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Abstract
The article is a theoretical study of state sovereignty. By looking at the concept in a different way from traditional methods, it tries to discern whether sovereignty is necessarily antithetical to a sustainable world. Emphasis is put on its territoriality and anthropocentrism – both of which make it into a major obstacle when tackling global and transnational environmental problems. State sovereignty is analyzed as an environmental practice of the state, which allows for the control of resources to be used by capital. The analysis is conducted using theoretical and conceptual critique as the main method. It is based on various sources ranging from critical geopolitics and critical geography to political science and political ecology, including the concept of Capitalocene.

As long as sovereignty remains utilized by the state in service to capital, it will be used to cement its ability to control space and extract resources. However, a different kind of sovereignty is imaginable and therefore the institution itself is neither friend nor enemy to environmental politics. This new understanding of sovereignty opens up new avenues for theoretical research in political ecology and International Relations, bridging the gap between traditional state-centric approaches and the transboundary nature of ecological problems.
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Introduction

In the context of an ecological crisis that is both global and multi-faceted, we need to rethink many concepts and categories which we have always taken for granted in social sciences. One of the most common proposals is escaping the traditional confines of anthropocentrism of all our historical projects. It is obviously a grand undertaking for every field of social science, including – if not most of all – international relations (IR). One of the possible paths of intellectual innovation may lay in the contestation and redefinition of concepts and categories that form the foundation of the discipline. They coalesce into the very core of IR and can be summarized as the “relationships between the normative categories of humanity, the international system of states based on sovereignty and non-interference, and the natural world”. The study of the international system traditionally perpetuates many anthropocentric and statist concepts and questions that come out of old models, many of which are centered around state sovereignty. The sacredness of the institution of sovereignty has already been challenged for at least three decades, but its problematic features need to be studied more closely, mainly in light of its usage as an argument against numerous international as well as domestic environmental policies. It needs to become a central theme of analysis rather than a mere background assumption. More effort should be put to understand why processes that had started in the 1970s – and culminated in many environmental agreements and new institutions – have not weakened, but only altered the practice of sovereignty.

Sovereignty appears to be a problematic concept – by nature it is anthropocentric and territorial, both of which are also the main obstacles to transforming IR into planet politics. It is also the concept and the institution that underpins and gives permanence to everyday policies and provides the foundation of discourse on both domestic and international politics. This article aims to explore the limits of our contemporary understandings of state sovereignty, focusing on anthropocentrism and territoriosity and its relation to capitalism. This is done in order to open a discussion on how we can critique and possibly redefine a concept that is central both to the science of IR as well as modern politics. The article is born from the manifesto of Burke et al., as well as its critique by Chandler et al., as both texts formulate an intellectually inspiring dialogue that tackles various important problems in different ways. The discussion borrows from other sciences as well, including innovative concepts such as the Capitalocene. It starts with indicating the reasons for a critique of sovereignty in light of the many transnational and global environmental crises. Then sovereignty is redefined as an environmental practice subservient to capital. The article ends with the idea that a new understanding of the well-established concept may provide valuable insights into its apparent animosity towards global environmental initiatives and its persistence in world order.

The necessity for a critique of sovereignty

Reiterating what it means to live in Anthropocene seems unnecessary nowadays. It is the idea about the age of the human which culminates in a global ecological crisis. Even if the geological term is still controversial to geologists, the scientific consensus about humanity’s destructive influence on the world is undisputable. The enormous burden of facts is troubling both intellectually and psychologically. Most of all, it challenges our way of governance. This is because every issue that has its roots in our relation to nature is by default tackled by sovereign territorial states – even if the issue itself has little to do with national borders. National sovereignty is still invoked relatively often during discussions about environmental politics, especially when they are related to policy areas traditionally connected to sovereign capacities of the state and its security, i.e. energy or foreign policy. Controlling borders and strengthening jurisdictional boundaries is the first line of thought for many politicians and intellectuals alike. In a kind

