Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi / The Journal of Social Sciences

Akademik Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 7, Sayı: 47, Ağustos 2020, s. 274-288

ISSN: 2149-0821 Doi Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/SOBIDER.45366>

Xheni SIMAKU

Istanbul Commerce University Media and Communication, xhenisimaku@gmail.com

AN INTRODUCTION TO GLOBALIZATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH NATION-STATE

Abstract

Nowadays one of the most used words is globalization, a fleeting conception experienced in almost all the fields of the world system, so as in the daily life actions of every individual. Several scholars all over the world give different explications and perspectives about globalization, here some of them will be taken into consideration to explain the complexity that this phenomenon brings. Different is also the approaches used with globalization, sometimes positive, sometimes negative, and other times skeptical; but what is interesting to see is how all those perspectives are focus on the same topics. The main question about this process is about the entity of globalization, and if is it a new order, just a myth or a necessary process? The common aim of those authors is the understanding of this phenomenon and solving its definition by pointing out the important effects and changes brought with it. The aim of this work is to give a wide perspective of the spheres touched by globalization, which are a lot, and to focus on its economic, socio- technologic, cultural and political dimension, by analyzing the role of the nation-state, which is one of the most discussed themes inside globalization's theory and especially the changing function or not that it brings in the new era.

Keywords: globalization, nation-state, hyperglobalist, skeptical, transformationalist.

KÜRESELLEŞMEYE GİRİŞ VE ULUS-DEVLET İLE İLİŞKİSİ

Özet

Günümüzde en çok kullanılan kelimelerden biri küreselleşme, her bireyin günlük yaşam aktivitelerinde olduğu gibi, dünya sisteminin neredeyse tüm alanlarında deneyimlenen, çabuk değişen bir anlayıştır. Dünyanın pek çok yerinde birçok araştırmacı küreselleşme hakkında farklı açıklamalar ve görüşler sunuyor ve bu çalışmada bu olayın getirdiği karmaşıklığı açıklamak için bazıları dikkate alınacak. Küreselleşme ile ilgili farklı tanımlamaların bulunmaktadır, bunlar kimi zaman olumlu, kimi zaman olumsuz diğer taraftan da şüpheli yaklaşımlardır; ancak ilginç olan, tüm bu bakış açılarının aynı konulara nasıl odaklandığıdır. Bu süreçle ilgili temel soru küreselleşmenin varlığıyla ilgilidir ve eğer bu yeni bir düzen ise, yalnızca bir efsane mi yoksa olması gereken bir süreç midir? Bu yazarların ortak amacı, bu olayların anlaşılması ve tanımının, beraberinde getirdiği önemli etkileri ve değişiklikleri göstererek çözmektir. Bu çalışmanın amacı ise, küreselleşmenin hayli fazla temas ettiği alanlara geniş bir bakış açısı kazandırmak ve ulus-devletin rolünü analiz ederek durumun ekonomik, sosyo-teknolojik, kültürel ve politik boyutuna odaklanmaktır, ki küreselleşme teorisinde en çok tartışılan konulardan biri ve özellikle içinde bulunduğumuz çağda ulus devletin işlevsel olup olmadığıdır.

Anahtar kelimeler: küreselleşme, ulus-devlet, küreselciler, şüpheçiler, dönüşümcüler.

INTRODUCTION

Although quotations to globalization have become progressively common in the last three decades, the notion itself can be found in a much earlier period. Its origins can be noticed in the work of many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century intellectuals, who recognized how modernity was integrating the world. But it was in the 1960s and early 1970s that the term globalization was actually used. (Edelman & Haugerud , 2005)

With the collapse of the state of socialism and the consolidation of capitalism worldwide, academic and public discussion of globalization intensified dramatically. The collapse of the Soviet bloc in 1989-91 does not arise suddenly a whole new world but was already largely the result of globalizing forces. The Soviet bloc with the dual international system, claims of a new polarized world order which would be clearly visible. Beginning in the early '80s with the Thatcher government and under Reagan administration, the policy of market liberalization, privatization of public property and tax reduction, made right for the first time in Britain after 1979, created the prerequisites for an economic globalization and with that, for global interaction subjected to a weak state regulation. ((Harvey, 2007); (Edelman & Haugerud, 2005).

