The Myth of Sovereignty in the Era of Hyper-Globalisation: Western Fears, Postcolonial Realities

Author(s): Callum Tonkins

The Myth of Sovereignty in the Era of Hyper-Globalisation: Western Fears, Postcolonial Realities
Callum Tonkins

Globalisation has made it necessary to review modernity's paradigms. One such paradigm that may no longer be an accurate descriptor (if it ever was) of international society is that of the sovereign nation-state.

Through an exploration of both the western nation-state and the space collectively referred to as 'postcolony', two different experiences of globalisation are exhibited, each with different power manifestations. For the former, globalisation has challenged both internal and external legitimacy, which as in turn led to perceptions of a loss of sovereignty. However, the loss of sovereignty does not imply the loss of power; sovereign power has morphed into biopower, with power remaining within that space. In contrast, the postcolony's historical relationship with sovereignty is one of negation- the *denial* of it. Globalisation thus threatens not the specific manifestation of power in sovereignty, but rather the *continued subordination* to *western sovereignty*. This has occurred due to a continuation of the 'state of exception' and socioeconomic hegemony.

The piece does not, however, claim to be a definitive analysis of power, sovereign or otherwise, under globalisation. Such an inquiry would be a much greater project that went beyond the two broad categories west/postcolony, looking at specific national contexts: 'reali*ties*' rather than 'reali*ty*', accounting for the heterogeneity of both the forms and experiences of colonialism. It is a map of the terrain, and like any map is pitched at the level of generalisation.

Introduction

Modernity saw the rise of a variety of paradigms that would dominate the socio-political terrain. One such paradigm was the nation-state, under which there was an inextricable link between *sovereignty* and *power*. Yet, this paradigm must be re-evaluated following present-day developments, particularly globalisation under deregulation.

For certainty, this paradigm is far from universal. Historically localised to the west, context is essential for carrying out a nuanced investigation. Globalisation's impact will be measured from two angles: the western nation-state, where sovereign power has been the traditional form of power, and the postcolony. Historically placed beyond sovereignty, the postcolony has in turn been defined through a *negation* of power, and *subjugation*. To neglect this would give an incomplete account of globalisation's impact upon the realities of power.

The binary I have constructed between the 'west' and 'postcolony' may appear problematic due the breadth of these categories which risk ignoring the heterogeneity of colonial forms and experience. Indeed, many countries now considered 'western' have been subjected to a 'colonial matrix of power'.[1] To counter this risk some clarifications needed to ensure against ignorance of 'extraordinary diversity of subjective positions, social experiences and cultural identities'.[2] The two categories I have selected are *ideal types*. Ideal types are 'not a *description* of reality…[but rather are] formed by the one-sided *accentuation* of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many…*concrete individual* phenomena'.[3] They operate as means to description, rather than as description itself.[4]

Here, the western nation-state is defined via its close association with sovereignty and power. The postcolony in turn has its accentuated trait as negation of this power. It is these two models that will form the basis of analysis for the impact of globalisation upon nation-state sovereignty, and more fundamentally distributions of power.

Structure

The west will be considered first. The paradigm of state-sovereignty-constitution as closely bound will be expounded, noting the importance

---

1   Epp Annus, *Soviet Postcolonial Studies* (Routledge 2018) 14.
2   Stuart Hall, 'New Ethnicities' in Morley and Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Routledge 1996) 443.
3   Max Weber, *Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Free Press 1949) 90. Indeed, Weber points out the very concept of the state is itself an ideal type; 99.
4   Ibid., 92.

of *legitimacy* and *borders/territory* to this. The metamorphosis of power in the twentieth-century as asserted by Foucault will then be explored, allowing for a better idea of power's reality today. Economic and political globalisation pose challenges to this traditional understanding; however, its consequences should not be overstated, as sovereign power is now only one part of a wider constellation alongside disciplinary power and governmentality. Power remains in the west, albeit in a new form.

The postcolony will then be turned to. These territories were not privy to the states-system of classical social theory, thus their exclusion from power becomes the focus: sovereignty unravels. The continued negation of power shows that it continues to be found within the occident despite formal decolonisation. The sovereignty of these nations is *formal* and not *substantive*. Overall, perpetuation of the 'state of exception' and hegemony mean globalisation does not threaten to introduce new problems, merely to perpetuate the old.