2. Burke, et al.,”“Planet Politics.”
4. Capitalocene is a term coined concurrently by numerous scholars, including Andreas Malm. It is an alternative to the Anthropocene, proving that it is not abstract humanity, but capitalism that is responsible for the enormous degradation of the natural environment in the last five centuries. See Andreas Malm, *Fossil Capital: The Rise of Steam Power and the Roots of Global Warming*, (London & New York: Verso, 2016).
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of wishful thinking, the territorial modes of jurisdiction prevail over relations and consequences that care not for our abstract demarcation lines\textsuperscript{14}. The resiliency of territoriality is apparent even in the case of the post-Westphalian experiment such as the European Union (EU), where the politics of climate change are still highly territorialized\textsuperscript{15}. In scientific discourse, this mode of thinking is especially prevalent in any realist or geopolitical analysis, where the emphasis on territoriality remains strong even though the current environmental challenges to state sovereignty have us rethink the foundation of our security theories\textsuperscript{16}. The other side of mainstream IR (liberal institutionalism) also tends to uphold the sacredness of state sovereignty in relation to environmental issues as it is traditionally one of the foundations of institutional thought\textsuperscript{17}. Even critical IR theory is often guilty of not addressing the relation of territorial sovereignty to environmental issues\textsuperscript{18}. Paradoxically, it is mostly critical geographers that point out that in IR theory the state’s essential territoriality is still – for better or for worse – being taken for granted and the dominating view of space is territorial (seen as chunks of planetary surface defined by territorial boundaries) rather than structural (where the spatial effects of different geographical entities result from their interaction or relationship with one another)\textsuperscript{19}.

Of course this critique of territoriality has its limits. It is rather general and does not go deeper into how these territories came to be. It is true that their genealogy across the globe is heterogeneous, although the article works on the assumption their historical-geographical dimension is mostly a social construction. It is assumed that modern state borders are generally based on arbitrary, but economically and strategically useful considerations of power centers. Nevertheless, when global ecological issues are at stake, it seems that most predictions about the decline of sovereignty made by political scientists in the past have been at least partially wrong\textsuperscript{20}. The state-centric geographies of security and sovereignty are withering and leaking, but not disappearing\textsuperscript{21}. Not only is sovereignty of the industrialized state fortified through global economic governance institutions\textsuperscript{22}, the whole global politico-economic framework upheld by states and for states still depends on their territoriality. This is why, even if environmental problems are framed as ‘global’ or ‘transboundary’\textsuperscript{23}, the response of the international system is almost always territorialized. Thus every international project in environmental politics – most notably the latest big undertaking that is the Paris Agreement of 2015\textsuperscript{24} – actually reasserts the role of sovereign territorial states as the default mode of governance\textsuperscript{25}. It is not only the axis of every guideline, but also the dominant discourse on the Agreement. This discourse includes state vs state rivalry or the ascribing of responsibility to states and not social groups or industries. As Bruno Latour puts it, the whole negotiation process showed:

“[…] the complete unrealism of their borrowed notion of sovereignty: sovereign states framed by sharp borders were discussing how to collectively bear something that crossed through all borders, and that over a few centuries had entangled them much more tightly than war or commerce had ever been able to do”\textsuperscript{26}.

This notion of sovereignty is used as justification for territorial rights by various voices in the politico-environmental debate. Nationalist justifications view territoriality as connected to national identity; proprietary justifications view it as the necessary condition for private property rights; and populist justifications connect it to democratic self-determination. It is also noticeable how all of these are connected to peoplehood and form a kind of ‘ecological blindspot’\textsuperscript{27}.

It must be noted that while territoriality’s centrality to the concept of sovereignty is usually a problem, the territoriality of the state itself is often part of a solution. It comes to fruition mainly during the implementation phase of global environmental regimes, because in a system of states, state-based legislation and its enforcement are both necessary and efficient. Thus, while ceding all responsibility to states in a pledge-based agreement – like the Paris Agreement – seems pointless when taking into account the history of such endeavors, there are examples of territorial states successfully tackling a global


\textsuperscript{16} Laferrière and Stoett, International Relations Theory, 86.

\textsuperscript{17} Laferrière and Stoett, International Relations Theory, 114.


\textsuperscript{19} John Agnew, Mastering Space: Hegemony, territory and international political economy (London: Routledge, 1995), 80-82.


\textsuperscript{21} Chaturvedi and Doyle, Climate Terror, 20.

\textsuperscript{22} Gabriella Kütting and Sandra Rose, “The environment as a global issue,” in Palgrave advances in international environmental politics, eds. Michele M. Beissil, Kathryn Hochstetler and Dimitris Stevis (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 120.

