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In the era of globalization, geographical distances are waning away and territorial boundaries are no longer an impediment.\(^1\) Mobility of goods, services and capital became free from import and export restrictions. Globalization fostered by free flow of information and rapid progress in technology is such a driving force that no country can turn back from. It does impose market discipline on the participants, which can be harsh, but is part of the mechanism that drives progress and prosperity.\(^2\)

Liberalization and globalization are both part of the programme of economic reforms undertaken by dozens of countries in the last decade to give a new shape and direction to their economies. This programme was a radical departure from the theory and practice of development planning that had such a powerful grip on policy makers in the backward economies of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the post-war years.

Liberalization is the diminution of progressive elimination of the control of the state over economic activities. It is driven by the neo-liberal idea that government involvement should be as low as possible (minimal state), leaving field to the operation of the self-interest driven market forces of demand and supply. Programme of liberalization has two dimensions\(^3\), internal as well as external liberalization.

**Internal Liberalization:** It confines itself to the domestic economy and takes measures to make it more responsible to market forces. Private agents are granted freedom to make their own decisions regarding consumption, production, input choice, pricing, market, lending and borrowing and investment in the national economy. Full control is retained over activities relating to the interface with the rest of the world (the external sectors).
**External Liberalization:** It consists of relaxation of state control in the spheres of foreign trade, foreign investment and flow of finance in and out of the country. External liberalization is alternatively known as adoption of a policy of globalization by the country concerned. This is a deliberately adopted economic policy intimately connected with the phenomenon of globalization as a process. This is an ongoing process of international integration as a result of unprecedented acceleration in the flow of trade, assets, technology, knowledge, information and ideas across national boundaries.

**Role of the State**

Contrary to the claims of the new liberals, economic reform cannot be reduced to the simple formula of a minimal state. Avoiding crude intervention like that of the past, a state must allow almost full freedom to private agents in the ordinary affairs of day to day business. Nevertheless, it must keep a close watch on such activities to prevent abuse of private monopoly power. The state's indispensable role is to maintain effective competition in the system through appropriate measures that do not kill off private initiative in the process.

In the midst of scientific and technological progress, the modern man cannot be kept confined within the territorial dimensions of his state. The state itself being a person and acting in the interest of the citizen has to come into contact with other sovereign entities and it is natural to evolve a spirit of cooperation between the negotiating parties including the states. It is an incidence of reciprocal agreements between the states that the parties adopt certain reasonable restrictions on the exercise of their sovereignty in the interest of global cooperation which in terms is for their own interest. It is no doubt a reasonable restriction in the operation of sovereign powers but it does not amount abandonment and abnegation of sovereignty. In dealing with others one cannot impose its own sovereignty but must accommodate sovereignty to the counterparty.

The process is similar to the process of a citizen adopting membership of so many other associations and much as he is bound by the laws of the state, he must also abide by the rules of
his own association, which is not a loss of his/her right but a desirable mode of exercise of that right. The legal or juristic status stands intact though in practice it has to make so many concessions but in the ultimate result these concessions are made in the exercise of one’s own sovereignty and are nothing but are self imposed restrictions.

**Sovereignty of the State**

In earlier civilizations sovereignty had meant little. In tribal societies, political authority was exercised by tribal or village headman, around the ties of lineage and kinship.

According to Aristotle, State evolved from associations. The first association was a household or the family, which arose to satisfy an individual's biological urges and everyday wants. A cluster of households became a village, and a group of villages constituted a political community or the polis. The final and perfect association is the 'polis' which may have reached the height of self-sufficiency. State grows for the sake of mere life, it exists for the sake of good life. Self sufficiency was its end and meant is not only for the satisfaction of economic needs but also for regulation of the full human potential. This was possible only within the polis. The polis was the most sovereign and inclusive association offering self-sufficiency for a full and true life.

In the 14th and 15th centuries political power was held by the church, the king and the feudal lords. There was no clear differentiation of political functions i.e. declaration of war and collection of taxes etc. The church and king both had their own armies and they both had the power to declare war. In Medieval Europe, both the ruler and the ruled were governed by universal laws derived from the authority of God. It was the church that provided an over-arching organizational, and moral framework transcending both legal and political boundaries. Feudal Europe knew no difference between the domestic and external spheres of organizations, nor was there any dividing line between the public and the private sphere of life.