Part I – Globalisation and the West
Sovereignty in Modernity

To give an account of the rise of sovereignty without the state would be incomplete and vice-versa; furthermore, if one does not account for the context of modernity, one will not grasp its historical specificity. 'Modernity' here is that period which lasted from 1648 until the beginning the First World War: the 'Westphalian' period. The eponymous treaty that inaugurated this period developed a 'language and logic of rule and statecraft''.[5] It is the starting point here.

'Sovereignty expresses the basic features of the state', and the two are 'entirely inseparable'.[6] Indeed, 'State formation became the dominant theme of the era, and sovereignty the desideratum of all rulers'.[7] One can add constitutionalism to this, acting as the agent that binds the two. In what follows, this triangle (state-sovereignty-constitution) will

5   Emilios Christodoulidis et al, *Jurisprudence* (3rd edn, Routledge 2018) 18.
6   Martin Loughlin, *The Idea of Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2003) 75.
7   Dieter Grimm, *Sovereignty* (Columbia University Press 2015) 5.

be expanded upon, taking each in turn and analysing their links.

State

There are four unities which demarcate the nation-state: unity of territory, a single fiscal system, a national language, and a unified legal system.[8] Additionally, the state is seen as deliberately *posited*, and maintaining *functional specificity* with an 'imputation of a teleological basis'.[9] This specificity is usually the need for a 'modus vivendi' achieved via the imposition of universal commands.[10] The state comes to be rather complex and must act in aid 'of a plurality of coordinated tasks', however cannot do so ad-hoc.[11] This institutional arrangement has sovereignty as its animus.

Sovereignty

In modernity, 'the state…reserves to itself the business of rule'.[12] It thus wields a vast amount of *power*. Sovereign power is the distinctively modern form of this power. From the Seventeenth-century onwards, it 'featured as the central element of how unified state power is exercised'.[13] Loughlin lays out several tenets of sovereignty, of which the following will be focussed upon: as facet of the modern state; public power as product of political power; and its relational nature. First, the key to modern sovereignty is the centralisation of the state, as for centralisation to occur and authority to be legitimated, a new way of utilising law as an instrument of command was necessary.[14] Second, the public power of the sovereign derives from the *political* relationship between it and subject. The power of the sovereign is legitimated through allegiance; it is not unilateral.[15] Closely connected is relationality: 'sovereignty constitutes the essence of the modern state'; the political relationship of sovereign and subject informs the

---

8   Gianfranco Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State* (Hutchinson 1978) 93.

9   Ibid., 96.

10   Ibid., 97.

11   Ibid., 98.

12   Ibid., 1.

13   Christodoulidis (n 5) 17.

14   Loughlin (n 6) 73-75.

15   Ibid., 81-82.

administrator's capacity.[16]

'The conception of sovereignty…operates in the realm of imagination and ideas'.[17] Accordingly, it is related to theories of social contract and subjects ceding authority to the sovereign.[18] Consequently, the role of *authority* and *legitimacy* become of central concern. Finally, sovereignty is *internal* and *external*. Internal is concerned the vertical relationship between state and citizen. Legitimacy is of central importance here.[19] In contrast, external sovereignty's primary concern is *territory/border*. The state is necessarily surrounded by other states in tension.[20] Classical international law was 'essentially designed on the basis of internal sovereignty and built a protective barrier around it'.[21]

Legitimacy and Constitutionalism

Legitimacy is necessary for the commands of the state to be binding. Here, legitimation is provided for via general laws. This is the departure point from the standestaat.[22] Drawing upon Weber's idea of legal-rational legitimacy, Poggi identified the need for depersonalisation and legal circumscription in the exercise of power.[23] In the nation-state, this requirement is fulfilled via constitutionalism, allowing 'comprehensive regulation of public authority'.[24] The constitution should not be mistaken as the source of sovereignty; it exists *beyond* the constitution.[25] Put summarily 'the democratic constitutional state… is a political order created by the people themselves and legitimated by their opinion'.[26]

16   Ibid., 83-94.
17   Grimm (n 7) 8.
18   Gurminder K Bhambra & John Holmwood, *Colonialism and Modern Social Theory* (Polity 2021) ch1.
19   Poggi (n 8) 92-95; 101.
20   Ibid., 87-92.
21   Grimm (n 7) 80.
22   Roberto Unger, *Law in Modern Society* (Free Press 1976) 176; 179-181.
23   Poggi (n 8) 101-104.
24   Grimm (n 7) 68.
25   Ibid., 73.
26   Jurgen Habermas, 'The Postnational Constellation and the Future of Democracy' in Max Pensky (ed), *The Postnational Constellation* (Polity 2001) 65.

