SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

SOVEREIGNTY IN PRESENT WORLD AND FOUNDATION OF MODERN STATE: ROOTS FROM WESTPHALIAN TREATY

Panthor Debbarma[1*], Dr. Marconi Debbarma[2], Dr. Pradip Molsom[3]
[1]*Assistant Professor, Political Science Programme, Mata Tripura Sundari Open University, Tripura*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Sociology Programme, Mata Tripura Sundari Open University, Tripura*
[3]*Assistant Professor, English Programme, Mata Tripura Sundari Open University, Tripura*
[*]*Corresponding Author*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra27176
DOI No: 10.36713/epra27176

ABSTRACT
The Peace of Westphalia (1648), comprising the Treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, represents one of the most consequential diplomatic settlements in modern history. By concluding the Thirty Years' War, it institutionalized the principles of territorial sovereignty, non-intervention, and juridical equality among states (Osiander, 2001). This article examines Westphalia's enduring pillars and evaluates their resilience against twenty-first-century pressures, including economic globalization, supranational governance, non-state actors, the digital revolution, and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine (Evans & Sahnoun, 2002). Employing doctrinal analysis, comparative historical methodology, and theoretical lenses drawn from realism, liberal institutionalism, and constructivism, the study identifies critical scholarly gaps particularly regarding cyber-sovereignty and post-colonial settings in the Global South. The article concludes that while the Westphalian framework has been tested and challenged, it persists as the bedrock of international order through adaptive evolution, and offers policy recommendations for navigating hybrid and post-territorial sovereignty challenges.

KEYWORDS: *Treaty of Westphalia; sovereignty; non-intervention; territoriality; state equality; globalization; Responsibility to Protect; cyber-sovereignty; international relations theory; post-colonial critique*

1. INTRODUCTION
The year 1648 marks a decisive watershed in the political history of humanity. After three decades of devastating warfare that claimed millions of lives across Central Europe, the parties to the Thirty Years' War gathered in the Westphalian cities of Münster and Osnabrück to negotiate a lasting peace (Bull, 1977). The resulting treaties did far more than end a particular war; they fundamentally restructured the political organization of the Western world and, through subsequent diffusion, of the entire globe (Krasner, 1999). The Peace of Westphalia brought into being the concept of the sovereign territorial state as the primary unit of international politics, an innovation so profound that scholars continue to debate its implications nearly four centuries later.

Prior to 1648, the political landscape of Europe was characterized by overlapping and competing authorities. The Holy Roman Emperor claimed universal suzerainty over Christian princes; the Pope wielded spiritual and temporal power that transcended territorial boundaries; and dynastic ambitions regularly subordinated the interests of territorial populations to those of ruling houses. The Thirty Years' War, beginning in 1618 as a conflict over religious and political rights within the Holy Roman Empire, rapidly evolved into a pan-European struggle that devastated entire regions and shattered the illusion of Christian unity under an imperial or papal umbrella.

The Peace of Westphalia resolved this catastrophe by establishing a new political grammar. The state understood as a territorially bounded, internally sovereign, and externally recognized political unit became the dominant form of political organization. The principle of cuius regio, eius religio (whose realm, his religion), codified at Westphalia, granted rulers the right to determine the religious confession of their territories, thus exercising comprehensive authority within their borders free from external interference. The principle of non-intervention emerged as a logical corollary: if each state was supreme within its borders, no other state had the right to interfere in its internal affairs.

Yet the twenty-first century presents formidable challenges to the Westphalian order. Globalization has rendered borders increasingly porous to flows of capital, information, people, and pathogens. Supranational bodies exercise authority once reserved exclusively for states. Non-state actors contest the state's monopoly on legitimate authority, and the digital revolution has created cyberspace, a domain that fundamentally defies territorial delimitation. This article examines these challenges systematically, asking whether the Westphalian framework remains adequate for governing international relations in an era of deepening interdependence and hybrid sovereignty.