In these years, in the last '80s after the great boom of deregulation, the intensification of trade and financial markets were developed in a very rapid way. Multinational groups started to have a centralized management manner and to be present all over the world, by transforming their companies into transnational ones, where the local productions give space to the international integrated one. Osterhammel and Peterson point out the importance that

technologies of communication and information had in this process by making the global markets developing and growing extremely fast. (Osterhammel & Peterson, 2015).

GLOBALIZATION

Osterhammel and Peterson (2015) refer to globalization as an interpretation of the present, even if initially was used only in economics publications, the concept has experienced a rapid increase in the nineties and different disciplines have taken as the main category of their analysis. In Hirst and Thompson's point of view, globalization is described as a trendy concept in the social sciences and a catchword for journalists and politicians of every stripe, they argue that the era in which we live biggest part of social life is determined by global processes, in which, national cultures, national economies, and national borders are dissolving (Hirst & Thompson, 2005). Modelski's interpretation of globalization is that world society nowadays is global and points out the fact that globalization is the process by which several historical world societies came together into one global system, which still dominates today's factors of world politics. (Modelski, 2005). While Ritzer gives another explanation of globalization, he underlines the complexity of globalization as a spacious area with different phenomena, globalization has a power which permits it to enter in every area and can expand relations across continents. (Ritzer, 2007)

Appadurai underlines fundamentally two important phenomena of our society, which shape political, economic, and cultural significances with their rapidly subjecting transformation processes. These factors are digitalization and globalization, the second one is described by the author as the interaction of people, goods, decision-making bodies, ideas and knowledge on a wide scale, which has the capacity to redesign the dimensions of time and space in the world (Appadurai, 1990).

In Giddens' eyes, globalization is not an easily defined or delineate phenomenon, which has become a supreme role of centrality within the economic, political, and cultural reflections in decades (Giddens, 2005). Giddens (1991) argues that globalization is basically the intensification of worldwide social relations that connect distant locations in a way that local events are affected by events that occur many kilometers away and vice versa, he accentuates the conceptual framework of time-space distance by stressing on the relations between local involvements and interaction across distance. The point of view of Giddens is shared with other emphasis and other focalizations, by authors such as Ulrich Beck (2003) and Zygmunt Bauman (1998), agreed in emphasizing the inevitability of globalization and its historical significance that cannot be resized, set aside or withdrawn. So Bauman (1998), effectively specifies the central node of reflection on globalization:

'Globalization' is on everybody's lips; a fad word fast turning into a shibboleth, a magic incantation, a pass-key meant to unlock the gates to all present and future mysteries. For some, 'globalization' is what we are bound to do if we wish to be happy; for others 'globalization' is the intractable fate of the world, an irreversible process; it is also a process which affects us all in the same measure and in the same way. We are all being 'globalized' means much the same to all who 'globalized' are. All vogue words tend to share a similar fate: the more experiences they pretend to make transparent, the more they themselves become opaque' (Bauman, 1998: 7-8).

Beck, sees globalization as trans-nationalization, a process that deteriorates the structure of national states and in which they fail to be a mediator between the local community and the rest of the world. Beck's analysis has important consequences in a particular way from a political point of view and rethinking new geography (O'Brien, 1992) of power and institutions. Beck's vision on globalization is much more radical than the other authors, he asserts that globalization is the end of the world's order based on the primacy of the nation-states, in which "every person has a homeland, his own homeland, and cannot choose it; It belongs by birth" (Beck, 2003).

On the opposite side to the one described so far, in moderate enthusiasm, but still focused on a vision of globalization as an incontestable historical process, lies a different perspective which sees the phenomenon as planned and with the specific aim of creating a universal world economic order. Two representative authors of this way of thinking are Hardt and Negri, who sustain the critical theory of globalization (Hardt & Negri 2000). In their book called 'Empire' they identify a new form of sovereignty that regulates the global changes in the economy, politics, and cultural spheres. The idea of globalization theorized in the Empire is based on three central aspects:

First of all, they argue that the new world order is not the result of interactions between groups and social forces arisen naturally, but legal transformations of singular circumstances that distribute procedures, authority, and power. The crucial principle of the Empire is that its power it is distributed across networks, through controlled mechanisms and doesn't have a proper localizable center.