The Metamorphosis of Power in the Twentieth-Century

One must remember that the Westphalian model is entrenched in a particular historical context, one far removed for the present day. Though a controversial label, post-modernity appears to be the context of the present, bringing with it new challenges to the conceptualisation of power. Foucault argued sovereign power had declined since the early-modern period and become part of a wider system. Power 'which can no longer be formulated in terms of sovereignty, is… one of the great inventions of bourgeois society', as the reality is that power is constituted in 'a myriad of bodies which are constituted as peripheral subjects.[27] Despite this, sovereignty is still seen as definitive, concealing reality.[28] Account must be taken of this transformation to properly gauge globalisation's impact.

Sovereign power was *deductive*, dealing with the right to kill; in contrast, power is now also *generative*, acting 'over life'.[29] One pole of this biopower is the '*anatamo-politics of the human body*' (discipline), the other 'biopolitics of population' (governmentality).[30] Now the deployment of power increasingly orbits the 'norm', 'no longer a matter of bringing death into play…but of distributing the living'.[31] Sovereign power is not gone completely, however- 'one has a triangle, sovereignty-discipline-government'.[32] The three reinforce one another.[33]

This can be applied to the analysis of nation-state sovereignty; 'the state is…the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities', given it has the power to (re)define its ambit.[34] Thus, 'the survival and

---

27   Michel Foucault, 'Two Lectures' in Gordon (ed), *Power/Knowledge* (Pantheon 1980) 102-103.
28   Ibid., 105.
29   Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* vol.1 (First Published 1976, Penguin 2020) 136.
30   Ibid., 139.
31   Ibid., 144.
32   Michel Foucault, 'Governmentality' in Faubion (ed) *Power* (Penguin 2020) 219.
33   Carol Smart, *Feminism and the Power of Law* (Routledge 1989) 162.
34   Ibid.

limits of the state should be understood on the basis of the general tactics of governmentality'.[35] It calls for a reformulation of how we account for power, with sovereignty only being one star in the constellation.[36] It really must be stressed, however, that sovereign power has not been lost to the ages; rather, its significance has diminished, and now makes up only one part of a broader reality. It must be recognised that, even if globalisation does further limit sovereign power, it does not necessarily signal the death of the nation-state nor the power that inheres within it.

Globalisation's Impact on Sovereign Power

A new degree of connectivity can be seen as emerging following the Second World War, particularly in relation to the increasingly merged spheres of politics and economics. The fundamental question is whether these changes signal mere intensification or 'a more fundamental rupture with the past'.[37] This section aims to clarify the impact of these changes upon the notion of nation-state sovereignty, and whether globalisation, understood this way, marks a paradigmatic shift.

Politically, globalisation has 'erode[d] the distinction between foreign and domestic affairs'.[38] There has been an 'intensification of political interconnectedness' whereby global regulation and policy is possible. Here, borders have become less important in demarcating the political space.[39] Economically, one can divide the post-war period into the 'Bretton Woods' period and 'deregulation'.[40] The first, referred to as the 'golden age of controlled capitalism',[41] allowed for state regulation of cross-border capital movement. The latter, however, saw the emergence of neoliberalism, bringing in a tsunami of deregulation.

35   Foucault (n 32) 219.
36   Loughlin (n 6) 96-97.
37   Christodoulidis et al (n 5) 101.
38   Anthony McGrew, 'Politics as Distorted Global Politics' in Adrian Leftwich (ed), *What is Politics?* (Polity 2004) 166.
39   Ibid., 167-170.
40   Manfred B Steger, *Globalization* (6th edn, Oxford University Press 2023) 41-45.
41   Ibid.

This period has seen the growth of the transnational corporation as an ever-more powerful institutional. It enters the political arena when governments fear corporate relocation.[42] The two key concerns are, for internal sovereignty, *legitimacy*; for external sovereignty, control of *borders/territory*.