2. OBJECTIVES
The present research is guided by the following objectives:

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

- To analytically examine the Treaty of Westphalia's foundational principles territorial sovereignty, non-intervention (rex est imperator in regno suo), and juridical equality and trace their historical institutionalization in international law (Brownlie, 2003).
- To systematically assess the adaptation, erosion, and resilience of Westphalian principles in response to twenty-first-century challenges, including globalization, the European Union, non-state actors, cyber domains, and humanitarian intervention norms.
- To critically examine the Westphalian framework from post-colonial and Global South perspectives, identifying structural biases and their implications for the sovereignty of formerly colonized states.
- To investigate 'hybrid sovereignty arrangements in which states exercise sovereignty in modified, shared, or conditional forms and assess its implications for the state-centric international order.
- To propose theoretically grounded policy adaptations addressing non-traditional sovereignty challenges in the digital domain, climate governance, and pandemic preparedness.

3. RESEARCH GAP

The scholarly literature on Westphalia is substantial. Foundational works by Bull (1977), Waltz (1979), Krasner (1999), and Osiander (2001) have established a sophisticated understanding of the treaty's historical significance and its relationship to the international state system. Legal scholars including Brownlie and Cassese have examined its contributions to international law. However, several important gaps remain inadequately addressed.

First, while scholars have extensively analyzed Westphalian principles in relation to physical territorial domains, the application of these principles to cyberspace has received comparatively little systematic attention (Schmitt, 2017). Questions about cyber-sovereignty who has the right to regulate digital flows, how states may respond to cyberattacks, and whether national 'data borders' are legally feasible, represent a frontier where Westphalian conceptual tools are strained to the breaking point. Second, the literature has paid insufficient attention to climate governance as a challenge to Westphalian sovereignty; international climate negotiations require states to accept binding limitations on domestic policies, constituting a form of 'ecological sovereignty erosion' not yet adequately theorized.

Third, post-colonial critiques of the Westphalian order, while intellectually compelling, tend to remain at the level of theoretical critique without offering robust empirical evidence from Global South states. Fourth, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed the limits of state sovereignty in managing global health crises while simultaneously generating a resurgence of nationalist responses to international health governance. Longitudinal studies examining 'pandemic sovereignty' in relation to the Westphalian legacy remain scarce. This article seeks to address these lacunae through a synthesis of international relations theory, comparative historical analysis, and legal doctrine.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This article employs a pluralistic theoretical framework, drawing on three major traditions in international relations theory: realism, liberal institutionalism, and constructivism. Each tradition illuminates different dimensions of the Westphalian legacy, and together they provide a richer analytical toolkit than any single perspective could offer.

4.1 Realism and State-Centrism

Classical and structural realism provide the foundational anchor for any analysis of Westphalian sovereignty. Realist scholars argue that the state is the primary actor in international politics, that states operate in an anarchic system without an overarching authority, and that power maximization is the dominant motivation of international behavior (Waltz, 1979). Waltz's structural realism formalizes this model, arguing that the anarchic structure of the international system produces recurring behavioral patterns regardless of states' internal characteristics. From a realist perspective, challenges to Westphalian sovereignty including humanitarian intervention and human rights obligations are best understood as instruments of power politics dressed in normative language. Krasner's concept of sovereignty as 'organized hypocrisy' captures the selective and inconsistent application of Westphalian norms in practice.

4.2 Liberal Institutionalism and Supranational Governance

Liberal institutionalism emphasizes the role of international institutions in managing the collective action problems of an anarchic system. The proliferation of international organizations since 1945, the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Criminal Court, and the European Union represents a structural transformation that has modified but not abolished Westphalian sovereignty. States remain the primary units but have voluntarily delegated aspects of their sovereignty to supranational bodies. UN Charter Article 2(7), prohibiting interference in matters 'essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state,' represents a liberal institutionalist codification of non-intervention, yet Chapter VII's collective security provisions and R2P have progressively qualified this prohibition in cases of grave human rights violations (Bull, 1977).