\textsuperscript{23} Kate O’Neill, The Environment and International Relations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 31-33.

\textsuperscript{24} UNFCCC, Adoption of the Paris Agreement, 21st Conference of the Parties (Paris: United Nations, 2015).

\textsuperscript{25} Dalby, “Unsustainable Borders,” 27.


environmental problem, as was the case with the Montreal Protocol. There is a ‘dark’ side to this success story, however, as Brian J. Gareau suggests – states have indeed been able to enforce necessary changes, but only because it was beneficial to specific industry interests.

This is where the emphasis on territoriority meets the second important problem of the international system – anthropocentrism. It is understood here not only as the centrality of human values and experiences, but mostly as the marginalization or outright rejection of any other way of political organization. On one hand it seems logical that any form of human organization, like the state and the state system, will be anthropocentric, although this view stems from a stunted political imagination that we have all been socialized into – one that does not allow us to conceptualize any form of political community other than a community of humans. Importantly, this anthropocentrism does not exist in a social and historical vacuum, but rather, as Mathew Patterson puts it, “it has emerged as part of an ideological system underpinning the emergence of modern science, of capitalism, of the modern state, and of specifically modern forms of patriarchy.”

Maybe this deep embeddedness of anthropocentrism in science is the reason why there are not many critiques of sovereignty that focus on this feature. In political theory it is most often treated commonsensically as a problem not worth mentioning. This may be why such a critique, when it happens, is very radical. The best example is the critique by Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, who use the controversial topic of extraterrestrial life. That Wendt and Duvall challenge the anthropocentrism of sovereignty by using the idea of UFOs is of no importance here. What is important is that they unambiguously state that modern sovereignty is constituted and organized solely by reference to humans, and this trait is common across all institutional forms of sovereignty today.

Wendt and Duvall point to the fact that modern systems of rule always silently reference humanity when they need to mobilize power, use power or command resources. But this agency of humanity can no longer be taken for granted and needs to be problematized in light of the breakdown of the human-nature divide that is evident in the global ecological crisis. Even if the anthropocentrism of sovereignty is logical in light of scientific facts – that there is no evidence that Nature has subjectivity – it obscures important notions of how our politico-economic systems relate to space and the environment.

An important argument here is the idea that every human activity throughout history has always been ecological in some way or another. This is most cleverly approached by the geographer David Harvey, who writes that every socio-political project in history is an ecological one and vice versa. This has profound implications for IR thought, although it is rarely taken into account. Because societies create their own environmental conditions required for their survival, those conditions reflect the dominant social, political, and economic relations of those societies. In a system of capitalist states, it is capitalism and statism that drive the shaping, production, and reproduction of nature by humans. As Christian Parenti puts it, “the capitalist state has always been an inherently environmental entity.”

Therefore, one important thing is missing from most of our studies of sovereignty and our idea of the Anthropocene as well – the fact that there has never been a collective, abstract Humanity driving both the history of civilization and the destruction of the environment. Thus the singular narrative of the Anthropocene may serve as a decent starting point, but it obscures as much as it clarifies. Chandler et al., warn against leaning on the concept too strongly. For them the Anthropocene is useful for emphasizing the unprecedented influence of humanity on the planet, but it still carries the traditional notions of human universalism and exceptionalism. The first one is especially important in this discussion, because the issue of responsibility for the crisis is not as simple as the Anthropocene discourse suggests. The driving force of human history, especially political history, was never the collective humanity, but specific social and geographically defined groups and the models of social relations and modes of production that they have carried with them. Because the dominant model of the last five centuries has been capitalism, it should always be present in any discussion we have about our political reality and environmental problems alike. This is why Chandler et al., suggest using the term ‘Capitalocene’ instead of Anthropocene within the modern study of IR. This mostly self-explanatory concept originated with Andreas Malm and has been promulgated by Jason W. Moore as an entry into the debate on what exactly is the character of the twenty-first century ecological crisis, when did this crisis originate, and what forces have been driving it! Because the Capitalocene is simply a different way of thinking about the ecological crisis and not a rival geographical
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definition, it does not invalidate the whole debate on the Anthropocene. It merely serves here as the basis for a different view of history – one where geo-biophysical processes and social and economic history can, or must, be analyzed together. Moreover, it provides a working assumption about the capi-
talogenic nature of the ecological crisis – an assumption explored not only by Moore and Malm, but also other scholars, mainly those following a Marxist tradition. Through this lens we might notice that the still strong territoriality and anthropocen-
trism of state sovereignty in every discourse is not accidental and has its reasons.

