

GLOBALIZATION AND INCREASING DOMINATION OVER THE NATION STATE

Ertuğrul Buğra ORHAN¹

Geliş Tarihi: 05/04/2021

Kabul Tarihi: 21/05/2021

ABSTRACT

Globalization is a phenomenon that deeply affects today's economies and politics. The excessive growth of global companies erodes the economic and political effectiveness of nation states. It is seen that this phenomenon is handled with different approaches in the context of globalization literature. However, especially the approach put forward by the critical theory has been the academic parameter adopted for this research. Therefore, the focus is on the context of the approach of globalization that strengthens capital companies and negatively affects nation states. In the research, it has been concluded that the nation state was the dominant actor of the global system, whereas today nation states are under pressure. In addition, it has been concluded that global capital companies are in a dominating position against nation states. The concepts of freedom, intervention, and domination have been abstract explanators in reaching this conclusion. The method adopted in the use of concepts is the functionality of the concepts and the related concepts approach. These approaches have been evaluated with an inductive conceptualization.

Keywords: Globalization, Freedom, Nation State, Domination

¹ Arş. Gör. Dr. Fırat Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi İktisat Bölümü, bugraorhan@firat.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-2455-5441

Küreselleşme ve Ulus Devlet Üzerinde Artan Tahakküm

ÖZET

Küreselleşme, tüm güncelliğiyle günümüz ekonomilerini ve siyaseti derinden etkileyen bir fenomendir. Küresel şirketlerin aşırı büyümesi, ulus devletlerin ekonomik ve siyasal etkinliğini aşındırmaktadır. Bu olgunun küreselleşme literatürü bağlamında farklı yaklaşımlarla ele alındığı görülmektedir. Ancak özellikle eleştirel teorinin ortaya koyduğu yaklaşım, bu araştırma için benimsenen akademik parametre olmuştur. Bundan dolayı küreselleşmenin sermaye şirketlerini güçlendiren ve ulus devletleri olumsuz etkileyen yaklaşım bağlamına odaklanılmıştır. Araştırmada, önceden küresel sistemin başat aktörü ulus devlet iken günümüzde ulus devletlerin baskı altında oldukları sonucuna varılmıştır. Ayrıca küresel sermaye şirketlerinin ulus devletlere karşı tahakküm edici pozisyonda oldukları sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu sonuca varılmasında özgürlük, müdahale ve tahakküm kavramları soyut açıklayıcılar olmuştur. Kavramların kullanımında benimsenen yöntem kavramların işlevselliği ve bağlantılı kavramlar yaklaşımıdır. Bu yaklaşımlar tümevarımsal bir kavramsallaştırma ile değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Küreselleşme, Özgürlük, Ulus Devlet, Tahakküm

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of known and recorded history, people have tended to live together due to their basic needs such as survival, safety and nutrition. This trend has paved the way for the development of ways to overcome the difficulties and needs imposed by collective life over time. After the organization required to meet the basic needs was made possible, managerial and political authority relations between the members of the community began to develop. In the context of the development of these relations, questions such as how and by whom the resources of the community will be used, how the sharing will be made, how the rules and boundaries will be applied by whom, have emerged and politics-management relations have developed in this manner. At the end of this development process, organizations called the state and existed for centuries (Kapani, 2002: 33) emerged. In the context of modern thought, the state is the unit that demands the rights and powers to be legitimate and mobilizes all necessary resources in order to produce the rules and norms that must be followed during all activities to be carried out on a territory with defined borders and to put them into action (Bauman, 2012: 65). The powers and capabilities of the modern nation-state have been developed and institutionalized in matters such as ensuring social order and security, making and enforcing laws, and ensuring that commercial life continues under fair and transparent conditions. These powers are guaranteed by the legal entity of the state with a contract to which all citizens are subjected (Kapani, 2002: 41) and the ruling-managed relations have been systematized in this context.

With the development of trade in the world and the monopolization of the capitalist system after the cold war, especially as of the 1990s, economy-based movements have started to erode the borders of the nation states. The concept of globalization, which started to affect the whole world in this period, started to show its power to affect the present and future of the world and turned into a current approach. The research aims to reveal the erosive effect of the phenomenon of globalization on the nation state and to evaluate the changes that occur in the context of nation state-freedom within the

context of domination and intervention within the framework of the concept of freedom. In the research, the method was determined in the context of integrating the concepts of domination and intervention under the concept of globalization, nation-state, freedom with their relational dimensions and evaluating them with an inductive approach. Thus, the relationship of the concepts could be dealt with in a subjective dimension and was not separated from the context of the literature. Functional concepts that fall under Klausmeier's (1992: 269) concept classification explain what a thing is for and point out the relationship between two or more elements. Merrill and Tennyson (1977) dealt with the concepts consecutively and in conjunction. Accordingly, consecutive concepts express that a concept is directly and sequentially related to another concept. Connected concepts relate to each other without being consecutive. The functionality and link quality of the concepts were taken into account in the study. Therefore, within the concept of globalization, the relation of both concrete and abstract concepts such as capital, global companies, nation state and domination has been taken into account. In the final analysis, the validity of the conceptual approach was verified through some concrete examples.