By the end of 15th century, Europe comprised some 500 more or less independent political units. A new set of social and
economic conditions were emerging characterized by increasing trade. The manufacturing class was gaining strength, and was supported by monarchies with a competent civil service and hired armies began to levy royal taxes, an individuals no longer owed their allegiance to the overlord and their village.

At the end of the 16th century the authority of the Church had declined and this resulted into secular absolutism. In Europe the bloody 30 years war came to an end with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and it recognized sovereignty of the state and treated it as an entity that acquired significance by its identity with nation. David Held identified the following features of the Westphalian model. 

1. The world consists of, and is divided by, sovereign states that recognize no superior authority.

2. The processes of law-making, the settlement of disputes, and law enforcement are largely in the hands of individuals states.

3. International law is oriented towards the establishment of minimal rules of co-existence; the creation of enduring relationships is an aim, but only to the extent that it allows state objectives to be met,

4. Responsibility for wrongful acts across the borders is a ‘private matter’ concerning only those affected.

5. All states are regarded as equal before the law, but legal rules do not take account of asymmetries of power.

6. Differences among states are often settled by force; the principles of effective power holds sway. Virtually no legal fetters exists to curb resorting to force; international legal standards afford only minimal protection.

7. The collective priority of all states should be to minimize the impediments to state freedom.
In this light the state came to be redefined, as the right to self-determination and sovereignty of a nation, which permits the state to become the ultimate decision-maker within its territory.

**Modern State**

The modern state has territorial base. This means that the state exercises its authority within its territorial borders which are acknowledged by other states. It also signals the emergence of a new man homo-economicus, the economic man, whose activities brought industrialization. It is out of the womb of industrialization that globalization came out.

The word ‘state’ means the modern state; a form of political organization that evolved in early modern Europe and from the ashes of the demise of Christianity and it emerged as a new community sustained to do what private citizens were unable to do. The modern ‘nation-state’ tries to fuse together the state, the society and the economy under the ideology of nationalism.

The emphasis on the territorial integration of the nation-state meant that its laws and regulations applied also to the commercial activities carried out within its territory. Most importantly, national currency as ‘legal tender’ within its territory became the symbol not merely of commercial trust, but also of the authority of the state over the economy. Nevertheless, these newer commercial norms and arrangements, often encouraged by the state, weakened at the same time many traditional social norms. As a result, nation-state extended its control over the civil society through the economy.

The Aristotelian doctrine that the optimum size of the state is determined to the level of self-sufficiency, was re-interpreted centuries later by Machiavelli as self-sufficiency in arms and the ability of the state to defend itself. It came to redefine as the right to self-determination and sovereignty of a nation, which permits the state to become the ultimate decision-maker within its territory.

The decentralized political arrangements that characterized Europe, replaced by the Westphalian state system, was characterized by territorially bound sovereign state, each with its own centralized administration and a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence. A new form of political control and relocation of
population and reorganization of territory facilitated the expansion of trade and growth of industry. The new form of state based on the notion of sovereignty redefines the idea of private property. Private and public spheres of life came to be sternly demarcated. The royal court became the supreme authority in the public sphere and paternal authority assumed this role within the family. The powerful centralized state was welcomed by the rising commercial class because it freed them from the oppressive authority of the feudal lords, and permitted them, to pursue their commercial activities without hindrance. The feudal state in Europe was replaced by the absolutist state based on the notion of absolute sovereignty wherein the king/queen was believed to have absolute right over their domain, an acquisition of new territories was simply a matter of extending sovereignty. This later became the instrument through which colonial expansion was carried out. These colonies was not intended to be territorially subjugated or ruled from abroad, but were to serve as centres of commerce in the initial phase as source of raw material and market.

In the era of globalization, if the state aims at preventing any alien power from violating its boundaries, the process of globalization seeks to make these boundaries porous. The current phase of globalization is important in the evolution of the nation-state. Precisely from this angle, economic globalization challenges the political authority, which the nation-state had retained by undermining gradually many of the norms of the traditional civil society. The political authority of the nation-state was consolidated in the process of expansion of commerce, as its law and jurisdiction extended over the national economy. This strengthened economic nationalism as a complement to territorial nationalism.