Challenging Legitimacy

Legitimacy comes to be threatened particularly by economic globalisation. Habermas argues legitimation is only possible where the welfare state provides 'appropriate allocation and a fair distribution of rights' to address the material imbalances of power caused by capitalism.[43] Consequently, policy initiatives play a major role in legitimation. However, deregulation has meant 'national governments steadily lose their capacity to influence economic cycles' due to a shrinking tax-base.[44] This in turn makes policy implementation harder. Crouch argues government becomes seen as an 'institutional idiot, its every ill-informed move being…discounted by smart market actors'.[45] Indeed, economisation begins to influence other subsystems, replacing their internal logic and threatening their functional differentiation and autonomy; 'the reflexivity of the legal and political system is short-circuited back into the market paradigm'.[46] The results are depressing: the subjects of the nation either acquiesce in 'informed abstinence', or they crave 'political charisma'.[47] Both are symptomatic of a lack of legitimacy. This is no theoretical problem; one can see Western leaders increasingly favouring pro-trade tariff nationalists at elections, the site where legitimacy is symbolically granted.

External Sovereignty

Questions of sovereignty also arise because of the increasing delegation of power to supranational institutions in efforts to tackle

---

42   Ibid., 56-61.
43   Habermas (n 26) 77.
44   Ibid.
45   Colin Crouch, *Post-Democracy* (Polity 2004) 41.
46   Emilios Christodoulidis, *The Differentiation and Autonomy of Law* (Cambridge University Press 2023) 42.
47   Habermas (n 26) 80.

developments that cannot be addressed via domestic legislation. This manifests particularly in relation to border control, the hallmark of classical external sovereignty. As issues begin to cut across territories, the Westphalian model struggles to account for them. State autonomy is thus impacted. Whilst somewhat redressable via cooperative measures, the reliance on supranational institutions lead to the emergence of 'legitimation gaps', and a loss of practical sovereignty.[48]

Whilst in theory sovereignty is retained, one must appreciate the qualitative difference this represents compared to the traditional model. Indeed, subjects may treat it as a loss of sovereignty. The subjects of the nation may treat it as a loss of sovereignty, with the UK exemplifying this, first in its withdrawal from the EU, and now with legislation which explicitly states international laws do not apply, attempting to restore external sovereignty.[49]

Assessing the Impact

Comparing the state of sovereignty before and after deregulation, a very different arrangement of power can be seen. Globalisation has challenged both the internal and external sovereignty of the state, reducing legitimacy and leading to perceptions sovereignty no longer resides with the state. Yet this does not necessarily mean power has evaporated. Sovereignty-disciplinarity-governmentality is the arrangement of power in the twentieth century; sovereign power was no longer dominant even before deregulation. The same power still exists, just in other forms. Furthermore, the space in which this metamorphosis has occurred is highly specific: the impacts described only occurs in the west. We must therefore, if we are to fully understand globalisation's impact, consider those territories *beyond* the west: the postcolony and the global south.

---

48   Ibid., 71.

49   Safety of Rwanda (Asylum and Immigration) HC Bill (2023-24) [38] s1(4).

Part II – The Experience of the Postcolony
Decolonising Social Theory

The west makes up only a small proportion of the world, and the power once manifested in sovereignty still inheres in that space. This new constellation is what is material. The impact of globalisation on the postcolony must be assessed. Never having been privy to the occidental states system, the impact on the specifics of sovereignty is less significant than globalisation's impact on their ability to escape power imbalances in general.

At the beginning of the twentieth-century 85% of the world's territory was colony.[50] European social theory arose during the age of empires, yet accounts on the development of the state conspicuously leave out the experience of most of the world. These 'disregarded legacies of colonialism' highlight the Eurocentricity of the paradigm; rather than being merely contingent to the development of the western nation-state, 'colonialism and imperialism are integral'.[51] The colonial experience considered here will be those victim to the European ''scramble for sovereignty' in Asia and Africa', as these offer specific 'histories of domination and resistance' that are particularly pertinent to the current investigation.[52]

The Negation of Sovereignty Under Empire

The localisation of the Westphalian system to Europe 'allowed the exercise of sovereignty over non-European Others as an expression of that sovereignty'.[53] Colonised populations were 'Othered', excluded from the order of power entirely. Inherent in the process of Othering is a violence that constructs the dominant term through *exclusion of the subordinate*.[54] On application to our problematic, the colony

50   Yehouda Shenhav, 'Imperialism, Exceptionalism and the Contemporary World' in Marcelo Svirsky & Simone Bignall (eds), *Agamben and Colonialism* (Edinburgh University Press 2012) 21.
51   Bhambra & Holmwood (n 18) 1-6.
52   Upendra Baxi, 'Postcolonial Legality: A Postscript from India' (2012) 45 Verfassung und Recht in Übersee 178, 178.
53   Bhambra & Holmwood (n 50) 7.
54   Alpana Roy, 'Postcolonial Theory and Law' (2008) 29 ALR 315, 321.

is defined via *lack of sovereignty*. Anghie develops this, suggesting 'mechanisms of exclusion are as essential a part of the sovereignty doctrine as the mechanisms of incorporation'.[55] *The very notion of sovereignty unravels*.