Sovereignty as an environmental practice
The framing of sovereignty in terms of territory, power, and
capital instead of merely territory and power provides an
interesting perspective. Traditionally state sovereignty has been
thought to have arisen to legitimize enforce internal
order and protect against external threats in service to political
authority. However, by using capitalism instead of inter-
national law as the main axis of analysis of the history of
international politics, we can notice how our notions of
sovereignty have related to our modes of production. And those
are always highly place-specific. Labor, food, energy, or raw
materials are all placed and accessed geographically. They
must be located and controlled territorially before they can be
put to work. However, capitalism itself is not well equipped to
do that. It needs the state. Alan Carter describes it in a com-
plex way as the entity that stabilizes the competitive and
inegalitarian economic relations which in turn support the
nationalistic and militaristic coercive forces empowering the
state while damaging the environment through technology.
Thus, the relation of support between capitalism and the mod-
ern state is mutual. Immanuel Wallerstein also sees the state
as the proxy through which enterprises, both private and
state-owned, maximize the conditions for profit-making.
When taking such perspectives into account one can notice that
the classical Westphalian concept of state sovereignty only
mystifies the reality and morphology of power in the capitalis-
t world order. The alternative idea is that it was capitalism
that created the modern state and this state – which defines itself
by its relation to other states – is simply the most convenient
institutional intermediary for establishing the conditions for
capital accumulation. Even though territorial sovereignty
(especially over resources) may appear to be inwardly
focused against ‘outside’ intervention, it is simply protected
and enhanced by global capital in order to create stable legal
property regimes. Thus the modern territorial state system
born in the seventeenth century provided the framework for
definitions of legal rights of ownership of the land, without
which the expansion of capitalism towards further capital accu-
mulation would not have been possible or as easy. Capital
needs a stable, institutionalized access to space, because it
equals a stable and secure access to nature.

This is why Parenti describes the state as a relationship with
nature. For him every modern socio-economic project exists
upon the surface of the earth thanks to the territoriality of
state. It was the state that enabled the territorialization of
political authority following the Peace of Westphalia, as well
as allowed capitalism to capture the necessary positive exter-
nalities and enhance the clustering of external economies within
national-state boundaries. Even now states compete with one
another to attract capital to their territories, because they
are ultimately the ones that control them and can enable the extrac-
tion of their use values. In return, capital strengthens the state’s
control apparatus and its political legitimacy. Thus, the apparent
 unbundling of state territorial sovereignty will not actually hap-
pen as long as there is capital searching for new ways of accu-
mulation. According to Kevin R. Cox, capital is the force that
necessarily territorializes and centralizes, because production
requires not only resources but also fixed infrastructures, like
transport networks, industrial estates, worker housing, water and
power provision, as well as infrastructure for the social repro-
duction of the labor power. The sovereign state becomes the unit
that intervenes both globally and nationally in response to the
bottom-up pressures of capital. Nowhere is it more visible
than during international environmental negotiations, when
governments are pressured by industries which are central to
modern capitalism. Under fossil capitalism capital is most easily
accumulated in the energy, transportation, and manufacturing
sectors of national economies. Those are the ones that
utilize what Matto Mildenberger calls ‘double representation’ –
the excessive political pressure exerted by carbon polluters
during any domestic or international climate policy negotia-
tions, which transcends any party lines and political interests.
The relation is therefore twofold: not only does the state
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provide economic entities with legal rights of ownership and conditions for capital accumulation, but it also empowers them to stymie efforts to curtail their privilege to extract use value from nature and labor. This is why even when landmark ‘green’ bills are passed by the governments of core countries, they still contain provisions that show the influence of carbon-intensive industries which receive some form of compensation in order to uphold their capital accumulating conditions.