Now a paradoxical turn in history confronts most nation-states, as the further spread of trade, commerce, finance and information obliterates many economic boundaries among nations. The commercial logic which help to consolidate nation-state through economic authority, now ironically undermining the economic authority of the nation-state, which it ones helped to consolidate.
Challenges to the State Sovereignty

In the background of the form of homo economicus and Treaty of Westphalia stipulated non-interference in the domestic affairs of the state. There are many issues which challenges the state sovereignty, whether the sovereignty has remained largely intact while the autonomy of the state has diminished or whether the modern state actually faces a loss of sovereignty in the era of globalization.

A number of fundamental gaps are apparent in the theory of sovereignty and globalization. David Held\textsuperscript{10} has identified five gaps with regard of concept of sovereignty in the global context: the world economy, hegemonic powers and power blocks, international law and the end of domestic policy.

The World Economy

There is gap between formal domain of political authority and the actual economic system of production, distribution and exchange which in many ways limit the actual power of national political authorities. In the economic realm, there are forces that actually undermine the power and scope of national states. In the context of world markets, role of multinationals increased social and workforce mobility and the decisive role of technology and communications to claim that the nation-state is sovereign in its economic policy is not correct.

Technological advances in transportation and communication are eroding the boundaries between hitherto separate markets territorial boundaries which were a necessary condition for autonomous national policies. The monetary and fiscal policies of individual governments are dominated by the movements in international financial product markets\textsuperscript{11}. Likewise, the levels of employments investment and revenue within a country are often subordinated to the production location decisions of multinational corporations\textsuperscript{12}. Even, when multinational corporation have a clear national-base their interest is above all in global profitability. Internationalization of production has eroded the state’s capacity to control its own economic future. The sovereign states continue to place their national interest in the forefront while
taking decisions concerning their economic policies but clearly their autonomy to do so is circumscribed. The economically weak states are under greater pressure then before both from outside and inside, to set their economic house in order. For example, International Monetary Fund with its structural adjustment programmes insist on certain conditions on its loans to a government, namely cut in public expenditure, subsidize welfare programmes and currency devaluation thereby monitoring the policy or performance of the economically weak states. Global markets imply greater competitiveness and increase dependence among states, making the idea of splendid isolation redundant. The global capitalism is creating serious threat for the theory and practice of sovereignty of the modern nation-states.\textsuperscript{13}

**Hegemonic Powers and Power Blocks**

The post Second World War period witnessed the denouncement of England and France as the super powers and the United States of America (U.S.A.) and the Union of Soviet Social Republic (U.S.S.R.) rose up as two most powerful power blocks. The U.S.A. represented the liberal democratic capitalist world, whereas the USSR assumed the leadership of the Communist States of Eastern Europe and China, which emerged as a symbol of socialism. World is divided into bipolar world. The dominance of the USA and USSR as world powers and the operation of alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, clearly constrains the decision-making for many nations. A state’s capacity to initiate particular foreign policy is restricted by its place in the international system of power relations. The existence of integrated supra-national command structure headed by the supreme allied commander in Europe, being always an American General appointed by the US President ensures that, in a situation of a war, NATO’s national armies would operate within the context of NATO strategies and NATO decisions\textsuperscript{14}. The sovereignty of a nation-state is necessarily and decisively qualified once its armed forces are committed to a NATO conflict.

The members of NATO are rival competing for scarce resources, arms contracts, international prestige and other means of national enhancements. Membership of NATO does not eliminate
sovereignty, rather, for each state, in different ways, membership … qualifies sovereignty. The establishment of integrated alliances and a tendency to shift the decision-making process from the nation-state to the power blocks limit the sovereignty of the state. Aspects of sovereignty are negotiated and re-negotiated in the NATO Alliance.

Till the Second World War, the state was the primary military actor which, however, got undermined with the emergence of power blocks, one led by the US and the other by the former USSR, through their respective alliance NATO and Warsaw Pact. The disintegration of the former USSR and the collapsed communism has led to the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. Though the US is the world’s only superpower, its dominance within NATO has diminished, primarily due to the rise of European Union (EU). Furthermore, there has been a decisive shift in the world mindset, which sees economic domination to be more important than military strength.