2. GLOBALIZATION

The general opinion that emerged in the context of globalization is that this concept is not easily defined and variable. However, the common feature of the approaches on globalization is that this concept has structurally interconnected and complex networks (Heywood, 2016: 131). With the effect of globalization, the borders of the nation-states of the modern era are becoming more and more permeable and the borders on the globe are disappearing. (Heywood, 2016: 131) While defining globalization, Scholte emphasizes its "independent" feature that develops among people. This is because the increasing number of links are transnational and cross-border feature and becoming independent from the land. (Scholte, 2000) In the economic context, globalization is about the intertwining of national economies and their loss of being independent units. The strengthening of international businesses and their increasing control of world trade are connecting all national economies together and reducing their effects (Heywood, 2016: 132). One of the criticisms made about globalization is that international companies and developed economies are permanent

winners. Accordingly, the continuous unilateral winning situation causes the formation of great inequalities (Heywood, 2016: 133). In addition, Henry Kissinger (2014) stated in his book "World Order" that the world has two different structures as economic and political organization. Accordingly, the economic organization is trying to complement globalization. Kissinger sees this structure as a dilemma and accepts the disappearance of borders as a result of this dual structure. In addition, there are also opinions that globalization has grown capital companies too much and therefore even capital has transformed within itself. One of them is the view that large companies have to transform into smaller units in order to compete and provide high mobility (Naisbitt, 1994: 5). Naisbitt supported this view by citing the downsizing decisions of global subsidiaries such as IBM, GM (General Motor), Xerox, ABB (Asea Brown Boveri) (Naisbitt, 1994: 4-5).

An imbalance arises due to the fact that the economy-based development and movement in the world is faster than the state and other structures. The fact that the capital is always one step ahead of the state makes it a feature that can transit national borders and have no space (Bauman, 2012: 60-61). Therefore, the increasingly dysfunctional of the economic instruments of the states emerges as an inevitable situation not only in the context of the global system but also within national borders. If the nation-state becomes economically more ineffective, it will undoubtedly weaken it politically. The lack of a fixed residence of the capital allows especially financial movements to move in large amounts and speeds and national economies to experience large losses of control.

According to Heywood (2006), one of the anti-globalization views is that the structures that are the losers of globalization have cheap labor and weak legal protective regulations. Although we do not deny the assumption that states with these characteristics are generally exposed to the negative effects of globalization, it should be noted that China is one of the leading players of globalization as a major exception.

It is a fact that global companies grow gradually in the current times of globalization. This growth has forced companies to formulate different strategies under increasing competition and tough market conditions. Global companies are now on the way of transforming from large centers into smaller and more efficient units. Thus, they have the chance to employ less

personnel and have the ability to manage their operations in different parts of the world by establishing a fast and mobile ecosystem. In the new process, even the companies experiencing a shrinkage in volume brings to mind the administrative problems of nation states. While discussing the negative effects of globalization on nation-states, what kind of changes the nation-states will “have to experience” has become a very important issue as capital has entered the new century by shifting. The traumatic effect of globalization has been generally evaluated in the context of the actors of the economic and political system. Therefore, different perspectives and approaches on globalization have emerged. To understand these, it is necessary to focus on the three most comprehensive approaches to globalization. These three different approaches include views that address the issue in the context of extreme globalization, anti-globalization and transformational approach.

2.1. Extreme Globalists

The extreme globalists, who view globalization as completely eliminating the features of the nation state by capital movements, argue that the traditional political system will change in the new age. The basis of this claim lies in the structural disruption of national economies by the international financial and production network together with economic globalization. From the economic system where the borders have disappeared, the nation-state administrators only assume the minimum regulatory role in the activities of international businesses. In addition, the social structures formed in the ecosystem of global capital are differentiated with new forms of organization outside the framework of the modern period national state model. This new organization has started to take over the position of national governments (Held and McGrew, 2008: 14-15).

Extreme globalization approaches recognize that the West benefits from globalization. However, how valid this acceptance is today is a controversial issue. Nevertheless, it is an undeniable fact that the West, which is the center with the increasing globalization, has largely included the environment in terms of values and culture. Therefore, this globalization approach expresses globalization in the context of the interaction between regions or geographically between continents (Held and McGrew, 2008: 14). It is stated that the developing new types of global-social organization will rival the political sovereignty of nation states. However, it can be said that

this social structure is not monolithic and homogeneous (Hablemitođlu, 2004: 20). According to the neoliberal approach, which is one of the most prominent examples of this, it is seen very positively that the rise of market economy and pure individualism surpasses the sovereignty of the state. The same situation expresses the absolute victory of global capitalism in terms of neo-Marxist approach (Held and McGrew, 2008: 30- 31).

2.2. Opponents of Globalization

Opponents of globalization approach globalization as a questionable concept and display a critical attitude. In the first place, they see globalization as a very broad concept and insufficient understanding of the world (Held & McGrew, 2008: 11). In terms of content, it is seen that global capital is held responsible as the source of inequality and injustice in general. Unlike extreme globalists, Hirst and Thompson (2007) stated that the world order does not have an integrated structure and that the system consists of national economies whose international dimension is strengthened. However, today, the existence of those with larger economic sizes than many national economies among global capital companies seems to be sufficient to ask questions about the validity of this idea. It is also known that extreme globalists are criticized by conservatives and communitarians as masking historical specificity by using liberalism (Erdođan, 2006:123).

