: It is another entrance and a form of contemporary states, which, although it is not considered an official or preferred formula for many states, is a reality that we must not ignore, but rather focus on it is important in discussing sovereignty, especially since it has become used today as a justification for interfering in the affairs of states under the pretext of rebuilding them and helping them achieve good governance, due to its the internal conditions resulting from the loss of control over the means of violence and the high rates of administrative and political corruption and security violations on the one hand, and what the term “failed state” itself dictates to the international community in terms of the necessity of intervention to protect citizens on the other hand and to help the state build peace and security.

Regardless of the level of state failure and the criteria for classifying it (weak, collapsed, failed, etc.), in all its forms it expresses a state of loss of control by the central authority over the public order within its borders, if not a loss or inability to guarantee the existence and operation of the public bodies and institutions that preserve the public order.⁶

The current requirements of humanity and the issue of generalizing and globalizing human rights have been one of the legitimate motives and justifications for creating many cases of blatant violation of state sovereignty. This has been embodied on the ground through mechanisms of humanitarian and even preventive intervention by international powers endorsed by the United Nations institutions or some organizations in order to reduce human losses. In these cases, it is claimed that the public interest of the individual (human security) prevails over the supreme and absolute values of the state (sovereignty), which is no longer an obstacle to the strength of human rights principles. It has become acceptable, based on the signing of human rights agreements by states, to expect at any moment the superiority of international standards and humanitarian conditions over their traditional authority, thus giving a new concept of absolute sovereignty that leads to the existence of sovereignty that is responsible before the international community and that is now practiced within the limits of international consensus and convergence regarding the citizen's right and his safety and security. In the face of the state's inability or failure to achieve security in the traditional way of understanding sovereignty, it must today share responsibility in ensuring security for the individual and the human being, and from there the actual realization and empowerment of the establishment of sovereignty.⁷

The problem with this approach is not that sovereignty can take more than one level and be performed in more than one way, but rather the

problem is in the occasion or situation in which the failure of the state is acknowledged and then the failure of sovereignty is confirmed and there is an occasion for intervention. Because of the fluidity and inconstancy of the behavior of those who decide the failure of the state, and the use of more than one face to justify forms of intervention, which hides behind humanity, there are many strategic interests and even reaching the point of abuse and the extermination of human lives.

3/ The imported state: The concept of the imported state refers to a group of countries that have recently achieved independence and construction, and have found themselves, according to the classification criteria and standards of global development, in late ranks. In light of the great increase in the effects of openness, interconnectedness and international entanglement, and in the context of pursuing and keeping pace with the levels of contemporary development and progress, these countries, believing that it is a gain in time and benefiting from the expertise and experiences of their predecessors, have taken to quoting and transferring ready-made models in all technological, economic and administrative sectors and even their political systems.

One of the important paradoxes in this regard is that the state was originally built due to internal factors and natural development that led it to follow a certain approach compatible with the orientations of its citizens, while the construction and establishment of these states came based on a process or decision to import models in a superficial manner and with all the divergence or contradiction in values, cultures, principles and goals that they entail, and without taking into account the extent of the reception, assimilation and learning of peoples and governments of this amount of sudden change in very short periods of time compared to the construction processes that took centuries in developed countries, during which peoples learned what serves their interests and what is compatible with the limits of their capabilities and ambitions. While the leaders or ruling elite in the importing countries learned the processes of imitating the old colonies that continued to influence political and economic developments.⁸

As a result of these operations, unequal relations and a state of dependency emerged in which the process of personalizing power ensures submission and complete imitation of the dictates of the model state, employing repression instead of legitimacy to ensure the survival and continuity of such clientelist systems.⁹

WALLERSTEIN argued that the strategy of tyranny accompanied by control has generated the emergence of dysfunctional states due to the

violation of their independence. They have obtained formal independence, the features of which have been entrenched by other means because they are:

- Plundered of wealth by virtue of their financing of unequal international development.

- Structurally backward: it is not certain to trust the process of free delivery of models that have claimed lives, destroyed cities, and taken centuries to be ready, and then presented to these states without guaranteeing the continuity of the developmental difference that destroys the dominant party.

- These imported states remain bound to accomplish functions dictated to them by the supporting states.¹⁰

The combination of all these factors has led to a complete separation and a major rift between the state and society. More dangerous than this is the emergence of societies whose cultures do not conform to the Westernized systematic structures that contain them. This has turned into a major deficit in their citizenship, fragility in their legitimacy, and weakness in their political ability to contain national identities. Here, the principle of sovereignty appears helpless in the face of one of its main characteristics (original and permanent), and the question about the reality of the principle of sovereignty is strongly confirmed: has it come to organize the ruling authority or the ruled authority?