Secondly, they describe Empire's mechanisms and how it works: taking in consideration the notion of "bio-politics" Foucault (1979), the authors illustrate a power that organizes individuals' lives, that controls over the population's bodies, by clearly outlining all the effects that those mechanisms generate in the population's subjectivity and behaviors. They also call attention to the important role in this case of the new technologies of communication which are fundamental for the imagination and transmission of the imaginary constituent of bio-politics. (Hardt & Negri, 2002)

The third point, Hard and Negri's Empire differs from the critical theory of globalization, they have a new vision within values, identity, and local content differences. They try to have a diverse perspective and approach from authors like Fukuyama and Friedman, that see globalization as the triumph of capitalism and the market economy, (Fukuyama, 1992; Friedman, 1999), which create a reduction of democracy, cultural homogenization and elimination of natural species and the environment (Kellner, 2002).

THE MULTIPLE DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION.

As seen in the above paragraphs globalization it's not easy to define, a lot of various point of views. To go more in-depth about globalization is useful to concentrate on the different fields that embrace.

Globalization affects different areas: economics, technology, organization of the state, culture, to name the most important ones. (Osterhammel & Petersson, 2015). The instrument, probably the most comprehensive among those so far presented, identifies four main areas of

globalization whose processes, which are grafted at the level of each of them, help to define the rapid and ongoing changes that affect our societies (Mills & Blossfeld, 2005). These areas are:

- Economic: refers to the internationalization of markets and increasing competition in the welfare state;
- Socio-technological: it concerns the spread of networks, information, knowledge on a global scale through the new communication technologies;
- Cultural: refers to standards, values, standards of conduct globally shared;
- Political: it is the area that interests the trans-nationalization of politics, decision-making, and legislative processes and institutions.

At this point, it is important to go into detail of the individual dimensions, highlighting not only the criteria of choice of the indicators but also, more generally, the meaning of each in the new global context.

THE ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION

The economic aspect has been considered the true engine of globalization. In particular, with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the division of the world into two blocks, the integration of economies all over the world which has experienced a growth and development phase, thanks to the neoliberal politics, creating competition between business and industry on a world arena (Fligstein, 1998). This new description of trade and economy competitiveness, started since the seventies and eighties of the twentieth century, increased rapidly in the nineties (Welfens, 1999), and created relationships between political and economic power by producing dependencies. This was a process of the capitalist model expansion based on privatization, accumulation, and exploitation, which tried to make the autonomy of the states being just apparent (Lacher, 2006).

It is in the nineties and with new measures of privatization, liberalization, and deregulation, introduced (Raab et al., 2008) that the order change creating uncertainty in individuals, workers, and organizations (Mills & Blossfeld, 2005).

The policies embraced in the '90s and in 2000, made economy and trade be cross-nationally, so the flow of goods started to become easier and faster, making the world more open to the trade. The breaking up of trade barriers has permitted global markets to rise for many goods, and with that, the major trading blocs were opened to competition from the rest of the world. (Osterhammel & Peterson, 2015)

The transformation of the global economic order has to be attributed to the nation-state. As Held and McGrew argue the role gave to nation-states is that to become part of a larger pattern of global transformations and global flows. They continue by asserting that goods, capital, people, knowledge, communications, weapons, etc., rapidly move across territorial boundaries, so they sustain that nation-state has a big responsibility and position in all this transformation (Held & McGrew, 1998). An important transformation in this process can be noticed in financial markets because flows have increased and with that transactions, while national capital becomes integrated with international capital. Financial globalization helped corporate alliances and national currencies become to circulate easily outside and inside the country. Important factors of this acceleration process are communication technologies and

information revolution which helped and favored financial globalization, and with that markets, production, and business organization earned a global dimension. (Held et al., 2005)

THE SOCIO-TECHNOLOGICAL DIMENSION

Although globalization is usually seen primarily as a phenomenon started engine by the economic sphere, the discipline of sociology has taken it firmly to heart as a cultural process too, because of its complexity.

