

**Maria Guzikova**  
**CASE Visiting Fellow, UC Berkeley**  
**April 22-May 8, 2007**

**Field report for the course “Rethinking Sovereignty in an Era of Globalization”**

Since the 30-years War and the treaty of Westphalia sovereign nation-state is considered to be the main actor of International Relations. There were some reconfigurations of the world order called the Vienna, Versailles or Yalta System but they mainly reflected the reconfigurations of great powers. Now it is common to refer to the new architecture of the world’s political organization - global world order. What consequences does the globalization have for the sovereign nation-state? Are there any competitors to the state? How the notion of sovereignty is transformed in the era of globalization? How has the system of international relations changed? Can state within its borders provide its citizens with all variety of goods? How the state can fail? Can the state then be arranged? What are the directions of global development? Is globalization inevitable? Will the “dark side” of the globalization lead to its changes?

The goal of the course “**Rethinking Sovereignty in an Era of Globalization**” is to address the questions above and to provide students of International Relations with better understanding of key point of International Relations – the notion of sovereign state and its transformations in the global world. The course is designed for upper-level undergraduate students who have had introductory courses in the theory of international relations and are acquainted with main IR actors and key issues. The sources of the courses are primarily in English, with the exception of the last unit, so the requirement of the course is high-level knowledge of English, especially perceptive skills. The course itself can be thought in English as well as in Russian. In order to simplify and deepen the discussions of the particular cases Russian language is welcome.

In accordance with the main goal of the course it is divided into five main modules reflecting specific objectives: “Theories of Sovereignty”, “Challenges to State Sovereignty from International System?”, “Challenges to State Sovereignty from Networks and Flows”, “Challenges to State Sovereignty from Subnational Units”, and “New Theories of Sovereignty”. The course is structured as a circle: beginning with theories of sovereignty, the course then addresses its main challenges in the global world going from above (international organizations), beyond (transborder networks and flows) and below (subnational independent activities) the state, concluding with approaches to sovereignty in the latest IR research.

The task of the first module “Theories of Sovereignty” is to look at the origins of the nation-state system. This module deals with the emergence of the state system, the Westphalian and Postwestphalian notion of sovereignty, and with the challenges to the state in the globalizing world. The second section examines the challenges to sovereign state from international system, analyzing international organizations, international interventions, and cases of WTO, IMF, and the EU. The third unit looks at networks and flows and their influence on sovereignty changes. Here we study economic aspects of globalization: capital flows, transborder activities of MNC as well as of transnational NGOs, and the unpleasant underside of transnational integration: criminal and terrorists networks. Then in the forth part we take a closer look at subnational actors of IR and their struggling for self-determination. In the last module before the course wrap-up theoretical innovations for the study of sovereignty are presented. We close the course with the discussion of Russian sovereignty discourse.

The course is designed as an “open system”, so additional modules can be added or some existing modules can be cut or replaced by others. The particular cases of IMF, WTO, and the EU can be replaced with the study of the UNO, international legal bodies and so forth. For instance, the module of sovereignty’ theories can be enlarged trough adding its “founding fathers”, French critique, and assessment of sovereignty of leading IR schools:

### **1. Theories of Sovereignty: a. the Classics**

1. Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988. (Meinecke, Friedrich, *Machiavellism; The Doctrine of Raison D'Etat and Its Place in History*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1984; Cassirer, Ernest, *The Myth of the State*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1946)
2. Bodin, Jean, *On Sovereignty*, Cambridge, Cambridge’s University Press, 1992. (Franklin, Julian, *Jean Bodin and the Rise of Absolutist Theory*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1973).
3. Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, Revised Student Edition ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991 (Bobbio, Norberto, *Thomas Hobbes and the Natural Law Tradition*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1993).
4. Locke, John, *The Second Treatise of Government*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. (Franklin, Julian H., *John Locke and the Theory of Sovereignty*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1978)
5. Rousseau, Jean-Jacque (1993) *Social Contract and Discourses*. London: Everyman.

### **b. Theories of Sovereignty: French School**

1. Agamben, Giorgio, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1998.

2. Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Sense of the World*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
3. Foucault, Michel, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*, New York: Picador, 2003.

**c. Theories of Sovereignty: Political Realists, Liberals, Constructivists, English School.**

1. Waltz, Kenneth, "Political Structures," In: *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert O. Keohane, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
2. Moravcsik, Andrew, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* 51, no. 4, 1997.
3. Zacher, Mark and Mathew, Richard, "Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands," in *Controversies in International Relations Theory*, ed. Charles Kegley, St. Martin's Press, 1995.
4. Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
5. Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977)

There will be no formal lectures in this course. The seminars are centered on discussion and are built upon questions which are to be answered and posed by students themselves. The task of the lecturer in this course is to be a moderator and facilitator. In addition to providing students with theoretical knowledge the course is aiming for improvement of students' analytical reading skills and fostering well-argued discussions on the course material. That is why the course requirements include presentations of weekly reading. Besides, students are encouraged to skim the journals looking more closely at articles directly related to topics covered by the course. The lecturer is expected to provide students with tips for analytical reading in general and special guidelines for IR literature.

It is important to create "a friendly environment" around the class, some space where students can exchange their opinions, ideas, where the lecturer can post additional readings or recourses, comment on assignments, answer the FAQs, announce cancelled or rescheduled class meetings and so on. It would be great to create a website or at least an e-mail address for the course. The final exam is going to be an essay which will ask the students to combine the theories under discussion with substantial empirical evidence from a particular case. The essays are to be posted on the website of the course where they are to be evaluated by other class participants.

**Last Comment:** Thanks to the possibility to participate in the joint CASE-UC Berkeley Field Project I have met scholars who are sceptic about the challenges to sovereignty. They articulated their vision that the state is main reference point in our world. "The state is solid as a rock". The politics still identify the state as their primary legitimate association. Even such an

outstanding example as the EU is not compelling enough. It is interesting to find out whether this viewpoint is confirmed by our students' feeling or they belong to other generation to which the "state"-reference is less important.