2.3. Transformational Approach

Transformational approach does not adopt the single-society expectation of extreme globalists to have a singular structure. Contrary to this approach, the transformational approach states that while some states and societies have more similar characteristics in the globalization process, some will take a very different form and separate from others. (Held and McGrew, 2008: 8-11). However, the transformational approach does not adopt the sharp picture drawn by other globalization approaches and does not have strong claims like them. Therefore, they do not consider the world in two poles as global capital and traditional states. In addition, approaches such as the opponents of globalization that globalization means the nation state and that this will fail are not produced. In short, the transformational approach sees globalization as a phenomenon that goes beyond national boundaries and is shaped by complex networks of supranational relations.

The main factor that makes different views on globalization different from each other is the differences in world views rather than their approaches to the phenomenon. For example, some Marxist groups who advocate the free movement of the free market and have a close stance with the liberal school in the context of the liberal school and the universal approach, which integrates universal values with it (Esgin, 2005: 190). One of the common points of these approaches is that the effect of globalization on the nation state will not be positive. Therefore, it can be said that concerns about the future of the current political system are not unfounded. In particular, the conditions that companies controlling global communication networks present to users regarding data security are the subject of great controversy. While currently discussing the tendency of nation states to use more control tools for public safety, businesses that provide social network communication can use user data as they want, creating a different agenda. In this respect, extreme globalists promise of more freedom to individuals based solely on liberal dialectics can be questioned in the context of data security and privacy violations. Because if the tendency of the state to use its positive rights for the public good is perceived as domination rather than intervention, the violation of privacy in the face of the use of a communication tool can also be considered as a domination relationship. Before evaluating this relationship, it is necessary to turn to the nation-state without leaving the context of globalization and to consider it in terms of its structural problems.

2.4. Globalization and the Nation State

The formation of the nation state started with the acceleration of expansion as a global system after the state system was formed in Europe (Giddens, 2012: 62). According to Ernest Gellner (1992), nation-states have emerged as structures where culturally similar communities live, have an integrated economic system, and all units have the opportunity to communicate with industrialization. Again, according to Gellner (1992), cultural homogeneity (based on the recognition that nationalism is a necessity in the modern world), the rise of the national state that provides an integrated economy and the opportunity for communication is a natural result of industrialization. In addition, most states or nations that exist around the world have a colonial past. The state systems of these nations are also designed in accordance with the model of the powers colonizing them.

The other states are the nation-states that were founded with the motivation of the previous multinational empires and the communities that separated from them. However, it can be said that the founders of the nation state are generally elites who want to control the power and apparatus of that society (Giddens, 2008: 334). Therefore, according to Giddens, the resources that constitute the nation state are mostly "external". The new state model established by the elites who are above external influence and society within always tends to carry the potential of class conflict in political terms.

In terms of the nation-state, sovereignty is about determining the principle of which element is external and internal. In other words, while "citizens" or "individuals" who remain under the sovereignty of the nation state are about the internal, the external ones are those who are outside this sphere. In the context of national sovereignty, the universal system has basically developed based on this rule (Giddens, 2008: 365). More broadly, the sovereign nation-state is an organization that has the ability to make legal regulations within a defined area of sovereignty, to ensure the enforcement of legal regulations, to apply compulsory practices that can be used in the legal context, to establish the political system and power, and to benefit from basic economic activities and use it in the state administration (Giddens, 2008: 366). Especially the effort of the nation state to carry out activities that increase its efficiency in the global economy in order to protect its own economic sovereignty and to develop joint work opportunities with other nation states are considered important in terms of reducing the negative effects of globalization. However, according to Giddens, the main threat to the sovereignty of states is not the risk that grants for debt management or economic independence depend on political conditions. According to him, the biggest risk is the fluctuation of national economies of states in a global economy devoid of political control (Giddens, 2008: 369).

In terms of an increasingly stronger discourse, people argue that the nation-state has lost its validity and that new forms of political integration have become more in line with post-industrial and postmodern trends. In fact, Yeates (2002) examines this in his article with the question of whether politics ends in strong globalization. However, there are also those who say that the claim that global economy and communication trends go beyond national borders and reduce the effectiveness of the nation state is not

realized as expected. In this respect, Smith is among those who think that globalization is not as worn out as the nation state is mentioned. However, there is an important point here, which is that in Smith's approach to the nation-state, he goes to a national state-nation state distinction. In this respect, we will not be able to examine this distinction since the nature of the ground where the state develops in the context of effective identity and authority is not within the scope of our conceptual approach. According to Smith, the power and influence of the state has been put under pressure by transnational companies, but states that use technological facilities (such as new communication technologies, internet) have also gained power by using cultural and social dynamics more effectively (Smith, 2003: 101). However, it is obvious that today, especially with the pandemic process, states have an efficiency problem despite using technology in the field of education. Therefore, it is not difficult to think about the state-society relationship directly in the context of technological possibilities and to say that it is getting more difficult to produce a positive approach. Because it is not easy to underline the claim that the variety of communication channels is directly proportional to the quality of the communication. The relationship of the state to society can be explained not only by means of communication but also by the transformation that takes place in the public sphere, whether the legal level can adapt to new conditions or not. The economic dimension of the work is already the biggest part of globalization and it is seen as absolutely damaging to the state in the dilemma of global capital and nation state. Therefore, the view that the comfort zone we are accustomed to as individuals of the settled order and the sense of control we assume is now just a "suspicion" (Bauman, 2012: 63) directly pushes us to the question of what the role of the state will be in the future. However, while asking this question, it is imperative that we ignore the question whether the state can continue to exist in the future or not. The state's being a "victim" of globalization is at least a fact in the context of the transformation of the economic order. The existence of the state, at least as a shrinking actor of the economy, does not make it a passive device in every sense. Actually, all actors of the globalizing world exist on an asymmetrical and difficult to predict plane. So much so that the local of each nation is now in contact with another distant local and forms a global local network. Structures with high mobility based on physical or communication, without being tied to the land,