The economic aspects of globalization, as asserted before, predominant for certain authors, would not have had such a big impact without the development and diffusion of new communication technologies. As variously discussed, communication technologies play a significant role in economic and social processes of what is considered to be the globalization process (Avgerou, 2002). ICT (Information and Communication Technologies) have played a central role in patterning the opportunities and risks of globalization; Narula (2006), agrees on the importance of ICT in the globalization process, which consists in encouraging the market liberalization, the competition between different systems and the start of globalization in Third World and developing countries.

Technologies, have the multifunctional tasks, not only to contribute to national political and economies' globalization, but also have an important role on social life by making possible social relationships on a global scale. Here again can be easily understand how ICT influences communication between individuals, organizations and communities making space and distance unimportant. 'ICT has fundamentally altered capacity (expanding the level of social business networks and power), intensity (regularized connections), speed (of the interactions and processes) and impact (global local impacts) of the transformations' (Mills & Blossfeld, 2005: 6).

The socio-technological dimension in globalization is fundamental to understand how ICT influenced and changed social relation during this process.

THE CULTURAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization is a multilevel phenomenon, which includes many spheres, and one of that can be named the cultural dimension, and especially thanks to the spread of ICT has meant that the impact on the cultural sphere was major, boosting the circulation of images, behaviors, values on a global scale, increased by creating a new culture, a global one. Globalization's approaches that accentuate its cultural dimension, concentrating on the processes of appropriation and modeling of cultural material, focus on mechanisms and national adaptation that influence globalization in the daily lives of individuals (Mayer 2001). The cultural aspect how is seen by Appadurai (1996), has a dual nature in the globalization process, especially linked to ICT and media, he asserts that in a cultural consumption of media content's aspect, are included homogenization and hybridization.

While modernization theorists think that homogenization as a process of social, economic and political transformations that h developed in Western Europe and North America (Eisenstadt, 1966), a passage that tends to have new characteristics of the nations of the Western world (Moore, 1963); on the opposite Rowe and Schelling, describe the concept of the hybridization, and in specific the cultural hybridization, which concerns the mixture of global

and local aspects and their combinations in new forms and practices (Rowe and Schelling, 1991).

The deep changes developed in the contemporary era in the name of progress and the compression of space and time have a significant impact on individuals and cultures. (Giddens, 2005) Regarding the cultural dimension of globalization, one of the biggest attempts among many scholars is to understand the dynamics of today's intercultural relations. Culture is a mixture of material, social, spiritual life of a people or ethnic group expression concerning the various phases of an evolutionary process, to the historical periods, environmental conditions; it is the set of beliefs or values and gods behaviors acquired through experience and strictly connected to a certain conception and representation of the world. The term cultural globalization refers to the transmission of ideas, meanings, values throughout the world, in a way that extends and intensifies social relations. Cultural globalization involves the formation of shared norms and knowledge with which people associate their individual and collective cultural identities. It brings a growing interconnection between different peoples and cultures. (Tomlinson, 2001).

Cultural globalization has a tendency to share knowledge, habits, and models of behavior, which in the anthropological language is called culture. Somehow, the man of the globalized society can stop from one border to another without ever feeling like a foreigner anywhere. Ritzer believed that this shared culture generates standardized products. Low quality, as well as in the fast-food chains of the States (McDonalidization). (Ritzer, 2007)

For global culture we cannot limit ourselves to associating it only with the American one as the cultural axis is moving in other directions. Sociologist Robertson, on the other hand, scaled- down this diagnosis by observing that globalized culture does not destroy local traditions, but rather mixes and integrates with it (glocalization). (Robertson, 1992)

The term globalization nowadays includes the set of all the multicultural influences and the possible interconnections, together with the cultural and economic problems that it involves. The interconnectedness transformations and the local transformations, in a more familiar and particularistic world, creates a close relationship between causal and intertwining cultures.

The inclusion of the cultural dimension in the study of the effects of globalization processes also reveals the complexity and multidimensionality of a phenomenon. The cultural dimension of globalization and its practices describes other risks and opportunities compared to those of merely economic globalization, Tomlinson (2001) asserts that the link between the multi-dimensional nature of globalization and the complexity of the cultural and social connections has to be weaved.