4.3 Constructivism and Norm Evolution

Constructivism shifts the analytical focus to the role of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping international behavior. Sovereignty is not a fixed, natural attribute of states but a socially constructed norm whose meaning has evolved considerably over time. The shift from cuius regio, eius religio to popular sovereignty, and subsequently to sovereignty as responsibility under R2P, represents a fundamental reconstitution of statehood. Constructivist scholars such as Wendt and Finnemore have shown how norms 'cascade' through the international system, reshaping

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

state identities and interests (Schmitt, 2017). Applied to Westphalia, constructivism helps explain why states continue to invoke sovereignty even as its practical content changes, and why new norms, human rights, environmental obligations, and digital governance are gradually incorporated into evolving understandings of sovereign statehood.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative research design employing doctrinal analysis as its primary method. Doctrinal analysis involves the systematic examination of legal and political texts—treaties, statutes, judicial decisions, and scholarly commentaries—to identify governing principles and rules. In the present context, analysis is applied to the primary texts of the Peace of Westphalia, supplemented by foundational texts including the Congress of Vienna Final Act (1815), the UN Charter (1945), the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969), and key UN Security Council resolutions bearing on R2P.

The doctrinal analysis is complemented by a comparative historical method tracing the evolution of Westphalian principles through key historical junctures: the Congress of Vienna, the League of Nations, the post-1945 UN order, the Cold War, and the post-Cold War era. Thematic coding identifies four clusters: (1) the persistence of Westphalian norms; (2) their adaptation to new domains; (3) normative challenges; and (4) hybrid sovereignty arrangements. Methodological rigor is ensured through triangulation—cross-validating findings from doctrinal analysis, historical comparison, and theoretical perspectives. The study is interpretive and relies entirely on documentary and secondary sources.

6. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

6.1 The Westphalian Pillars: A Detailed Analysis

The Peace of Westphalia institutionalized three core principles that define the Westphalian model. First, territorial sovereignty each state possesses supreme authority within a defined geographic territory, replacing the overlapping jurisdictions of the pre-Westphalian era with a clear and exclusive assignment of authority to territorial rulers. Second, non-intervention sovereign states may not legitimately interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign states. Third, juridical equality all sovereign states, regardless of size or power, are equal before international law. Together, these principles created a 'society of states', as Bull (1977) famously described it in which, despite the absence of a central authority, states-maintained order through shared institutions, rules, and norms.

Table 1: Evolution of Sovereignty Dimensions

Sovereignty Dimension	Pre-Westphalian Feature	Westphalian Innovation	Contemporary Challenge
Internal Sovereignty	Overlapping feudal and papal authorities	Monopoly on legitimate force within borders (Weber)	Cyberattacks, pandemics, non-state armed groups
External Sovereignty	Hierarchical imperial structures; papal supremacy	Non-intervention and legal parity among states	R2P, economic sanctions, ICC jurisdiction
Territorial Delimitation	Fuzzy, contested, and overlapping boundaries	Fixed borders as basis of political authority	Cyberspace, climate commons, transnational migration
Juridical Equality	Hierarchical ranking of princes and polities	Equal standing of sovereign states in international law	UNSC permanent veto; structural power of developed economies

6.2 Globalization and the Porosity of Sovereignty

Contemporary globalization represents perhaps the most pervasive structural challenge to the Westphalian model. Economic globalization has progressively reduced the capacity of states to exercise effective economic sovereignty (Osiander, 2001). The mobility of capital means states must now compete to attract investment by maintaining macroeconomic environments determined less by national democratic choice than by global financial markets. The Asian financial crisis of 1997–1998, the global financial crisis of 2008, and the European sovereign debt crisis of 2010–2012 all illustrated the constraints financial globalization places on state sovereignty. The globalization of trade, governed by the WTO and bilateral agreements, further constrains sovereignty by requiring members to conform their domestic regulatory frameworks to internationally negotiated standards.