In this perspective states are no more than coordinating devices to connect and integrate networks of power of the dominant economic entities into discrete territories. It is also the world economy that regulates the extent of each state’s sovereignty – by determining exchange and interest rates, by imposing structural adjustment programs and so on. Empires and capitalists have always needed the territoriality upheld by political and epistemic power of the state. This is what Perenti calls ‘geopower’ – the ‘technologies of power that make territory and the biosphere accessible, legible, knowable, and utilizable’. Geopower has many forms, one of which is described by Moore as ‘geo-managerialism’. It is a set of managerial procedures and imperatives – including identification, maximization, and restructuring of labor and knowledge – which are utilized by states in order to identify the productive potential of the part of nature (including the human population) they control and make it directly useful to capital, while reproducing the conditions of its accumulation. One of the most important implications from this is that the state uses not only its political and legal power but also science and technology to shape its citizens view of nature as something to be appropriated on the basis of territorial entitlement. The argument of sovereignty, among many others, is then abused by the power of the fossil capitalism’s dominant economic interests when they stymie environmental reform efforts.

The idea and discourse of sovereignty are therefore one of the major ways in which the dominant system of power and capital can create, uphold, and defend its own model of environmental management and resource allocation. Even the anthropocentrism of sovereignty is necessary for capitalism, because it blurs the responsibility for environmental degradation, moving it from specific economic entities to state populations as a whole, while at the same time strengthening the notion of a specific part of the Earth as ‘belonging’ and subservient to a population. In conclusion, capitalism has become the structure of relations that provides necessary conditions for regionalizing and identifying state territories and asserting their power over the land and by extension over nature as a whole. This perspective is different than a purely geopolitical one, in which only (a handful of) states are responsible for the geopolitical discourse that describes world order. The geo-managerial perspective under Capitalocene reveals a different, more obscure force that shapes the discourse on states, sovereignty, rivalry etc. Thus the so-called ‘return of geopolitics’ and the strengthening of discourses centered around sovereignty is not antithetical to global capitalism, but rather is the emanation of its efforts to reproduce conditions necessary for its existence. This is because state sovereignty has three aspects. As an idea it obviously serves as the foundation for maintaining national identity and provides the feeling of security of having basic resources required for a society’s survival – even if those resources end up as means for capital accumulation rather than for subsistence activities. As an institution it provides the legal framework for controlling a chunk of space and those resources and the populations that provide labor. As an environmental practice, state sovereignty determines how those resources and labor are claimed and for what purpose.

**Conclusions**

The critique of sovereignty presented here is aimed to support the notion by Chandler et al., that the Capitalocene, not just the Anthropocene, is what presents one of the major challenges to IR. Despite some hopes that in a proper ecological society the issues of politics including sovereignty, territoriality, and interstate competition will sort themselves out, history has rarely worked that way. The problem of state sovereignty as a major obstacle to tackling global existential threats is both political and intellectual. Burke et al., came up with ideas for groundbreaking reforms, which would raise significant political and legal complexities. However, their proposals still do not challenge the concept of anthropocentric and territorial sovereignty. A perspective in which state sovereignty is a fundamental tool of capitalist division, control and appropriation of the Earth is absent from their otherwise groundbreaking Manifesto. This is why the conclusions of Chandler et al., – that what we need is not new authoritarian institutions and regimes but bottoms-up solutions that put nature before capital – seem more on point when taking into account the problematic nature of sovereignty under capitalism. So rather than focusing on a new global
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security governance that actually entrenches the current fundamental issues\textsuperscript{67}, we might be better of focusing on how capitalism influences state behavior and geopolitical discourse in order to overcome those pressures.