THE POLITICAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION

The erosion of state sovereignty is one of the central themes of globalization, but the analyzes taken into consideration do not always reach the same conclusions. One of the critical dimensions, which often is directly related to the economic one, is the political dimension. Some of the crucial issues of political globalization relate to the changing role of the nation-state actions and the concept of democracy and its significance in the global society. Nash (2010) identifies two fundamental aspects that call into question the representative democracy in the age of globalization:

- the autonomy and sovereignty, which are considered interrelated and interdependent, by arguing that the weakening of state control on domestic policy shows only a loss of autonomy, not of sovereignty (Williams, 1996). Here, supranational institutions, legal and legislative institutions directing on an international basis has diminished the states' autonomy level, but has also consolidated the sovereignty (Thomson & Krasner, 1989);

- The second issue is about the concept of national interest and sense, Nash asserts that by experiencing the loss of autonomy of the states, democracy's notion tends to be broadened to a more open look and globally.

Modern politics came up with the development of political communities, which were connected to the land, so the nation-state, with that the centralization of political power, the creation of state structures, and necessity of order between states. (Axtmann, 2004). Forms of democracy were developed within certain states.

On a political level, the characteristic situation of the twentieth century, based on the often conflicting balance between the nation-states, is transformed into a new model where the different political systems are standardized at an institutional level (tending towards the model of presidential democracy with majority electoral system) and ideological (especially at the level of economic policy, with a progressive but continuous transfer of governance towards international and supranational institutions).

Today's situation is different, there are a political transformation and different discussion about the nation-state and the exclusive link between geography and political power. The new era has seen new institutions have linked sovereign states together and pooled sovereignty beyond the nation-state. Various are the points which have to be analyzed to understand the role of the nation-state in this new era and if it changed how it changed.

THREE PERSPECTIVES ON GLOBALIZATION

The complicated nature of the globalization process, the importance that assumes in today's world and the interconnectedness with various fields, remains pretty arduous to delineate this phenomenon. Not less important is the point of view of scholars related to globalization. Like all big notions, also in globalization there are different scholars, who sustain different perspectives in explaining the globalization process. Here again, Held and al. (2005) definition of these perspectives will be take in consideration because, most of the globalization scholars point out just two perspectives, which are one pro and the other one against globalization, but what Held and al. propose is a third way of thinking that seems interesting for all those scholars who stay between the two different and opposite way of thinking.

Osterhammel and Petersson's point of view is that no singular account of globalization has a total status of orthodoxy, but oppositely, competing assessments continue to frame the discussion. They argue that the heterogeneity of this process can be distinguished two different accounts: those who think that globalization is real and have historical development in the contemporary world, the so-called 'globalists', and those who, on the contrary, argues that globalization is just a necessary myth, the so-called 'skeptics'. Neither the skeptics nor the globalist theories exhaust the complexity of the interpretations of globalization and the various points of view to be found in the existing literature. (Osterhammel & Petersson, 2015). That's why the choice of a third way of thinking, Held et al. (2005) thesis of a third way which is not

so fixed, but fluid, transformable with time, is a different version of globalization. They introduce the so-called ‘transformationalists’.

Scholars David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton provide an overview of different perspectives on globalization dominant in the 1990s. They describe the general conceptual contours of each perspective and note the limitations of each. The authors identify the perspective as:

- The Hyperglobalist perspective,
- The Skeptical perspective,
- The Transformationalist perspective.

HYPERGLOBALIST PERSPECTIVE

The hyperglobalist perspective is described as an approach that sees globalization as a new epoch in human history. This new epoch is characterized by the declining relevance and authority of nation-states, brought about largely through the economic logic of a global market. The hyperglobalist current think that economies are becoming denationalized. (Held,1995)

Held et al. (2005), argue that the hyper globalists even if they have a positive approach to globalization, various authors explain the value of these changes in very different ways. The hyperglobalist scholars agree on the general issues of globalization and the outcome of this process, but they have controversies over the fact whether these forces are good or not. The hyperglobalist vision emphasizes an interpretation of globalization which perceives the importance on the particular spatial characteristics of globalization.

The globalist analysis rejects the idea that globalization can be described by reference to capitalism or technology; they dismiss the issue that globalization can be seen just as a projection of Western modernity across the globe (Giddens, 1991), but they see it as a kind of product of multiple factors and forces, like political, economic and technological and specific conjunctural factors. The hyperglobalists discredit historicism or determinism globalization’s interpretations and advance an open-ended version of global change rather than a definite understanding of the globalized world.