The State of Exception

The notion of the 'state of exception'[56] has gained credence with a host of postcolonial scholars. In the colony, Mbembe proposes the relation of power and authority made it 'in both theory and practice the exact opposite of the liberal model'.[57] Here, 'commandment was based on a regime d'exception- that is, a regime that departed from the common law'.[58] The aim of this was the absolute submission of the colonised population.

Given how sovereignty was never material to actions in the colony, the need for legitimacy provided by universal rules was diminished, and 'ruling was based on…ad-hoc arrangements or exceptions'.[59] To talk of peace in this period is absurd in consideration of its violence, however the construction of the colony as exceptional has marginalised this.[60] Mbembe urges us not to think of the state of exception as being suspension of the norm, rather it is the *continuation* of the norm. The colony 'is…the site par excellence where controls and guarantees of judicial order can be suspended' and represents 'a site in which sovereignty fundamentally consists in exercising power outside the law'.[61]

In view of this, one cannot even talk about sovereign power. What was exhibited was *negation*, with power held exclusively by colonisers. To think this ended with the decolonisation efforts of the 20th century,

55   Antony Anghie, 'The Evolution of International Law: Colonial and Postcolonial Realities' (2006) 27 Third World Quarterly 739, 341.
56   See Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology* (Chicago University Press 2006).
57   Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (California University Press 2001) 25.
58   Ibid., 29.
59   Shenhav (n 50) 23.
60   See Nadine El-Enany, *(B)ordering Britain* (Manchester University Press 2020) 186.
61   Achille Mbembe, *Necropolitics* (Duke University Press 2019) 77.

however, would be a mistake. The mask of formality must be cast away to reveal the substance of power.

Power and the Postcolony

Following the Second World War, a series of decolonisation movements were initiated.[62] Thus emerged the postcolonial nation-state, modelled upon the western paradigm. It is important to analyse the state of power in these allegedly sovereign states, to see whether emancipation actually occurred. Only if it did can the impact of globalisation on these states be considered the same as the west.

Unfortunately, in practice western dominance continues in an unbroken lineage. Despite purportedly being independent, the sovereignty enjoyed by postcolonial nations is not what one could call sovereign *power*; power remains firmly within the west. Subordination is attained via two broad means. One is that the state of exception has not ended. The other is western hegemony, both material and intellectual; materially in economic domination, and intellectually in the inherent occidentalism of the legal doctrines alleged to emancipate the postcolony.

Continuation of the State of Exception

Despite the end of formal colonialism, it has continued via alternative means. The fact European states no longer impose their *sovereign* power on these nations does not matter, as they never needed to in the first place; the very nature of power exerted on the colonies was it was beyond legality altogether.[63] If legality was completely absent from the colonial ventures in the first place, the introduction of the legal status of statehood will not change much.

This is compounded by technological change. Mbembe sketches how each stage of imperialism has taken advantage of certain essential technologies; whilst historically 'sovereignty meant occupation',

---

62   Dane Kennedy, *Decolonisation* (Oxford University Press 2016) 38-45.
63   Shenhav (n 50) 27.

this is no longer necessary.[64] Using Palestine as an example, modern technology has transformed occupation into one of 'vertical sovereignty'.[65] Physical occupation is no longer necessary for power to be exerted. Thus, imperial domination can continue, exerting the same degree of power in a novel way.

