Journal of Foundational Research

Volume XXXII, Number I-January 2024

ISSN 2395-5635

UGC-CARE Indexed

Chief Editor
Arvind Vikram Singh
Editor
Anubhav Varshney
Associate Editors
Manish Sinsinwar
Manish Gothwal



Department of Philosophy University of Rajasthan, Jaipur 2024

Contents

	Contributors in this issue	iv
	Editorial	v
Articles		
1.	Vedāntic Conception of Man, History and Society Yash Dev Shalya Kamal Nayan	1-10
2.	Śraddhā in the Bhagavadgītā Binod Kumar Agarwala	11-40
3.	Plato and Aristotle on Virtue Gopal Sahu Aparna Shukla	41-51
4.	Empire Replaces Nation-State? A Critical Reading of The Crisis of Modern Sovereignty in Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt Muzaffar Ali	52-64
5.	Pursuit of <i>Puruṣārtha</i> -s in <i>Kāvya-Śāstra</i> -s: Exploring Abhinavagupta's <i>Rasa</i> Theory Kavita Chauhan	65-76
6.	Reframing the Basic Concepts of Deontic Logic: A Plea for Permission Venusa Tinyi	77-87
7.	रसेल की दर्शन की अवधारणा का पुनरावलोकन Russell <i>Kī Darśana Kī Avadhāraṇā Kā Punarāvalokana</i> Amit Kumar Pradhan	88-107

Empire Replaces Nation-State? A Critical Reading of The Crisis of Modern Sovereignty in Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt

Muzaffar Ali

Abstract

Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt argue that a shift in the nature and scope of modern sovereignty (limited to the territorial boundaries of nation-state) has taken place with the advent of globalization. Post-globalization, the deterritorial Empire, that exists in the non-place of supranational structures spanning nations and continents, has seized control of some crucial aspects of modern sovereignty. In this paper I aim to map and identify three such areas (human needs, economics and violence) where this sovereign shift has actualized and nation-state either has a limited or no control on these spheres.

Keywords: Empire, sovereignty, nation-state, war, globalization

Modern sovereignty rests within the locus of a nation-state, which in itself is a creation of modernity. Prior to modernity, sovereignty rested with the king, who legitimized the right to sovereign rule by invoking the transcendent will rather than the will of people/subjects. Contemporary political philosophers such as Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt argue that a supranational sovereign entity in the form of Empire has come into being post-globalization. The political constitution of the Empire, they argue has resulted in the shift from modern sovereignty (which rested with the nation-state) to a new kind of sovereignty labelled as imperial sovereignty. The paradigmatic shift from nation-state sovereignty to imperial sovereignty happens at two levels. First, the transfer of sovereignty occurs from the territorially located nation-state to the non-place of Empire. And, second, the transformation in the nature of sovereignty itself-from the modern-imperialist sovereignty to imperial sovereignty. Imperial sovereignty unlike modern-imperialist sovereignty is deterritorial and decentralized. In other words, it has no fixed location and lies in a kind of non-place. This shift-from modern imperialist sovereignty to imperial sovereignty—signifies the crisis of nation-state. The crisis is not in the sense that nation-state ceases to exist. It is rather a crisis because the most important pivot/power of a nation-state has shifted away from its domain. They write;

Our contention, expressed most generally, is that Empire is a global form of sovereignty that includes within its constitution supranational organization, national structures (including nation-states), and local or regional organisms. In other words, our notion of Empire does not indicate an end of the nation-state. Nation-states remain extremely important but their functions have been transformed within the order of Empire. At the highest level, one could say that only Empire (and no longer any nation-state) is capable of sovereignty in a full sense.¹

Negri and Hardt trace the philosophical trajectory of the rise of Empire in the crisis of modernity. Modernity, according to their arguments, is founded on