SKEPTICAL PERSPECTIVE

On the opposite side of the hyperglobalist perspective, there is the skeptical one. Held et al. (2005), affirm that the skeptical perspective on globalization views current international processes as more by fragmented and regionalized than globalized.

In contrast to hyperglobalist perspectives, that emphasize the growth of global capitalism, by describing globalization as a necessary root, scholars in the skeptical perspective view global capitalism as a myth, an extended form of capitalism and not a new historical epoch. Therefore, they point out that the concept of globalization is an ideological construction, a myth which legitimizes the neoliberal global project, by creating a global free market and consolidating capitalism. They continue by asserting that globalization is not a new historical process, because the golden age of globalization occurred at the end of the 19th century, and precisely in the belle époque, known as the period from 1890 to 1914.

They see the growth of multinational corporations not as a weakening of the nation-states, but as Held et al. (2005) affirm, skeptical authors point out to the fact that foreign investment flows into the control of a few advanced economies. Multinational corporations are still linked to their states or regions of origin. Therefore, they think that a more valid notion of current trends can be explained by the world's 'internationalization' and 'regionalization' (Hirst & Thompson 1999). These terms are related to territory, borders, place, and national governments in the contemporary world order.

Other skeptical approaches can be seen in Hardt and Negri (2000), who underlines that the present phase of globalized capitalism is creating a new global order. This order is represented as an Empire, as a system of global regulation that has no boundaries but has relations of dominance and subjugation, in which globalization is the center of the Empire. According to skeptical's point of view, international interdependence is ultimately a temporary and contingent condition.

TRANSFORMATIONALIST PERSPECTIVE

Here, the third perspective took into consideration is the transformationalist current, which stands in between the hyperglobalist and the skeptical perspective. This theoretical position asserts that globalization should be understood as a complex set of interconnecting relationships in which indirectly exercised. Held et al. (2005) argue that the transformationalist perspective differs basically from the other two perspectives in the fact the outcome of processes of globalization is not determined like the other two perspectives, but that there various variables in globalization. Transformationalists' approach not so certain about the historical paths and the factors of these. So for example, if the hyperglobalists think that the power of national governments is decreasing, skeptics argue that the power of national governments is increasing, while the transformationalists point of view is the national governments is changing but a description of this change, by not defining it in a simple way.

Transformationalists see in globalization a changeable and open process, inclined to influences and modification than can adopt different tendencies. Giddens and Sutton explain the transformationalists' globalization point of view as a process characterized by connections and fluxes that operate in all directions. (Giddens & Sutton, 2001).

The transformationalist perspective has a much less determinate understanding of the processes of globalization than authors from the other perspectives. For transformationalist authors, the range of variables influencing the processes of globalization is much wider, and the outcomes are not so certain. (Held et al,2005) .

THE NATION-STATE

The nation-state is one of the fulcra of globalization, its role is largely discussed nowadays, by hyperglobalists, skeptics and transformationalists, who differ from each other on the description of it.

The modern state emerged in Western Europe and its colonial territories in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, although their origins date back to the late sixteenth century (Held, 1995). The origins are traced to the Peace Treaties of Westphalia of 1648, which concluded the Thirty Years' War (Nash, 2010); (Keohane 1995), with the seventeenth century can see the beginning of the contemporary international system; the key parts of which are sovereign states

claiming exclusive authority within their own geographic boundaries. This system is characterized by territorial states in where their own national interest is above all others; and which recognizes no superior authority to themselves. The modern state developed as nation-state political body, by legitimacy as a result of the loyalty or consent of their citizens.