**International Organizations**

The development of international and transnational organizations has led to important changes in the decision-making structure of world politics. New forms of multinational organizations have been established and with them new forms of collective decision making involving states, inter-governmental organizations and a whole variety of transnational pressure groups, also moderated the idea of state sovereignty. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) may impose, as a condition of its loan to government, that the state cut public expenditure, elevate its currency and cut back on subsidized welfare programmes. European Union (EU) is a significant illustration of these issues. European Union provides opportunities and restraints. The membership of European Union threatens state powers and many decision on matters like monetary policy and defence are made by European institutions rather than by the member of state themselves.


**International Law**

Rights and duties are recognized in international law which transcend the claims of nation-state and which, whilst they may not be backed by institutions with coercive powers of enforcement, have far-reaching consequences. For example, the International Tribunal at Nuremberg – in the spirit of thinker like Grotius – laid down for the first time in history, that when international rules that protects basic humanitarian values are in conflict with state laws, every individual must transgress the state laws (Cassesse 1988: 132). The legal framework of Nuremberg Tribunal marked a highly significant change in the legal direction of the modern state, for the new rules challenge the principle of military discipline and subverted national sovereignty at one of its sensitive points, the hierarchical relations within the military.

Internationally recognized legal mainstays of sovereignty have been progressively questioned by western courts. And while it is the case that national sovereignty have most often been be victor when put to the test, the tension between national sovereignty and international law is now marked, and is by no mean clear how it will be resolved.

**End of Domestic Policy**

In the present global scenario, the distinction between domestic and foreign policy is becoming harder and harder to sustain. For example, cold war elevated communism and politics to the left generally to a political threat which knew no territorial limits: the enemy within was to be feared as much as the enemy without. Within NATO, the domestic stability of each member state became a routine concern; for it was regarded as a vital condition of the political and military cohesion of the alliance\(^\text{16}\).

In the name of national security interest, moreover public matter can be placed beyond public debate. When, national security interest are invoked, public policy can readily become a matter for state personnel alone locked into, among other things, the network of power blocks. The questions this poses for the idea of the sovereign democratic state are considerable. The modern theory of the sovereign state pre-supposes the idea of a ‘national
community fate’ – a community which rightly govern itself and
determines its own future. The idea is certainly challenged by the
nature of the pattern of global interconnections and the issues that
have to be confronted by a modern state. National Communities
do not exclusively ‘programme the action and decision of
governmental and parliamentary bodies’ and the latter by no means
simply determine what is right or appropriate for their own
citizens. In this way, domestic autonomy gets limited with the
larger security concerns of the power blocks undermining the
traditional concerns of sovereignty which conceives the state as the
primary spokesman of its citizens by determining domestic public
policy and protecting their foreign interests.

The concept of sovereignty remains the most important
distinguishing marks of the state even today. The process of
globalization, the operation of international law during peace and
war, the international organizations and the non-governmental
organizations, world-wide terrorism redefine its meaning by
making it more legitimate and accountable without, however,
replacing it. The nation-state still plays the role of both de-jure and
de-facto sovereign and the citizens identity is linked with it though
there is distinction between legitimate and illegitimate sovereign
authority and also what is considered as just and unjust wars.
These developments successfully question the Hegelian hypothesis
of a conflict between two sovereign nations reflecting two different
notions of right. The actualization of human rights with a doctrine
of some basic inalienable rights to every single individual has
completely transformed the entire concept of sovereignty
analogous to the change from the divine right theory to the
emergence of the constitutional and accountable political authority.
Nations like individuals, have rights but again, like individuals
these rights are not absolute and as a consequence no sovereign
state, as no individual, is above the law of nations.

New Actors on World Scenario

There is a new set of actors on the world scenario who,
unlike governments, do not approach problems from the
perspective of national interest. There are international coalitions
of non-governmental organizations, and issue-networks among
people across borders. These groups are shaping a whole set of
standards, rules and norms. In the private sectors, these ranges from the International Standards Organization to the International Organization of Security Commissions. There is World Economic Forum at Davos and International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Amnesty International, Green Peace, which are apt illustrations of global civil society and global mass movements. Terrorism and Nuclear Proliferations have also threatened the sovereignty of nation-state.