The global flow of information accelerated by the internet, social media, and satellite communications has similarly eroded information sovereignty. Governments that once controlled their citizens' information environments through state-run media and censorship now face a borderless digital information space in which political mobilization crosses borders with ease. The Arab Spring of 2010–2011 demonstrated the power of networked communication to challenge authoritarian state control, while simultaneously revealing the capacity of states to employ digital surveillance to monitor and suppress dissent.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

6.3 Supranational Governance: The European Union Case

The European Union represents the most advanced experiment in voluntary sovereignty pooling in international history. The process of European integration, beginning with the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 and culminating in the Lisbon Treaty of 2007, has progressively transferred sovereign authority from member states to supranational institutions in an expanding range of policy domains, including the single market, common trade policy, competition policy, and for eurozone members monetary policy. The EU's institutional architecture constitutes a genuinely novel form of political organization that does not fit neatly into either the Westphalian model of sovereign states or the federal model of a unified state (Evans & Sahnoun, 2002).

Brexit: the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the EU following the 2016 referendum and completed in January 2020 provides a revealing data point. While often interpreted as a reassertion of Westphalian sovereignty (the slogan 'Take Back Control' resonated precisely because it appealed to Westphalian intuitions about national self-determination), Brexit also demonstrated the costs of sovereignty restoration in an economically integrated world. The UK's post-Brexit challenges in managing trade relationships and Northern Ireland's border arrangements suggest that sovereignty, while legally and normatively significant, does not translate straightforwardly into practical policy autonomy in an interdependent world.

6.4 The Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention

Perhaps the most philosophically profound challenge to Westphalian sovereignty has come from the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine, adopted by the UN World Summit in 2005. R2P holds that sovereign states bear a primary responsibility to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, and that when a state manifestly fails this responsibility, the international community has a duty to respond including through coercive measures authorized by the UN Security Council. R2P represents a conceptual revolution in the understanding of sovereignty, reframing it not as an absolute right but as a conditional grant of authority contingent upon the fulfillment of basic responsibilities toward the state's population (Evans & Sahnoun, 2002).

The Libyan intervention of 2011 authorized by UN Security Council Resolution 1973 represented the most prominent application of R2P in practice. While it initially succeeded in preventing a massacre at Benghazi, the subsequent controversy over NATO's apparent extension of the mandate to encompass regime change severely damaged R2P's credibility. The aftermath collapse of the Gaddafi regime and fragmentation of the Libyan state hardened opposition among Russia and China to humanitarian intervention. The subsequent failure to authorize intervention in Syria despite massive civilian casualties illustrated the continuing power of sovereignty norms to constrain humanitarian responses to mass atrocities (Waltz, 1979).

6.5 Cyber Sovereignty: The Frontier Challenge

The emergence of cyberspace as a fifth domain of human activity poses novel and deeply disruptive challenges to the territorial foundations of Westphalian sovereignty. Cyberspace is characterized by borderlessness: data packets traverse national borders at the speed of light, and attribution of cyberattacks to specific actors is technically complex and politically contested. States have sought to assert sovereignty over their national segments of the internet through measures such as national internet gateways, data localization requirements, and censorship regimes. China's 'Great Firewall' and Russia's 'sovereign internet' legislation represent the most developed expressions of this cyber-sovereignty impulse (Schmitt, 2017).

However, the technical architecture of the internet designed for resilience and distributed routing resists straightforward territorial partitioning. States face a fundamental tension between connectivity (which requires openness) and sovereignty (which requires control). The Tallinn Manual, developed by international legal experts under NATO's Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence, represents the most systematic attempt to apply existing international law to the cyber domain. Its conclusion that state sovereignty applies in cyberspace is significant, but also reveals the limits of applying territorial sovereignty concepts to a domain defined by non-territoriality.

6.6 Non-State Actors and the Contested Monopoly on Force

Weber's definition of the state as the entity possessing a monopoly on legitimate physical force within a defined territory is increasingly contested by a diverse array of non-state actors. Transnational terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS not only challenge state monopolies on force within specific territories but also conduct attacks across multiple national jurisdictions simultaneously, evading the territorial logic of state-based counter-terrorism frameworks. Transnational criminal organizations similarly exploit the gap between the territorial state system and the borderless nature of criminal networks. Large multinational corporations exercise quasi-governmental powers over economic life in many countries—setting employment terms for millions, lobbying governments, and accumulating data rivaling state intelligence capabilities without being subject to the accountability mechanisms democratic states impose on governmental authority.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