materialize the sociology of the movement due to the global civil society over time. This entity, which is different from the classical nation-state organization of the modern period, has now evolved into a multi-layered governance, a social mobilization both within the global economic structure and in the context of this accelerated cultural and social movements (Urry, 2000: 185). Therefore, a transformation process from local to global has been entered, locality has lost its old meaning and the nature of national borders has become more uncertain. As a result of this uncertainty, it has become inevitable that national-cultural identity, identity and ethnic distinction will begin to melt into a global pot. In such a process, no socio-cultural data and predetermined definitions have any meaning anymore. (Beck, 2002: 61-62). An element of social networks that mobilized within this inclusive and transformative phenomenon is now the nation state. It will inevitably be one of the affected and transforming elements of new social spaces in the nation state (Beck, 2002: 17) Taking this transformation into account, current approaches try to explain the future of the nation state in the globalization process with post-national definitions and in terms of social dynamics, post-social. However, it is difficult to be clear about how effective and radically changing the effects of globalization on political and social structures will be. In this context, Touraine defined society as an uncertain space that renews itself within the framework of constant conflict, social relations, political responsibilities and demands, and ideologies (Delanty, 2006: 40). It seems quite normal in the context of Touraine's approach that globalization has uncertainties in terms of its nature even though its quality is different in terms of state-society relations.

In the light of the above information, it is a fact that globalization has forced the nation-state at certain points, but this view is not sufficient and correct for us to accept it as a completely dead or dying phenomenon. The emergence of a global society is not enough and enough to put the nation-state out of circulation yet. In fact, one of the biggest actors of the political-social transformation locally is still the nation state. According to Jessop (2004), this role seems to continue until a transnational political organization emerges and becomes institutionalized in a democratic capacity that is seen as legitimate by everyone. However, we can say that other supranational-international actors are also involved in the state-society interaction and we can analyze it from this perspective. When viewed from a broad perspective,

we can see that globalization has drawn all actors to an interactive process. As it seems obvious, the world still continues to preserve its bureaucratic, capitalist, social and realistic structure (Scholte, 2000: 110). In this respect, the state-society or individual relationship can be evaluated in its own internal conditions, taking into account the dynamics of globalization.

According to Bauman, the handling of today's world as a whole has become increasingly chaotic. The unpredictable structures of the newly emerged forces (Bauman, 2012: 63). have begun to take place on a plane of irregular and asymmetrical competition. Bauman stated that the understanding of order in the modern age is based on controllability. This understanding obviously turns it into a habit of staying in the expectation of establishing and maintaining order. However, according to him, it is not important that this understanding is based on strong foundations or if it is an illusion. According to Bauman, this is just an assumption that we are in control (Bauman, 2012: 63). Therefore, the control capabilities of the nation-states, which are the dominant actors of the modern period political system, have been approached with suspicion long before today. Today, there is no clear answer to these doubts. Because it still seems difficult to talk about a singular structure that dominates the regulatory aspect of the global-political system. One of the reasons is that the framework for controlling the system is still unclear. In a globalized world, although the nation-state represents the existing local authorities, it cannot be as effective as an orderly provider. Due to the uncertainties in the context of the effectiveness of the nation state and the role of non-state actors, a general consensus on the new political system that globalization will bring could not be formed (Bauman, 2012: 64). However, despite this uncertainty, there are also approaches that criticize the negative side of globalization very harshly. Accordingly, the realities recently revealed by globalization are now perceived by people together with the situations that cause poverty, hunger and employment loss. This perception causes an increase in reactions against globalization (Aydoğan, 2006: 12). While political parties maintain their power in developed countries during the globalization period, the opposite is the case in underdeveloped countries. The reason for this is that after capital's control of politics in developed countries, they establish an exploitative relationship in underdeveloped countries (Aydoğan, 2006: 15). This view seems remarkable in terms of feeling the negative effects of globalization more and

increasing reactions in less developed countries. As a matter of fact, Aydoğan argues that globalization is basically the aim of downsizing, dividing the nation-state and providing full control. This approach can be understood as the deliberate activities of capital that directly represent an ideology and ideology of globalization. However, although most of the views expressed in the context of globalization contain harsh criticism, they are not so assertive.