Held argues that in the contemporary world is difficult to detach the role of the nation-state from the other forces of current day transformations, although the difficulties to understand nation-states' role, these with each other, they are seen as social actors, that are able to socialize, because international society interacts to produce contemporary world politics, as seen in the policies of deregulation, privatization, and liberalization. (Held, 1989)

Since the nation was one of the crucial points on which the phenomenon of globalization has pivoted, in addition to having been much discussed, it has also seen different and contrasting points of view. Jackson and James argue that events and forces of the twentieth century have not reduced the meaning and importance of sovereign statehood. They continue by asserting that states are interconnected and have their territorial, economic, and political independence; for this reason, the assertion that globalization is irreversible in their opinion can be discussed. Nation- states functions are still a lot, like to provide the regulation of financial globalization, to control and support innovations such as technological, where the state is seen as a major beneficiary of economic and technological advances. (Jackson & James, 1993)

Held and McGrew argue that economic globalization does not mean necessarily weakening of state power, but they affirm there is a transformation on the condition of state power operation and regarding the political field, in which states have still a central role in the development and institutionalization of regional and global governance, and with that the autonomy and sovereignty of the state are not diminished by these processes, (Held & McGrew, 2005); that's why Giddens point of view underlines the fact that states still survive, but a dialectical character of globalization and the influence it has, should be taken in consideration; because the loss of autonomy on the part of some states or groups of states in one hand, accompanies with an increase of others states or groups, highlighting in that way cultural, political or economic changes. It is a push and pulls between tendencies. (Giddens, 2005)

Robertson (1992) refers the characteristic to the present world of compression and interdependence as a conscientious global link that crosses national boundaries, by building a network with dependences and interpersonal relationships. Robertson has an approach in which he defines interdependence as a flexible and procedural totality of the world, within which national, transnational cultures, civilizations, movements, and organizations enter in various connections, creating different world orders.

Held thinks that we should not generalize about the effects of globalization and in particular to assume that because a certain state has experienced a decrease in its international freedom of action, sovereignty, is thereby eroded. He continues by asserting that economic globalization mainly confines the bargaining positions of smaller and weaker states. (Held, 1989)

Similar thoughts can be observed in Giddens, Beck, and Bauman, who remain the awareness that the role played by national states is still decisive, although part of a gradual process of weakening. Beck (2003).

Here again, we have to stress the perspectives about the concept of the nation-state within Globalization. The new challenges of internationalism do not diminish the state-centric world. Skeptics reduce the assumption that internationalization indicates the emergence of less state-centric world order. Hyperglobalists discuss with these contentions, by defining the idea that nowadays globalization is transforming the nature and form of political power. They affirm that the ruling right of the state in delimited territories is on the edge of transformation. Transformationalists think that the nation-state is having a new process, which has to transform itself, but not for this has less power. (Held & McGrew, 2005)

There has been an intense discussion about globalization between those who believe that globalization determines the end of the nation-state and those who reject the globalization idea and affirm that what globalization says, has been seen it all before. The authors point out that globalization is about the connections between different regions of the world from different fields, from the cultural to the economic, the political, the technological, which are changing in time. What Held and McGrew study, is how globalization has been going on for centuries, by observing the fact that globalization today is different in scale and nature. In their opinion globalization doesn't mean the end of the nation-state, but demonstrates that politics has various factors and is not just based simply on nation-states. (Held & McGrew, 2005)

The state has played a key role in delineating the nature of the global discipline of international relations. The classic statement of this position can be found in Aristotle's Politics :

‘ Observation shows us, first, that every polis (or state) is a species of association, and, secondly, that all associations are instituted for the purpose of attaining some good- for all men do all their acts with a view to achieving something which is, in their view, a good. We may therefore hold that all associations aim at some good; and we may also hold that the particular association which is the most sovereign of all, and includes all the rest, will pursue this aim most, and will thus be directed to the most sovereign of all goods. This most sovereign and inclusive association is the polis, as it is called, or the political association’. (Barker, 1962:1)