Consequences of Globalization on State

The state’s role is changing as a result of globalization. According to them, there is the possibility of states adapting themselves to the transformations in international society, in the form of ‘pooled sovereignty’ – the idea that states that would be weak and ineffective acting independently could acquire greater influence by working together with other states through the vehicle of international or regional institutions. Others believe that globalization is itself driven by the state. States are themselves the authors of globalization by promoting and shaping the nature and pace of globalization. Trade agreements and regionalization are instances of this. Political elites in different countries often use globalization as an ideological device to make the move towards market reforms appear inevitable and irresistible. States are now more concerned about their role as actors in global markets to protect national economic well-being and are entrepreneurial. They are less concerned with political sovereignty and security than they were earlier. Moreover, as Michael Mann (1997) argues, we need to make distinctions between states to understand the changing role of the state. Globalization will affect powerful European states differently from a vulnerable country in South America or Africa. Some states might become stronger and more powerful, while others weaker.19

Foreign trade investment or finance can play a contradictory role with respect to national sovereignty. It may undermine the political authority of the economically weaker nation-state by making crucially dependent on foreign trade, investment and finance, contrarywise, it may enhance the political authority of the economically stronger states in so far as the weaker nation-states are crucially dependent on them.
Globalization is a code of international behaviour and any state in its equality with other states has to make reasonable concessions without affecting its sovereignty. And if these concessions may have their internal consequences cannot be helped. International things may become national problems, and in the fast progressing life of man requires this sacrifice as a cost of development. The inevitable process of globalization has side by side aroused a necessity within each state to alert on its defence because the greater the progress the greater it becomes risk to the security and in order to maintain the security of the states are competing also in military strength corresponding to the trend of globalization. Self-defence is realized as part of globalization. In terms of military strength states are internally enjoying greater power day by day in globalized world. Externally in economic spheres sovereignty is being compromised.

When external effects are significantly present in production or consumption, the market mechanism fails to attain efficiency. In particular, free global competence cannot guarantee optimum use of air, water, forests, energy and other environmental resources for development sustain over a long horizon as there is no automatic mechanism for internalizing the social externality costs. Carefully designed policies are needed to prevent over exploitation and to preserve ecological balance.

Globalization could have different consequences for different states. As states differ in the degree of international power, they can assume the role of agents of globalization as well as become its passive victims. Thus, the impact of globalization on state sovereignty is much more complex than what the end of the state thesis allows for. The countries which are far behind on the scale of economic growth has to find ways and means to promote it. For this they have to sacrifice their hard-won independence because safeguarding independence requires rigid state boundaries and demand of economic growth requires porous, or at least, opening up of state boundaries.

Most of the less developed countries are still to achieve the status of full nation-state. To successfully promote and achieve the goal of national reconstruction, they have to emphasize nationalism as a symbol of community and legitimacy in
developing countries. As such, nationalism and politics involved with national construction, act as determinant and regulator of economic growth in developing countries. Economic development is inextricably tied to political development but the developed countries considers phenomenon of nationalism as a hindrance to economic growth but also to the welfare of the world community as a whole. Therefore, developed countries put emphasis on the primacy of universalism over nationalism and of economics over politics. In the eyes of the developed countries, nationalism impedes the free play of economic factors and as a result slows down the process of economic growth. Thus to quicken the pace of economic growth, it is necessary that economic values must be allowed to assert their benign rationalizing influence over political values.  

Economic postulates emphasized a value system, which rewards entrepreneurship and efficiency in production. Politics, on the other hand, rewards power. In developing countries, politics have the primacy over economic growth. World economy has become so interdependent that any distinction between national and extra national becomes superficial. The phenomenon of globalization in a situation of unequal exchange is bound to create cultural, economic and political anomalies and the spread of universal model destroys the local values identities and cultures. Institutions of world order are weak and in many respects ineffective. Thus, when trade in a situation of unequal exchange penetrates, political factors also penetrate and then cultural changes also occur to progressive homogenization of people across nations. Such a situation threatens the possibilities for national identity and cultural distinctions.

The sovereign state at international level remains an important instrument but now it cannot perform its functions single-handedly. The functions of state are growing but the laws which the state enforces for economic management are not the result of its sovereign will but most a part of global compulsions.