3. FREEDOM AND GLOBALIZATION

Freedom is a concept that has been discussed and constantly transformed in every age and period. As a result of the concept being so dynamic, what freedom is, its limits, how much it can be used and how it will be limited by whom has been constantly discussed. In the context of approaches that remain within the framework of modernity, the timeline in which freedom is dealt with systematically and the literature begins to expand can be explained with liberalism. One of the reasons for this is that the individual, which is one of the underlying approaches of the Kantian moral philosophy that influences liberalism, is viewed as a goal rather than a tool (Erdoğan, 2006: 44). In terms of its origin, the word liberal is derived from the Latin word liber (free) and has been used to mean "befitting a free person" until the end of the 18th century (Berktaş, 2015: 49). In fact, the modern era interpretation of freedom and the emergence of the philosophy of liberalism started with the effects of developments such as the rise of capitalism, the decline of the aristocracy, and the industrial revolution. However, in terms of philosophical thought, liberalism began to develop in John Locke's political philosophy long before the industrial revolution. Locke deals with concepts such as the limitation of political power, the absence of arbitrary rule, the equality and freedom of people, the right to life and property. (Zabcı, 2009: 164-167) Thus, political, entrepreneurial and individual freedoms have developed within the framework of the understanding of liberalism as very important topics of the political philosophy. The point that the study will emphasize at this point will be to indicate the negative and positive aspects of freedom and to discuss the points that the state and capital face within the framework of the concept of freedom in the context of Pettit's approach to freedom within the framework

of globalization. For this, first of all, it is necessary to briefly touch and explain the negative-positive understanding of freedom.

While freedom develops within the political thought within the framework mentioned, one of the most important names examining this concept is Isaiah Berlin. In Berlin's work titled "two liberation theory", freedom has not been handled as a singular concept but has been studied as a whole composed of two different concepts (Swift, 2006: 51). Accordingly, freedom has been handled in two different ways as negative and positive freedom. Negative freedom refers to the area that needs to be established in order for individuals to perform their actions without being restricted or interfered with by someone else (Berlin, 2002: 169). This understanding is considered within the framework of liberalism's "laissez faire" approach, which recommends that individuals act freely independently of someone or something. Negative freedoms should be as limitless as possible and should not be subject to interference in any way. In Arendt (1996: 207), he expressed this meaning as people are free as long as they can act. Mill (2000: 25), while talking about individual (negative) freedom in the political system, refers to the aspect of which it should exist for one's happiness but without hindering another's happiness. According to Bellany (2005), Berlin's negative freedom approach has been expanded to remove obstacles to demand and election, based on the idea that the willingness of freedom can be restricted and negative freedom can be narrowed in this way. The positive freedom of individuals is considered by Berlin within the framework of negative freedom. That is to say, the person chooses the decisions that he can make freely with the control he has created within himself, and becomes his own master, so he prioritizes what he wants, not another person (Berlin 2002: 178). In both freedom approaches, there is the ability to act and make decisions independently from external influence in the context of one's negative freedom. The only point that separates positive freedom from negative freedom is that the person monopolizes the ability to control and brake independently from outside intervention at the point of making decisions and choices. In Philip Pettit's (1998) book titled "Republicanism: A Freedom and Management Theory", positive freedoms are discussed in the context of the freedom of the state to intervene in order to use the general freedoms of the society by using the understanding of the motive to control the decision and choice. Pettit discussed the state's limitation of freedoms

with the concepts of intervention and domination and evaluated which one restricts general freedom arbitrarily within the framework of these two concepts. Accordingly, there is a huge difference between an intervention that the authority does for the common good, that is, an intervention that nobody turns into an object of discussion, and an intervention that is made in a completely arbitrary way (Pettitt, 1998: 14). The protection of freedom from arbitrary interference by others, or not being exposed to it, is essential for an acceptable, respectable political order. Because intervention for the common good does not mean an arbitrary restriction, and therefore intervention is positive, and domination, which is arbitrary obstruction, is negative. Therefore, non-domination gives the ability to object to democratic understanding (Pettitt, 1998: 16). Thus, individuals are liberated thanks to their right to object to the negativity that arbitrariness has on them. Deprivation of liberty cannot be explained solely by restriction. This is also associated with being subject to potential judgment of the arbitrary will of another person or institution (Pettitt, 1998: 24). To give a concrete and up-to-date example to this, it has been a matter of discussion, especially during the pandemic process, to enforce sanctions against those who oppose the practice of wearing masks in the public sphere without a judicial decision. Even sometimes, social opposition may develop against restrictions and interventions of general benefit even in Europe. A global socialization may cause the intervention to be perceived as domination. For Braudel (1996) stated that liberal libertarian thought (which can be evaluated in the context of capital-nation-state today) positions the state in a narrower framework in a less executive position. Within the framework of this view, both the political and economic effects of the state's restrictive measures may result in the state being seen as a mechanism that should be restricted and cause social upheavals. Therefore, the intervention of a state that has protected its legitimacy in the eyes of society is not viewed negatively. However, considering the opposite, legitimacy weakens in political systems where arbitrariness is not fully understood or where there is domination that looks like intervention (Pettitt, 1998). If globalization weakens nation-states and causes an increase in authoritarian tendencies, the legitimacy of the positive rights of the state in the eyes of society also becomes a matter of debate.

Liberalism has long been known for its assumption of negative freedom and the non-use of means of domination in the context of the

absence of intervention (Pettit, 1998: 29). However, the understanding of social justice and the commitment to equality is in a different place than the purely liberal understanding. Economic liberalism's pursuit of absolute freedom paved the way for a much more complex understanding of freedom with the inclusion of the state and society in the system. In the 21st century, a complete contradiction has emerged in the establishment order created by capital, in the pursuit of freedom and rights of the nation-state and citizens. Hence, demands for individual freedom began to fall outside the borders of the nation state and from different systems into the borders of the nation state. The state's self-avoidance reflex and authoritarianism can also be interpreted as an adaptation problem or an existence crisis in this context.

4. THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION, NATION-STATE AND FREEDOM

Wallerstein (1998) stated that liberalism still defends the legitimacy of peoples' rights, but is not sincere in this. He even stated that the defended rights were also defended in order not to be fully implemented (Wallerstein, 1998: 154). When this view is evaluated in the context of exercising rights or arbitrary intervention by nation states, it actually makes the liberal understanding seem meaningless, especially on the capital side. Since we know that capital is not a legitimate political authority, it can be said that the understanding of imposing freedom on nation states is not really for freedom, at least from Wallerstein's perspective. In addition, the welfare state that exists to ensure liberal equality and guarantee freedoms (Kymlicka, 2016: 130) turns into an ideal that is difficult to survive as a result of globalization weakening the nation state. Therefore, the function of nation-states to produce and distribute prosperity is weakened, and their ability to expand the space of equitable distribution and negative freedom within weakens. Because capital is not only outside but also within national borders. If we accept that the state has no tendency to share power with capital, the likelihood that freedoms will be the victims of power struggle from different angles will increase. However, since the authority exercising power in democratic systems has the responsibility, the structure that bears the most political risks will be the legitimate powers of the nation state. Citizens are undoubtedly the biggest victims of the influence of the government.

Fukuyama et al. (2021) stated that the democratic order in the USA is under the threat of technology hegemony, that politics is under the control of the elite groups, and the social reflex of a mass supporting Trump in the last presidential elections (2020) is one of the results of this hegemony. Accordingly, an ironic picture of the USA, which is the production and distribution center of globalization, falling into a difficult situation in the face of globalization has also emerged. However, the belief that the USA's own principles are universal by exporting its own system in the context of both foreign policy and globalization seemed functional until recently. In addition, there was an understanding that these values were forced to be accepted by other states (Kissinger: 2014). Today, globalization has become much more complex under both the pressure of capital on nation-states and the pressure of powerful states of the traditional global system. Therefore, the negative legitimacy of freedom will be determined within the scope of the problematic of what will be accepted as intervention and domination.

During the demonstrations that started against the covid-19 measures in Amsterdam in January 2021, the harsh intervention of the police was encountered. (The New York Times, 2021). In the Netherlands, the government imposed restrictions and interfered with negative rights to secure general freedoms on grounds of public interest. As can be seen in this case, in the event that the pandemic surrounded the whole world with the effect of globalization and the nation-states had to take restrictive measures, intervention within the society was evaluated in the context of domination. In addition, the political and economic responsibility of the public damage that occurs is again above the political authority. In the context of the negative effects that will occur in the economy, the political authority has to spend money to support the private sector and at least to protect employment. Otherwise, there is no reason why results in the form of weakening or loss of the legitimacy of the political authority should not occur.

One of the examples of the domination effect of capital on the nation state came up with a recent statement. Accordingly, German Chancellor Angela Merkel (2021) calls on the US administration to restrain internet giants and social media companies. Apart from this statement, the President of the European Commission Ursula Von Der Leyen (2021) also stated that

the activities of internet giants should be regulated and this structure affects their democracy. Another explanation about the influence of capital companies on states came from the Russian President. Vladimir Putin (2021) said that technology giant companies have begun to play an increasingly large role in societies, as seen in the US elections, they are no longer just economic giants, and in some areas they are now actively competing with states. The focus of these examples is that global companies are beginning to greatly affect nation states. It is especially important that the European Union focuses on the concept of "democracy" and Russia's "competition with the state". The control of global companies, especially the global communication network, is perceived as a threat both in terms of the functionality of the democratic mechanism and the position of the state in the global system. The most prominent example of this perception in the discourse is Donald Trump's words on globalization at the United Nations General Assembly in 2019. Accordingly, Trump (2019) has openly opposed the vision of extreme globalists, with the statement that "the future belongs to the patriots, not the globalists". Arbitrary interventions by social media companies are accepted as domination by nation states, and the expectation is developing as "independent from" non-domination. Because the main thing is that the "master" does not cease to be a master by not intervening and remains a source of domination (Pettit, 1998: 349). In other words, it would not be very meaningful for nation states to react to the ability of technology companies to influence democratic elections and censor heads of state. Because the management of communication and communication data by these companies will always exist as a source of domination, even if it is not used as an intervention tool. In this case, states will become "individuals" of the globalized world and will be subject to the unnamed rules of capital companies. How societies deal with such a picture with legitimate national legislators will become more complex.