CONCLUSION

Nowadays more than ever, the world is pretty struggling with big issues, with global dilemmas, and the difficulties to solve them. This paper tries to give an actual idea of globalization phenomenon, even if it's pretty difficult to follow its process, which is continuously changing, and with that new debates rise. In the last years can be registered big events that affected the whole world, that can make thinking about a new phase, a de-globalization one or a kind of promotion of a more nation-centric politic, some examples of this trend can be the wall that Trump wanted to build between USA and Mexico, the Brexit which delimited UK confines from the European Union, or just think about the pandemic situation with COVID-19, a global problem, but all the states tried to solved it primarily nationally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appadurai, Arjun. (1996). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. M. Featherstone içinde, *Nationalism, globalization and modernity* (s. 295-310). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Avgerou , Chrisanthi;. (2002). *Information systems and global diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Axtmann, R. (2004). The Nation-State and Globalization: Changing Roles and Functions. Les États nations et la globalisation: Roles et fonctions en mutation. *International Political Science Review / Revue internationale de science politique*, 259-279.
- Barker, E. (1962). *The Politics of Aristotle* . Oxford: Oxford Press Univeristy.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization. The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2003). *La società cosmopolita. Prospettive dell'epoca postnazionale*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Edelman, M., & Haugerud , A. (2005). *The anthropology of development and globalization: from classical political economy to contemporary neoliberalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1969). *The political systems of empires*. New York: Free Press.
- Fligstein, N. (1998). Is the globalization the cause of the crises of welfare states? *Working Paper*
- SPS (s. 98/5). Florence: European University Institute.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Nascita della biopolitica. Corso ald Collège de France (1978-1979)*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Friedman, T. L. (1999). *The lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and last man*. New York: Free Press.
- Giddens , A., & Sutton, P. W. (2001). *Fondamenti di sociologia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2005). The Globalization of Modernity. D. Held, & A. McGrew içinde, *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (s. 60-66). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Ocford: Oxford University Press.
- Held, D. (1989). *Political Theory and The Modern State*. Standford: standford University Press.
- Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2005). *The global transormations reader. An introduction to globalization debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldbatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2005). Rethinking globalization. D. Held, & A. McGrew içinde, *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (s. 67-74). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalisation in question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (2005). Globalization- A necessary Myth? D. Held, & A. McGrew içinde, *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (s. 98-105). Cambridge : Polity Press.
- Jackson, R. H., & James, A. (1993). *States in a Changing World*. Oxford: Clanderon Press.
- Kellner, D. (2002). Theorizing globalization. *Sociological theory*, 285-305.
- Keohane, R. O. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lacher, H. (2006). *Beyond globalization. Capitalism, territoriality and the international realtions of modernity*. New York: Routledge.
- Mayer, K. U. (2001). The paradox of global social change and national path dependencies. A. Woodward, & M. Kohli içinde, *Inclusion and exclusion in European societies* (s. 89-100). New York: Routledge.
- Mills, M., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2005). Globalization and the early life course. A description of selected economic and demographic trends. B. & al. içinde, *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (s. 1-24). London: Routledge.
- Modelski, G. (2005). Globalization. D. Held, & A. McGrew içinde, *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (s. 55-59). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moore, W. E. (1963). *Social chenge*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Narula, U. (2006). *Handbook of communcation. Models, perpectives, strategies*. New Dehli: Atlantic.
- Nash, K. (2010). *Contemporary political sociology. Globalization, politics and power*. Malden: Blackwell Publisher.
- O'Brien, R. (1992). *Global financial integration. The end of geography*. London: Chatman House/Printer.
- Osterhammel, J., & Petersson, N. P. (2015). *Storia della globalizzazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Raab, M., Ruland, M., Schönberger, B., Blossfeld, H.-P., Hofäcker, D., Buchholz, S., & Schmelzer, P . (2008). GlobalIndex : A Sociological Approach to Globalization Measurement. *International Sociology*, 596-631.
- Ritzer, G. (2007). *The globalization od of nothing*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Dehli: SAGE.

- Rowe, W., & Schelling, V. (1991). *Memory and Modernity. Popular culture in Latin America*. London: Verso.
- Thompson, J. E., & Krasner, S. J. (1989). Global transactions and the consolidation of sovereignty. E. O. Czempiel, & J. N. Rosenau içinde, *Global changes and theoretical challenges. Approaches to world poliics for the 1990s*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Tomlinson, J. (2001). *Sentirsi a casa nel mondo. La cultura come bene globale*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Welfens, P. J. (1999). *Globalization of the economy, unemployment and innovation. Structural change, schumpetrian adjustment and new policy challenges*. Heildelberg: Springer- Verlag.
- Williams, M. (1996). Rethinking Sovereignty. E. Kaufman, & G. Young içinde, *Globalization: theory and practice* (s. 109-122). London: Pinter.