6.7 The Persistence of the Westphalian Framework

Despite the profound challenges outlined above, the doctrinal analysis and comparative historical review confirm the remarkable persistence of the Westphalian framework. The clearest evidence is the behavior of states themselves: the near-universal invocation of sovereignty as a legitimizing norm, the strong political resistance to interventions that challenge state autonomy, and the continuing primacy of the state as the unit of international legal personality and political identity (Osiander, 2001). The 193 member states of the United Nations, despite vast differences in size, power, culture, and governance, all participate in an international system organized around the mutual recognition of sovereign statehood.

Even the most significant departures from Westphalian norms tend to be justified as exceptions rather than repudiations of the framework. The Libyan intervention was authorized through the UN Charter's collective security provisions rather than asserting a unilateral right of intervention. European integration has proceeded through voluntary treaty agreements, each state retaining the formal right of withdrawal. Emerging norms of cyber sovereignty are being developed through international legal discourse that seeks to apply, not replace, existing international law. Krasner's characterization of sovereignty as 'organized hypocrisy'—routinely violated in practice, yet invoked as a legitimizing norm captures this dynamic with precision.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Developing a Cyber-Westphalia Framework

The most pressing policy need is the development of an internationally agreed framework for cyber sovereignty a 'Cyber-Westphalia.' Such a framework would define the scope and limits of state authority over digital infrastructure, data flows, and online expression, while preserving the openness and interoperability that makes the internet a global public good. It would establish clear rules for state behavior in the cyber domain, including prohibitions on attacks against critical civilian infrastructure and norms governing state-sponsored espionage. A pragmatic Cyber-Westphalia would focus on high-stakes issues attacks on financial infrastructure, interference with electoral systems, or assaults on hospitals where shared interest in clear prohibitions is most evident. The Budapest Convention on Cybercrime provides a precedent for international cyber governance cooperation that might be built upon (Schmitt, 2017).

7.2 Reforming the Responsibility to Protect Mechanism

The Libyan experience highlighted the dangers of R2P being used as a pretext for regime change, while the Syrian experience illustrated the humanitarian costs of excessive deference to sovereignty norms. A reformed R2P mechanism should establish clearer criteria for triggering international responses and stricter procedural safeguards against mission creep. Reform of the UN Security Council veto system perhaps through a norm against using the veto to block action in response to genocide or mass atrocities could help address politically motivated obstruction. Post-intervention planning and commitment to state rebuilding should be mandatory elements of any authorized intervention, to avoid the 'Libya syndrome' of intervention without responsibility for the aftermath (Evans & Sahnoun, 2002).

7.3 Post-Colonial Sovereignty and the Global South

Policymakers in both the Global North and South need to address the structural inequalities embedded in the Westphalian order that disadvantage formerly colonized states (Krasner, 1999). Greater voice and representation for Global South states in the governance of international financial institutions, the IMF and World Bank and reform of global trade rules are necessary first steps. Global South-led initiatives to codify economic sovereignty norms, including the right to pursue heterodox development strategies and impose capital controls in response to financial crises, should be integrated into the reform of WTO dispute settlement mechanisms. The principle of 'special and differential treatment' for developing countries provides a starting point for more substantive accommodation of economic sovereignty in the global trade regime.

7.4 Sovereignty in Climate Governance

Climate change governance represents the domain where the tension between state sovereignty and collective action requirements is most acute. The Paris Agreement's model of 'nationally determined contributions' (NDCs) respects state sovereignty by allowing each country to set its own emissions reduction targets while creating a framework of international review and peer pressure to encourage ambition. Policymakers should explore models that preserve state primacy while creating stronger incentives for ambitious action. Carbon border adjustment mechanisms and climate clubs among willing states as proposed by economists including William Nordhaus could provide frameworks for deeper cooperation while maintaining sovereign rights. The principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities,' enshrined in the UNFCCC, should be operationalized more effectively to reflect the historical contributions of developed nations and development constraints facing poorer states.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