In the article written by Henry Kissinger (1968) to US President Richard Nixon, it was emphasized that the USA should rule the world according to its own democratic values and standards in the political system centered on the nation states of the world. This understanding could be applied after the establishment of a USA-centered world in the post-cold war global system. However, today, technology companies and businesses that produce and use communication infrastructure have attained the

infrastructure that can offer concepts such as democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms indoctrinated by the USA as tools that can be used against the USA and the rest of the world. Therefore, it can be observed that this monopoly has begun to collapse, while the distribution and use of fundamental rights and freedoms are primarily under the monopoly of the USA and other nation states. Thus, the intervention-domination distinction designed by Pettit (1998) for the state and society gains more meaning today in terms of the nature of the relationship between capital and the nation state. We are in a period where the speed of change of paradigms with globalization increases in the world. The understanding that the speed of capital is higher than the speed of other institutions in this increase can explain the situation in which nation states fall against capital. The competitive speed and power of the states are decreasing against the capital companies producing communication tools and information technologies. Therefore, the monopoly of the nation-state concept to control the infrastructure and governing bodies in a particular geography is about to disappear. If the power of capital continues to increase in the global system, it does not seem unlikely that nation states will experience an existence problem. The world's transition towards capital singularity within the framework desired by extreme globalization approaches confronts us with the fact that the nation state is on the target board. In this context, it is still possible for capital companies to turn globalization into a process for the benefit of the societies with a new "global contract" with the representatives of the nation state. Otherwise, as a result of steps taken solely for the benefit of global companies, nation states and their citizens may have to look for new and risky ways to redistribute resources and opportunities. In this case, it should not be ignored that the mutual domination that will develop will lead to the destruction of all modern period freedoms that have been gained and recognized on a global scale.

5. CONCLUSION

In the global sense, the assumption of an order in which the main basis of power and legitimacy is not the state is getting stronger. The questions such as which "legitimate" authority will provide the negative rights when the legal sovereignty created within the borders of the nation state disappears, and what will be the legitimacy source of the intervention

methods developed by the nation state for “establishment of order” have not been answered yet. For this reason, it does not seem very incomprehensible to consider Naisbitt's statements that the market economy transforms even its own ecosystem in a scenario where the nation state will be transformed by the market. In this context, the non-dominant intervention approach stated by Pettit seems more useful in the context of protecting the general good, although it is not the main argument of an entirely ideal order. The fact that the actors representing the free market economy are the unrivaled power of globalization will also create a political monopoly and the values produced for the "common good" and intervention for some will mean domination for some. Basically, the capitalist market mechanism, which derives its legitimacy from the liberal understanding, has grown too much in the age of globalization, and thus creates a de facto domination system on the legitimate political systems of the modern period. Within this order, the nation-states will not have to share the crisis of the existence problem with the society and the individual as they fall back from their previous position in the power hierarchy. However, it is inevitable to create conditions suitable for legitimacy crises, since this stakeholder is primarily in favor of the state economically, or rather the state tries to secure its own comfort zone.

Recent developments, especially in the US presidential elections, have the potential to spark new debates on the use of freedom. Following the messages sent by Donald Trump, who is expected to hand over the Presidency to Jo Biden, via Tweeter, comments were made that there was a serious attack on the democratic system as a result of the raid of the US congress building. In this process, Tweeter announced that it suspended Trump's messages and profile. Freedom of expression, one of the negative rights of individuals, has been suspended by a non-state organization. Aside from whether the statement incites crime or is a discourse of violence, the fact that an enterprise controlling the global communication network implements censorship-like practices shows that freedom will no longer be a matter of debate between the nation state and individuals. For this reason, the approaches expressed in the context that globalization makes the nation state more protectionist seem to increase over time with questions such as whether the capital has intervention or domination, good or bad. In the final analysis, the pessimistic approach of globalization to establish a relationship

of domination over nation-states and at least the future of nation-states is becoming more meaningful.

REFERENCES

ARENDR, H. (1996). Geçmişle Gelecek Arasında, (Çev. Şener, B, S) *İletişim Yayınları*, İstanbul.

AYDOĞAN, M. (2006). Küreselleşme ve Siyasi Partiler, (2. Baskı), *Umay Yayınları*, İzmir.

BAUMAN, Z. (2012). Küreselleşme: Toplumsal Sonuçları, (Çev. Yılmaz, A) *Ayrıntı Yayınları*, ISBN 978-975-539-254-7, İstanbul.

BECK, U. (2002) *The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity, Conceiving Cosmopolitanism : Theory, Context, and Practice*, der. S. Vertovec ve R. Cohen, Oxford/New York: *Oxford University Press*.

BELLAMY, R. (2005), "J. S. Mill, T. H. Green and Isaiah Berlin on the Nature of Liberty and Liberalism", *Rethinking Liberalism*, Richard Bellamy, *Continuum*, pp. 22-46.

BERKTAY, F. (2015), 19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler, Örs, B. , *İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları*, İstanbul.

BERLİN, I. (2002), Two Concepts of Liberty, *Liberty: Incorporating Four Essays on Liberty*, (Ed.) Henry Hardy, *Oxford University Press*, New York, pp. 166-217.

BRAUDEL, F. (1996), *Uygarlıkların Grameri*, (Çev. Kılıçbay, M, A) *İmge Kitabevi*, Ankara.

DELANTY, G. (2006), "The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory", *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.57(1).

ERDOĞAN, M. (2006), *Aydınlanma, Modernlik ve Liberalizm*, Orion Yayınevi, (1. Basım), Ankara

ESGİN, A. (2005) "Ulus-Devlet ve Küreselleşmeye İlişkin Bazı Tartışmalar", *C.Ü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, cilt:25,No:2.