Hegemony

Hegemony involves a cultural process where 'practical movement and theoretical thought are united'.[66] Certain ideas become 'popular, mass phenomenon, with a concretely world-wide character, capable of modifying…popular thought'.[67] It creates consent and allows for the perpetuation of dominance of one group over another. In the postcolony there is a 'continuing hegemonic position of western economies'.[68] This has only intensified with globalisation but can be dated back to the decolonisation movement itself. This informs Harvey's idea of 'capitalist imperialism', seeing it as a new form of imperialism. Arguing it is distinctive due to its concealment of 'ambitions in an abstract universalism', money-power comes to dominate cultural production.[69] This coercion is different as it is not based upon coercion or racism.[70]

Whilst Harvey is right to emphasise economic domination, he overemphasises the novelty of such an arrangement. There is little new about it; there is a clear lineage, for example, between UK control of the middle east and the US taking up the mantle following the second world war.[71] This is not to say that the economy is not hegemonic- it absolutely is- however it is a *tool of maintaining* pre-existing subordination. There is an uninterrupted pattern of control

---

64   Mbembe (n 61) 79; see also Gilles Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (1992) 59 October 3.
65   Ibid., 81.
66   Antonio Gramsci, 'Hegemony of Western Culture Over the Whole World Culture' in *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, [5].
67   Ibid [6].
68   Roy (n 54) 320.
69   David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford University Press 2005) 50-55.
70   Ibid., 44-45.
71   Ibid., 19-24.

in the territories affected by this hegemony dating back to the nineteenth-century. The economy is a tool of domination, but not the core. Indeed, Roy reminds us of the need to view neocolonialism as mere continuation of colonial rule, as stopping at the economic as a 'new' imperialism 'does not significantly challenge the concept of economic development as a western idea'.[72] It is the same imperial logic underlying it, and the same imperial power enabling it.

One can also see continuity via the intellectual hegemony that asserts the legal form of the nation-state is necessary for emancipation. Constitutionalism emerged in the west, and despite the appearance of neutrality and universality it has a subtle ideological coding. Schmitt maintained the 'neutralisations and depoliticizations…[under liberalism] are, to be sure, of political significance'.[73] Whilst liberal forms may ostensibly move away from actively distinguishing friend/foe,[74] they perpetuate it in much more discrete ways. For example, 'the political concept of battle in liberal thought becomes competition in the domain of the economic'.[75] It 'cannot escape the logic of the political'.[76]

Applying this to the form of the constitution, and legality more generally, it reproduces a logic of truth that creates a gulf between western legal forms and others that it frames as regressive. Baxi draws upon this through the idea of the imperial project of 'ethical violence' whereby European colonisers embarked upon 'civilising' missions based upon enlightenment reason. Because of this, counterviolence in the form of *insurgent reason* in the postcolony 'may never be regarded as bearing the weight of dignity of the title…'Reason''.[77] This is shown in the narrative of constitutionalism in these territories, which he sees as 'a massive indictment of accomplishments of liberal thought'.[78] Constitutions allow for both rule and resistance- they are not

72 Roy (n 54) 337.
73 Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political* (Chicago University Press 2007) 69.
74 Ibid., 26. This is for Schmitt is the core dichotomy of the political.
75 Ibid., 71-72.
76 Ibid., 79.
77 Baxi, (n 52) 179.
78 Ibid., 181.

inherently colonial, as 'colonialism and constitutionalism were always strangers'.[79] Because of this, the enunciation of a constitution marks a rupture with the past- creative resistance is possible. Unfortunately, whilst not *colonial*, constitutional forms are *colonised*, as the reason and language of law informing these projects 'established…the reach of eclectic mimesis'.[80] Constitutional forms are hegemonic and allow for subtle rule through standards of reason.

Baxi points to the Indian Constitution, which departs in substantial ways from the traditionally western constitutional form[81] - because of this departure, hegemonic reason steps in to label such arrangements as regressive. This is the power of western hegemony in action, excluding non-western thought. Power remains with the west, as the limits of sovereignty are shaped by it.

It is worth stating again sovereign power has declined as the pre-eminent power formation in the west; power is now far more subtle. Therefore, it can be said that the 'gift' of sovereignty to these nations was more performative than substantive when compared to what such a transfer of power would have been a century before. Sovereign power has greatly declined. The west has displaced little.

Conclusions

Taking a properly global survey of the realities of power, the impact of globalisation appears far from uniform. In the west, the seat of power and the birthplace of the sovereign nation-state, globalisation has posed new challenges to this paradigm. Internal sovereignty is threatened by legitimacy-crises generated by economic hyper-globalisation, and external sovereignty is altered by political and social globalisation requiring the delegation of sovereign power to supranational bodies. However, the impact of this on the overall power balance within the nation should not be overstated- now, sovereign power is only one element of a wider structure of sovereignty-disciplinarity-governmentality. Power still very much remains, just in different

79   Ibid.
80   Ibid.
81   Ibid., 189.

forms.