4/ The State in the International Community: The state has long controlled a wide range of jurisdictions, but today it is subject to a process of continuous and strong reduction of environmental, economic and human rights issues. The nature of these issues has proven the ineffectiveness of the individual approach of states in managing them, which required unifying efforts, pooling resources and strategies, and combining political wills to be able to achieve them effectively and efficiently.

With the increase in cooperation on these issues and tasks (such as epidemics, inflation, terrorism, global warming, etc.), states have become more connected to multilateral agreements and international institutions, whereby states are prepared to make concessions and bear some violations in order to perform the tasks arising from the issues raised, each according to its jurisdiction (civil society, state, companies, international community, etc.).

In this context, states that traditionally adhered to the principle of absolute sovereignty as a means of organizing authority internally and controlling chaos between states had to re-separate the sovereign areas that fall within their jurisdiction from the sovereign areas required by

collective action and external relations that achieve international security and peace. This was clearly shown in:¹¹

- The adaptation processes carried out by states between national legislation and international conventions in a manner consistent with ensuring the possibility of implementing the latter.

- Acceptance of monitoring processes for the status of human rights.

In the presence of international law and multilateral agreements, the submission of states to their rules does not express the elimination of sovereignty as much as it is a rearrangement and definition of the scope of their jurisdiction. States remain masters of themselves, but by virtue of their existence in an international legal community, they work to amend and adapt the requirements of their survival to international law that guarantees their legitimacy and the continuation of their connection to the international community. Rather, they have become convinced that what they previously rejected as an infringement of their sovereignty and interference in their internal affairs has become acceptable and even required within the framework of international collective action.¹² Thus, the theory of absolute sovereignty of the state becomes incompatible with the establishment of an international security system, except by amending it through the concept of **relative sovereignty** at the international level, where sovereign areas are shared between the state and the international community with the establishment of binding rules and controls for all parties that guarantee their sovereignty at the limits of international sovereignty.

Third chapter: Sovereignty from a modern realistic perspective

The models that have been presented that the state has come to in the context of globalization suggest to us that the sovereignty of the state is being penetrated and collapsed even within the strongest states due to technical development and economic interconnectedness. This acceptance will either settle the research into the fate of the concept and condemn it to extinction and disappearance, or on the contrary, it will develop our research and scrutiny of the reality of the concept in order to extract the source of its survival and the reason for its strength in the face of the theoretical and practical conflicts it has been exposed to, especially in the era of globalization, and the developments taking place at the level of the nation-state, the traditional body entrusted with this concept.¹³

What is emphasized is that the state as a traditional actor used to absorb and contain all dynamics within a framework of possible regionalism, while globalization imposed on the nation-state a network of

relations, issues and legal charters with a global dimension, which allowed for a clear decline in sovereignty in the absolute sense. It even became illogical to adhere more to the spirit of this concept, which became devoid of its traditional content, and even unrealistic when the state that represented it strongly adapted the requirements of its survival in an international community closely interconnected by interests, agreements and media outlets beyond all limits of privacy. Accordingly, the state finds itself today either forced or willing to give up part of its sovereignty in accordance with its economic and legal obligations, without depriving it of its legal right to possess sovereignty.

If sovereignty appeared as an expression of a certain authoritarian status that was valid at a certain time, and it was merely a local conception confined to one form of political organization, which is the nation-state, then sovereignty today has broad and multiple aspects of practice, and none of these aspects is stable and fixed. The content of sovereignty is changing and moving more towards reducing the sovereignty of the state without its final disappearance and the participation of parties alongside the state in managing the modern functions of the state.¹⁴

The variables that globalization has introduced to the state have had direct effects on the borders and scope of its control in many issues, and on many national geographical areas, but on the one hand it still monopolizes the right to determine the scope of the area that it is subject to and the scope of the area that it wishes to share with one of the active parties, and this is due to its acceptance and the extent of the delegation of some of its functions. Therefore, the state today is reviewing the borders of its sovereignty and reorganizing the borders of its authority in a way that enables it to survive and perform functions more effectively, quickly and efficiently. This separation between areas has become necessary and required today in light of the complexity of sectors, the doubling of the population and the exit of some issues from the regional control of the state, where the functions of the state are constantly determined and changed to suit the form of the state.¹⁵

In fact, sovereignty has not been abandoned or excluded, but rather it has been re-established and organized on new foundations in which the state is not unique in possessing sovereignty, but rather shares with some actors in managing sovereignty. This organization is done by highlighting the shortcomings raised by adherence to the Westphalian concept as follows:

First: If the traditional concept of sovereignty referred to it as one specific idea, which is the supreme and absolute authority of the state, and

if we accept this concept today, then we confirm the illegitimacy and illegality of many official and recognized local and international actors, and this dilemma requires accepting the sovereignty of some parties, but without denying it to the state as a political actor that decides when to give the decision to share the sovereign right, then the nature of international relations today refers to the existence of two levels of exercising political authority: The level of the sovereign state: It imposes traditional natural authority relations that it exercises over its territories, with the existence of a basis for international action in which the international community imposes an authority that surpasses local authorities in some cases.¹⁶

In light of this clear division in the levels of political authority, the central question becomes related to the nature of the entity concerned with sovereignty in the world in which we live today? In this context, two main hypotheses appear that compete fiercely in contemporary studies on the concept of sovereignty: First: It is illogical to adhere to the centrality of the state as the sole legitimate actor of political authority in a world teeming with formal and informal actors, where it is challenged by new authoritarian groups in society such as multinational corporations and terrorist groups... and other actors that have proven and played a significant role in local dynamics and international issues. Accordingly, the single path of sovereignty is heading towards the possibility of dividing it and sharing it with a number of actors, within the framework of reviewing a characteristic of the Westphalian concept of sovereignty, as it is **one and indivisible**. Therefore, in today's world, instead of emphasizing the unity of sovereignty, one should be convinced to abandon some of its characteristics that are not appropriate for its application to the current reality, not abandoning itself.

According to a second opinion, it is likely that the sovereign state will remain a powerful source of authority in society, and that talk about these emerging actors is nothing more than a temporary historical phase that will disappear with the disappearance of the mechanisms that enabled these actors to influence some of the course of political life. The state will remain the main official, integrated entity that possesses the internal and external legitimacy and power that enables it to control the borders and authority of the remaining actors, proving their eligibility to exercise sovereignty in the manner they want.

Second: The superficial understanding of sovereignty as the state's authority to decide what it wants internally and externally will lead to clashes and conflicts between sovereign states, based on the absolute

freedom of each one of them. But history always proves that there is international law, even in cases of war, that regulates and limits the actions and chaos of the complete absence of restrictions internally and externally. A deeper understanding of the issue of a state's sovereignty means that in its exercise of sovereignty, it is independent of all authorities except with regard to legitimate and internationally accepted obligations and practices.¹⁷ This is considered a necessity that prompts us to distinguish between national sovereignty and international legal sovereignty, which removes the problem that occurs with regard to the case of the convergence of sovereignties and wills at the international level. States' acceptance of the provisions of international agreements and even their undertaking of local procedures to conform to what international law dictates is not a derogation of their sovereignty, but rather an exercise of their full sovereignty within the limits of their equality with other states in sovereignty. If national sovereignty regulates authority within the state's territory, then legal sovereignty regulates national sovereignties at the international level.¹⁸

In summary, in light of the ongoing debate about the disappearance and decline of the concept of sovereignty, based on the superficial understanding that is linked to its emergence in order to organize authority within the borders of the state, and taking sovereignty as an absolute and fixed concept, and through a deep examination of the nature of the change that has occurred, we inevitably assert the following:

- It is certain that there is a change in the concept of sovereignty from a practical standpoint. If this concept, during its emergence, came to organize the supreme authority and entrust it to the state, then it is necessary to warn and point to it as Westphalian sovereignty, that is, the sovereignty that expressed the state's uniqueness in practicing it, and that what is happening today is the presence of new and recognized actors searching for a field for sovereignty in order to be able to control, and it is more accurate to say that sovereignty has declined in the sense of the Westphalian that organized the system of nation-states only, while today sovereignty faces a global system managed by non-state actors.¹⁹

- Certainly, when sovereignty emerged, the state was a simple state that controlled all areas within its borders, but today the state faces a number of issues, problems and concerns with an international dimension, which are considered an expressive image of local problems that must be controlled by a higher authority that manages them, and possesses in itself an aspect of sovereignty through which it can manage and impose order and commitment between the competing sovereignties at the international

level. Here, instead of talking about sovereignty as a pure property of the state, it must be understood as a way to manage the possible aspects of authority in society in a way that serves the public interest, and it is an institution in which all states and actors participate to become a concept capable of continuity and organizing politics suitable for all conditions and times.

- The studies that deny sovereignty over the nation-state today, have focused on sovereignty as the state's control over all aspects of economic, political and technical life. Indeed, if we look at it from this perspective, the state today is withdrawing from many areas, but in return we must understand sovereignty not by measuring the degree of control and domination of the state, but by its ability to exercise its authority in deciding and implementing its choices.