FUKUYAMA, F, Richman, B, Goel, A, (2021), “How to Save Democracy from Technology: Ending Big Tech’s Information Monopoly”, Foreign Affairs, Retrieved from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-11-24/fukuyama-how-save-democracy-technology?utm_medium=email_notifications&utm_source=reg_confirmation&utm_campaign=reg_guestpass

GELLNER E. (1992), Uluslar ve Ulusçuluk, (Çev. Ersanlı B, ve Günay Özdoğan, G, G) İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

GİDDENS, A. (2012), Modernliğin Sonuçları, (Çev. Kuşdil, E), Ayrıntı Yayınları, (5. Basım), İstanbul.

GİDDENS, A. (2008), Ulus Devlet Ve Şiddet, (Çev. Atay, C), Kalkedon Yayınları, İstanbul.

HABLEMİTOĞLU, Ş. (2004), Küreselleşme Düşlerinden Gerçekleri, Ankara: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları.

HELD, D., McGrew, A. (2008) Küresel Dönüşümler: Büyük Küreselleşme Tartışması, (Çev. Güngen, A, R), Phoenix Yayınları, Ankara.

HEYWOOD, A, (2016), Siyaset Teorisine Giriş, (Çev. Köse, H, M), Küre Yayınları, (7. Baskı), İstanbul, ISBN: 978-605-5383-02-2.

JESSOP, B. (2004) *The European Union and Recent Transformations in Statehood*. In: Transformations of Statehood from a European Perspective. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. ISBN 3-593-37632-6

KAPANİ, M. (2004), Politika Bilimine Giriş, *Bilgi Yayınevi*, (16. Basım), İstanbul.

KİSSİNGER, H. (2014), Dünya Düzeni, (Çev. Gül, S, S) *Boyner Yayınları*, (1.Baskı), İstanbul, ISBN: 978-975-7004-74-5

KLAUSMEIER, H. J. (1992). Concept learning and concept teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 27 (3), 267-286.

KYMLICKA, Will, (2016), Çağdaş Siyaset Felsefesine Giriş, (Çev. Kılıç, E), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.

LEYEN, U, V.D. (2021), “Almanya ve AB: Sosyal medya devlerini dizginleyelim” Retrieved from <https://www.dw.com/tr/almanya-ve-ab-sosyal-medya-devlerini-dizginleyelim/a-56350601> (Erişim Tarihi: 25.01.2021)

MERKEL, A, (2021), “Almanya ve AB: Sosyal medya devlerini dizginleyelim” Retrieved from <https://www.dw.com/tr/almanya-ve-ab-sosyal-medya-devlerini-dizginleyelim/a-56350601> (Erişim Tarihi: 25.01.2021)

MERRİLL, M. D., & Tennyson, R. D. (1977). Concept teaching: An instructional design guide. NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

MİLL, J. S. (2000) Özgürlük Üstüne, (Çev. Ertan, A), *Belge Yayınları*, İstanbul.

NAİSBİTT, J. (1994), Global Paradoks: Büyüyen Dünya Ekonomisinin Güçlenen Küçük Oyuncuları, (Çev. Gül, S), *Sabah Kitapları*, İstanbul, ISBN: 975-7238-04-X

PETTIT, P. (1998), Cumhuriyetçilik: Bir Özgürlük ve Yönetim Teorisi, (Çev. Yılmaz, A) Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

PUTİN, V. (2021), “ Extension of START ‘step in right direction': Putin" Retrieved from <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/politics/extension-of-start-step-in-right-direction-putin/2124911> (Erişim Tarihi: 26.01.2021)

SCHOLTE, J. A.(2000), Globalization: A Critical Introduction, (New York: *St. Martin's Press*).

SMİTH, A. (2002), Küresel Çağda Milletler ve Milliyetçilik, (Çev. Kömürcü, D) *Everest Yayınları*, 1. Basım, İstanbul.

SMİTH, A. (2003), "Küresel Bir Kültüre Doğru Mu?", (Çev. Gungen A, R ve diğerleri), Ed. Held, D. & McGrew, A.), Küresel Dönüşümler: Büyük Küreselleşme Tartışması, *Phoenix Yayınevi*, Ankara.

SWİFT, A. (2006), Political Philosophy, *Polity Press*, Cambridge.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, (2021), “Anti-Lockdown Protesters Clash With Officers in the Netherlands” Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/video/world/europe/100000007568109/anti-lockdown-protesters-police-netherlands.html> (Erişim Tarihi: 28.01.2021)

TRUMP, D, (2019), “Trump: Gelecek küreselcilerin değil vatanseverlerin” Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-dunya-49816735> (Erişim Tarihi: 15.05.2021)

URRY, J. (2000), "Mobile Sociology", *British Journal of Sociology*, 51/1

WALLERSTEİN, I. (1998), *Liberalizmden Sonra*, (The New Press, New York ile yapılan anlaşma ile yayınlanan eser), Orj Adı *After Liberalism*, 1995, (Çev. ÖZ, E) *Metis Yayınları*, İstanbul.

YEATES, N. (2002), *Globalization and Social Policy*, *SAGE Publications* (London, Thousand Oaks, ca and New Delhi) vol. 2(1): 69–91. [1468-0181 (200204) 2:1; 69–91; 022095]

ZABCI, F.Ç. (2009), *Kral Devletten Ulus Devlete, Siyaset Felsefesi içinde* (162-222). Ağaogulları, M,A, Zabcı,F,Ç, ve Ergün, R., *İmge Kitabevi*, (2. Baskı), Ankara