The discourse of separate and often rivalrous states, founded on the concept of territorial sovereignty and exclusive jurisdiction, may prove effective when faced with challenges to political identity, but definitely fails against trans-territorial and global threats\textsuperscript{68}. This is because it translates into entitlement of states to pursue their environmental and developmental policies within their own territories as they see fit. And because this state-centric discourse is still the dominant one, the global environmental crisis and the advances in international environmental politics merely reconfigure a fluid notion of sovereignty, but never challenge it outright\textsuperscript{69}. All of these reconfigurations serve not to overcome sovereignty but protect the forces that use it in order to control, extract, and accumulate. Just like the state itself, sovereignty is neither an ally nor an enemy of transformation towards sustainability, even though the idea of territorial exclusivity appears to make it mutually exclusive with any kind of ecological holism. Rather than endlessly debating over whether sovereign states are here forever or are about to disappear in a global cosmopolis\textsuperscript{70}, we could be better off trying to understand the forces that underlie the problem in order to challenge them\textsuperscript{71}. Focusing on sovereignty as an environmental practice in relation to capitalism may be a starting point for further discussion and a way to circumvent the traditional constraints of mainstream IR theory and political theory in general. Any kind of intellectual endeavor aimed at shifting the international society towards a sustainable one should not disregard sovereignty or hope that its erosion will be a natural by-product of socio-economic changes. It is a tool that has no inherent moral value and its 	extit{raison d’être} depends on the forces allowed to control its discourse. So if the institution is here to stay for at least another few decades, we should rather focus on trying to redefine it\textsuperscript{72}. By looking through the lens of the Capitalocene we can see that state sovereignty is not only a political idea and an institution, but also an environmental practice instrumental for capitalism to carry out its prerogative of capital accumulation by way of the geo-managerial state. And if it is here to stay, we may then try to steer it away from capital accumulation and towards sustainability. A different kind of state sovereignty is imaginable – one that not only fulfills the populations’ needs of identity and security, but also becomes the environmental practice of a sustainable state, where the well-being of nature trumps the needs of capital. A sustainable world does not have to be a difficult to imagine state-less cosmopolis but can become a system of responsible entities that serve as guardians rather than managers of the part of nature ceded to them.

The questions raised here are to complex and nuanced to receive satisfactory answers within the scope of a single article. Moreover, depending on the reader’s own ontological and theoretical perspective, even more questions appear: Is sovereignty or territoriality the fundamental problem? Or is it a matter of their conceptualization and institutionalization? Can the limited success of some market-based solutions provide a pathway towards reigning in more of capitalism’s destructive momentum? Certainly history gives us examples that allow one to be both an optimist and a pessimist when it comes to letting a system of sovereign territorial states solve any global problem, irrespective of their economic system. The author’s hope is that all the above questions will be further explored and the draft of a new perspective presented here will serve as an intellectual inspiration for heterodox approaches which contest ideas and concepts that the mainstream of political science takes for granted.
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Thank you for the opportunity to read and review this paper. I approached it as someone who has researched the paper’s main topics. For transparency, I am not familiar with the paper’s author or the author’s other work. Given the innovative format of this journal and review process, and given that the paper is already publicly available, I consider this as an opportunity to provide what help I can for the author to develop the paper further.

I have selected “approved with reservations” due to the reasons I explain below. This is not a criticism of the author’s or the paper’s academic merit. Rather, I have chosen this option due to there being clear ways in which the paper and its argument could be improved.

The paper’s main aim is to assess whether state sovereignty is necessarily antithetical to a sustainable world. The paper’s conclusion seems to be that it all depends on how sovereignty is understood. This is not surprising at least to a social constructivist; sovereignty itself has no meaning but meaning is bestowed upon it through speech and various kinds of social acts including interpretations and practices. Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) with its “sovereignty as responsibility” is a relatively recent and globally well-known attempt to re-define sovereignty that has been arguably also successful to some degree. The author’s argument seems to be somewhat similar: sovereignty should be understood as environmental practice. After the introduction, the paper proceeds by critiquing sovereignty followed by its explanation of sovereignty as an environmental practice.

The paper is generally well written, and it manages to discuss quite a lot in a relatively short amount of space (less than 4,000 words). The paper’s topic is important, and the author builds the paper’s argument with the help of relevant literature.

Yet, the paper has room for improvement, too. For one, there are statements in the text that are not necessarily true or supported by documented evidence. For instance, it is not necessarily true...
that “National sovereignty is invoked during every discussion about environmental politics.”

Second, the author makes excellent points about the problematic territoriality of the state. Here, though, while it is true that this is often taken for granted without much thought, and while it is true that many environmental or other problems do not respect such artificially drawn territorial borders, it is also true that one should not neglect the “genealogy” of sovereignty, the state, those borders, and territoriality for instance in relation to law and the law’s contemporary impact on how e.g. such questions as authority, jurisdiction, responsibility, and governance are settled. This does not mean, of course, that these cannot be understood differently than they are now, but it does mean that critiquing states for being territorial is not completely fair. It is similarly surprising to criticize an international agreement by sovereign states for asserting the role of sovereign states. At the same time, however, the paper seems to pay little attention to such examples as the Montreal Protocol that show that territorial states have the ability to tackle global problems. Moreover, the paper does not pay much attention to the actual changes there have been regarding sovereignty and the territoriality of sovereign states in the past decades. While RtoP is an example of the former, what “territoriality” means and entails has not remained historically constant. Not only have there been and are historically contingent extra-territorial acts by states but also there are completely novel spaces, including virtual spaces, within which states act and regulate.