Epilogue

In traditional sense state is an independent, equal and unique entity. It considers the state as a fundamental unit of political
analysis and sovereignty as the essential characteristic of political organization. However, the structure and function and power of the state is rapidly undergoing a substantial change. Even in the case of defence from foreign aggression, state is not independent e.g. Iraq’s aggression of Kuwait. It is not merely that the states have changed, it is the domestic and international environment and the technological sophistication in which they have to operate, has been so transformed as to call into question the meaning and essence of sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty is in dilemma. Which the powers of the state and their capacity to use it have increased because of technological innovations. In the case of internal order and defence, an area in which the state has the monopoly to use force, the rise of ethnic minority movements, terrorism religious fundamentalism, private military forces, all point to an increasing disposal of power. Military options of states are more and more influential by the arms manufacturers, banks and other financial institutions, foreign governments, their intelligence organizations and international collective arrangements.

The power and authority of the state is dispersed across diverse and complex set of local, national and international institutions that is thought of by a system of sovereign states.

According to Hinsley, although the theory of sovereignty has been challenged by a variety of factors in the modern domestic state, yet these developments do not meet the primary need to ensure the effective exercise of power, more so as the growing complexity of the community is serving to emphasize the importance of the state. If the growing needs are to be satisfied, the only remaining recourse is to locate sovereignty in the body politic i.e. both in community and state together: community being the source of sovereignty and the state as the instrument wholly exercises it. The recent developments have not superseded the requirement that no political or legal system can function unless it possesses coercive machinery with which the community/state can enforce compliance with the decrees of regulating authority, and that authority whether it is nominal or real is by definition the state, and it is the concept of sovereignty which authorizes and justifies its acts.
In the era of globalization, states have become neither weaker nor less important. On the contrary, in the countries with the most advanced and internationally integrated economies, governments ability to tax and redistribute incomes, regulate the economy and monitor the activity of their citizens has increased. In this way, internal sovereignty of the state is threatened but not going to wither away. Externally in economic terms sovereignty is being compromised.

Yet the globalization is homogenizing the world but as much as different cultures and identities are there, the concept of sovereignty has to sustain. Paul Hirst examines the issue of sovereignty in the context of a rapidly changing world and suggest that a world economy with a high degree of trade and investment is not necessarily a globalized economy and in such a system nation-states have a crucial role to play especially in providing governance of the economy. He observes that so long as nation-states remain important, sovereignty would remain relevant, although its role and manifestation has altered.

The role of the nation state is critical for both development and democracy in the world. In a national context, the belief that markets know best and that less government is better government is open to serious question. For markets exclude a significant proportion of people, particularly the poor, unless governments regulate and complement them so as to make them people-friendly. Such correctives can only be introduced by the state. The reason is simple enough. Governments are accountable to their people, whereas markets are not. In the international context, where the distribution of economic and political power is so unequal, the nation state is perhaps the only institutional medium through which poor countries or poor people can attempt to influence or shape rules and institutions in a world of unequal partners. Even today, in large part, only nation states have the authority to set international rules or create international institutions. Thus, developing countries and transnational economies must ensures that their voices are heard in this forum. Groups of countries with mutual interests are more likely to be heard than single countries by themselves. There will always be some conflict of interest, but there will also be areas where it is possible to find common cause and accept trade-offs.
In principle, it is possible to contemplate cooperation among nation states to create rules and norms for the market that transcend national borders, just as the nation state created rules and norms for the market within national boundaries. In practice, however, a recognition of the benefits of such cooperation might not be motivation enough. Cooperation among nation states is far more likely to materialize, much like stable coalitions, if and when the costs of non-cooperation cross the threshold of acceptance. In either case, the nation state is the most important player in this game. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine good governance in the world without nation states, just as it is not possible to have good governance in countries without governments.

In the era of globalization, the state which was withdrawing from welfaristic activities and promoting privatization and liberalization, is now providing bailout packages. The so called capitalist state, United States of America is providing financial assistance and subsidies to its private banks, in order to save it from insolvency. This represents a modified form of capitalism but this tendency is strengthening the institution of state and its sovereignty. The present global recession of 2009 and its repercussions on state economy are evidence of the fact that the vicissitudes in the global economy do not so much undermine as vindicate the inherent sovereignty of the state.
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