8. CONCLUSION

The Treaty of Westphalia's enduring legacy is both remarkable and paradoxical. Remarkable, because principles articulated in 1648 to resolve a European religious conflict continue to shape international relations nearly four centuries later. Paradoxical, because the persistence of these principles coexists with profound and continuing change in the content, application, and meaning of sovereignty. This article has argued that Westphalia's three foundational pillars—territorial sovereignty, non-intervention, and juridical equality remain the organizing principles of the international system, though they have undergone substantial evolution in response to contemporary challenges (Bull, 1977). Globalization has made sovereignty more contested; supranational governance has made it more shared; humanitarian norms have made it more conditional; and the digital revolution has made it more contested in new domains.

The Westphalian system's resilience derives in part from its structural logic the state remains the most effective institutional vehicle for translating collective human will into political authority and in part from its normative entrenchment in the identities and interests of states and governments. Even actors who challenge Westphalian norms in practice invoke them in justification. This suggests that any viable alternative to the Westphalian order would need to address the same fundamental challenges of authority, accountability, and collective action, and do so more effectively.

The appropriate response to the shortcomings of the Westphalian system is therefore not its abolition but its reform and extension developing institutional innovations and governance mechanisms that allow it to address twenty-first-century challenges without sacrificing its core contributions: a framework for peaceful coexistence among diverse political communities, a basis for the rule of law in international relations, and a system for managing collective action problems without resort to hierarchy or empire. The Westphalian edifice, constructed from the ashes of a devastating war, has proven more durable than either its advocates or its critics anticipated. Its endurance is testimony not to its perfection, but to its adaptability its capacity to evolve, absorb challenge, and reconstitute itself in response to changing circumstances.

REFERENCES

1. *Annan, K. (1999). Two concepts of sovereignty. The Economist, 352(8137), 49–50.*
2. *Bodansky, D. (2016). The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A new hope? American Journal of International Law, 110(2), 288–319. https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.110.2.0288*
3. *Brown, C. (2002). Sovereignty, rights and justice: International political theory today. Polity Press.*
4. *Brownlie, I. (2008). Principles of public international law (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.*
5. *Bull, H. (1977). The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics. Columbia University Press.*
6. *Cassese, A. (2005). International law (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.*
7. *Evans, G., & Sahnoun, M. (2002). The responsibility to protect. Foreign Affairs, 81(6), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.2307/20033347*
8. *Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. International Organization, 52(4), 887–917.*
9. *Gilpin, R. (1981). War and change in world politics. Cambridge University Press.*
10. *Held, D. (1995). Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance. Stanford University Press.*
11. *Hinsley, F. H. (1966). Sovereignty. Cambridge University Press.*
12. *Keohane, R. O. (1984). After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy. Princeton University Press.*
13. *Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. Little, Brown.*
14. *Krasner, S. D. (1999). Sovereignty: Organized hypocrisy. Princeton University Press.*
15. *Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. W. W. Norton.*
16. *Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace. Alfred A. Knopf.*
17. *Osiander, A. (2001). Sovereignty, international relations, and the Westphalian myth. International Organization, 55(2), 251–287. https://doi.org/10.1162/00208180151140577*
18. *Philpott, D. (2001). Revolutions in sovereignty: How ideas shaped modern international relations. Princeton University Press.*
19. *Reus-Smit, C. (1999). The moral purpose of the state. Princeton University Press.*
20. *Schmitt, M. (Ed.). (2017). Tallinn Manual 2.0 on the international law applicable to cyber operations (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.*
21. *Spruyt, H. (1994). The sovereign state and its competitors. Princeton University Press.*
22. *Teschke, B. (2003). The myth of 1648: Class, geopolitics, and the making of modern international relations. Verso.*
23. *Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of international politics. Addison-Wesley.*
24. *Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). Free Press.*
25. *Wendt, A. (1999). Social theory of international politics. Cambridge University Press.*
26. *Wheeler, N. J. (2000). Saving strangers: Humanitarian intervention in international society. Oxford University Press.*
27. *Zacher, M. W. (2001). The territorial integrity norm: International boundaries and the use of force. International Organization, 55(2), 215–250.*