Third, the author makes an important point about the anthropocentrism of the international system. Here, though, it could be clarified, what is actually meant by anthropocentrism. If one considers the international system (esp. as it is taught in introductory IR courses), its central elements are sovereign states, not humans. On the other hand, the international system does exist solely due to humans and it seems to uphold only human values and experiences, even though that can also be critiqued, given that raison d’état – reason of state – is to many, esp. of the realist camp, one of the main values.

Fourth, the author is quite right in underlining the ecological impacts humans have always had. Similarly, the author is right in how historically it has been true how different ways of organizing societies and their relations with each other can have significant differences to for instance whether environmental aspects are considered as “externalities.” Yet, the connection between sovereign states and capitalism could be made clearer, and one does wonder about how non-capitalist states fit the author’s framework. This is not an argument against the notion of Capitalocene – there I am probably in agreement with the author – but the connections between the state, capitalism, and the ecological crisis could be made clearer. The author’s argument is clearer about the mutually beneficial relationship between capitalism and the modern state. Yet, I am unsure whether it is true that capital is a force that “necessarily territorializes and centralizes.” The author seems to be thinking only of physical production. While also non-physical modes of capitalism do depend on some physical infrastructure somewhere, they are not similarly territorial as in the examples the author gives. Here, one can think of such trends as being one of the largest lodging companies in the world without owning any hotels, motels, or guest rooms and having practically no employees. Or one can think of cryptocurrencies that are not territorial in any normal sense of that concept but which result in significant amounts of greenhouse gas emissions.

Fifth, in the end, I am unsure whether the author argues that there is some fundamental problem with the sovereign (territorial) state itself, whether the sovereign (territorial) states are not doing
enough regarding the ecological crisis, or whether sovereign (territorial) states are unable or unwilling to “rein in” capitalism and its ecologically worst forms. Clearly, sovereign states have demonstrated e.g. through the Montreal Protocol and other agreements that they are able to act for the planet and life on it. Clearly, though, more could be done. At the same time, it should be noted that capitalism is also used for making a change (e.g. carbon trading, green markets etc.).

Lastly, I don't know why there is both a summary and a conclusion at the end of the paper.

In sum, the author manages to raise important questions and to provide at least preliminary answers. Yet, the discussion and analysis could go further and be more nuanced in a longer version of the paper.
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Dear Hannes, Thank you for the constructive critique. I've uploaded a revised version of the article which I hope will provide some answers to your remarks and comments after it is prepared by the editor. Some remarks I addressed in a few words in the text, and some I addressed only briefly, as they are further explored in the literature I cite. I did try to
address most of them, though, at least partially. I would also like to explain the nature of the article, which - as you have noticed - is not a very long one. This is because it is intended to be mainly an intellectual inspiration for as many different approaches as possible, without pointing to any specific theory or methodology. I will provide my own proposed answers to the questions contained within the text and the ones you’ve stated in your review, but I intend to do that in a separate text, combining more than only a critique of sovereignty. If everything goes well, this article will be a first of a series that deductively thread towards a new theoretical proposition. All in all, your comments made me think twice about a few things in this article and will stay relevant for me in my future research as well! Thank you!
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This is a very interesting article. It is well-written, clearly organized and is structured in a proper way. The author shows a profound knowledge of the debates and categories used in International Relations and inserts his proposal in the global discussion around the environment, the Anthropocene and Capitalism as a world-ecology. The principal idea that is supported here relates to the role of sovereignty as an essential dispositive for resource accumulation and, thus, for the destruction of nature by capital. The proposal is sound and helpful to broaden the current global environmental debate on how to tackle climate change and stop the rise of the Capitalocene. The article makes a solid argumentation and is also propositive, as it shows how the reflections around sovereignty may lead us to think on alternatives to earth destruction. It’s been a pleasure reading it, congratulations to the author!
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