In contrast, the postcolony paints a different picture. Here the effect of globalisation on power more generally is the central concern, given how such territories were never granted access to the Westphalian system. Power continues to remain firmly with the west, representing a lineage that can be traced from today back to the early-modern period. Here, globalisation does not pose a new challenge; the major concern is how it will *perpetuate the negation of power*. Sovereignty has only been formally granted; power has not been substantively given.

Going forward, there is much to explore considering these findings. Recall the identification of 'west' and 'postcolony' as ideal types. Future research ought to take this as merely provisional, investigating specific national contexts, recognising 'realit*ies*' rather than a singular 'realit*y*'. Furthermore, an investigation into the significance of some western attempts to 're-establish' sovereignty in globalisation's wake would be potentially fruitful considering the decline of sovereign power in favour of biopower.

Bibliography

Antony Anghie, 'The Evolution of International Law: Colonial and Postcolonial Realities' (2006) 27 Third World Quarterly 739

Epp Annus, *Soviet Postcolonial Studies* (Routledge 2018)

David Armitage, *Foundations of Modern International Thought* (Cambridge University Press 2013)

Upendra Baxi, 'Postcolonial Legality: A Postscript from India' (2012) 45 Verfassung und Recht in Übersee 178

Gurminder K Bhambra & John Holmwood, *Colonialism and Modern Social Theory* (Polity 2021)

Giuseppe Campesi, *A Genealogy of Public Security* (Routledge 2016)

Emilios Christodoulidis, Marco Goldoni and Scott Veitch, *Jurisprudence* (3rd edn, Routledge 2018)

Emilios Christodoulidis, *The Differentiation and Autonomy of Law* (Cambridge University Press 2023)

Colin Crouch, *Post-Democracy* (Polity 2004)

Dehm, 'International Law at the Border: Refugee Deaths, the Necropolitical State and Sovereign Accountability' in Chalmers and Pahuja (eds), *Routledge Handbook of International Law and the Humanities* (Routledge 2021)

Gilles Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (1992) 59 October 3

Nadine El-Enany, *(B)ordering Britain* (Manchester University Press 2020)

Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* vol.1 (First Published 1976, Penguin 2020)

Michel Foucault, 'Two Lectures' in Gordon (ed), *Power/Knowledge* (Pantheon 1980)

Michel Foucault, 'Governmentality' in Faubion (ed) *Power* (Penguin 2020)

Antonio Gramsci, 'Hegemony of Western Culture Over the Whole World Culture' in *Selections From the Prison Notebooks**[82]

Dieter Grimm, *Sovereignty* (Columbia University Press 2015)

Jurgen Habermas, 'The Postnational Constellation and the Future of Democracy' in Max Pensky (ed), *The Postnational Constellation* (Polity 2001)

Stuart Hall, 'New Ethnicities' in Morley and Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Routledge 1996)

David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford University Press 2005)

Dane Kennedy, *Decolonisation* (Oxford University Press 2016)

Martin Loughlin, *The Idea of Public Law* (Oxford University Press 2003)

Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (California University Press 2001)

Achille Mbembe, *Necropolitics* (Duke University Press 2019)

---

82   * The edition of Gramsci's *Selections from The Prison Notebooks* that I own strangely does not have any publication details within it- this is why this information has not been provided.

Anthony McGrew, 'Politics as Distorted Global Politics' in Adrian Leftwich (ed), *What is Politics?* (Polity 2004)

Gianfranco Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State* (Hutchinson 1978)

Alpana Roy, 'Postcolonial Theory and Law' (2008) 29 ALR 315

Safety of Rwanda (Asylum and Immigration) HC Bill (2023-24)

Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology* (First Published 1922, Chicago University Press 2006)

Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political* (First Published 1932, Chicago University Press 2007)

Yehouda Shenhav, 'Imperialism, Exceptionalism and the Contemporary World' in Marcelo Svirsky & Simone Bignall (eds), *Agamben and Colonialism* (Edinburgh University Press 2012)

Carol Smart, *Feminism and the Power of Law* (Routledge 1989)

Manfred B Steger, *Globalization* (6th edn, Oxford University Press 2023)

Roberto Unger, *Law in Modern Society* (Free Press 1976)

Max Weber, *Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Free Press 1949)