- On the other hand, in many cases, it cannot be denied that there is a direct and explicit violation of the sovereignty of some countries, where the authority to decide, control the field, and independence in choosing directions is absent. This is the case of the colonized state and the regions that did not gain independence, and even in some countries where foreign intervention takes place without their desire or ability to resist. Only here can we talk about the end and disappearance of the sovereignty of some countries without generalizing the judgment on the political and abstract concept of sovereignty. Regardless of the size and number of violations against some countries, others still recognize them, respect them, and work with them.²⁰

Conclusion

The presented review of the concept of sovereignty shows that globalization did not have a direct impact on the concept of sovereignty in light of this huge momentum of studies that confirm the influence of sovereignty on globalization or its disappearance and demise, but globalization first affected the state by changing its functions and position within an international community that globalization increased its interconnectedness, connection and overlap, and generated major common issues and problems that require organizing this interconnectedness through many mechanisms such as institutions and agreements.

The discussion about the validity of the concept of sovereignty and testing the extent of its ability to withstand, and as a result of the accurate re-reading of the term within contemporary political and social changes and contrary to some expectations about its disappearance and decline, the discussions led to proving its strength instead of weakening it, and

increasing its flexibility and ability to adapt. Historical circumstances have proven the change of this concept across time and place, and these changes impose a similar large-scale change at the level of institutions and bodies entrusted with practicing this principle.

Instead of talking about the absolute sovereignty of the state as a single actor, it should be replaced by the concept of shared sovereignty in which the state shares specific aspects of its sovereignty with actors. Instead of considering this the end of its sovereignty, it should be considered a capacity and a point of strength that enabled it to adapt the formula of sovereignty that enabled it to deal with the challenges posed without its exclusion and collapse, and adherence to the Westphalian concept of sovereignty is met by recognition of the internationalization of sovereignty and taking the international side in organizing world politics.

Accordingly, a careful review of the concept proves that it is a strong and flexible concept that was able to modify and mold itself with the challenges it faced, and instead of talking about the end of sovereignty, we must emphasize the renewal of its formula and its ability to adapt without the possibility of its exclusion and end.

Bibliography List:

- 1 Robert Jackson, *sovereignty*, first published, polity press, Cambridge, UK, 2007, PP. 49, 50.
- 2 Daud hassan, "the rise of the territorial state and the treaty of Westphalia "year book, Newzealand, jurisprudence, vol.46, 2006, PP. 62-65.
- 3 Joseph A Camilleri, jim Falk, *the end of sovereignty: the politics of a shrinking and fragmenting world*, Edward Elgar publishing company, usa,1992, P.3
- 4 David Harvey, *Neoliberalism: A Brief History*, trans. Mujab Al-Imam, 1st ed., Riyadh, Al-Obeikan Library, 2008, pp. 109, 110.
- 5 Joseph A Camilleri, Jim Falk, *op. cit*, PP. 78,79
- 6 Charls T Call, "the fallacy of the failed state," *third world quarterly*, vol.29, n.8, 2008, PP. 4-7.
- 7 Luke Glanville, *Sovereignty and the responsibility to protect*, the university of Chicago press, USA,2007, PP. 217, 218.
- 8 Fakhr al-Din Mihoubi, *The Problem of State Building in the Maghreb: A Study in the Development of the Post-Colonial State*, 1st ed., (Alexandria, Al-Wafa Legal Library, 2014), p. 39.
- 9 Bertrand Badie, *The Imported State: Westernization of the Political Quorum*, trans. Shawqi Al-Badawihi, 1st ed., (Beirut: Lebanon, Dar Al-Farabi, 2006), p. 49.
- 10 Bertrand Badie, *op. cit.*, pp. 38, 39.
- 11 Saeed Seddiki, "Human Rights and the Limits of National Sovereignty," *Moroccan Journal of Administration and Local Development*, No. 50, May 2003, p. 83.
- 12 Federico Lenzerini, "Sovereignty revisited: international law and parallel sovereignty of indigenous peoples," *Texas international law journal*, vol .42:155, P.159.

13 Robert Jackson, *op. cit*, P.112.

14 Dieter Grimm, *sovereignty: the origin and future of political and legal concept*, tr: Belinda Cooper, Columbia university press, new york, 2015, P.104.

15 Jens Bartelson, "The Concept of Sovereignty Revisited," *European Journal of International Law*, n.17(2), April 2006, PP. 2.3.

16 Robert Jackson, *op cit*, PP. 112,113.

17 Jens Bartelson, *op. cit*, P.7.

18 Dieter Grimm, *op cit*, P.78.

19 Trydy Jacobsen and all, *re-envisioning sovereignty: the end of Westphalia?*, (UK: edited by Charles Sampford, Ashgate Publishing, 2008), PP.7,8.

20 Thomas Hansen, Finn Stepputat, "Sovereignty Revisited," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35(1), January 2008. P. 13.