

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES [IJLSSS]

ISSN: 2584-1513 (Online)

Volume 4 | Issue 2 [2026] | Page 12 - 24

© 2026 International Journal of Legal Studies and Social Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlsss.com/>

In case of any queries or suggestions, kindly contact editor@ijlsss.com

“GLOBALIZATION VS. INDIAN SOVEREIGNTY— LEGAL CONFLICTS IN A BORDERLESS WORLD, PARTICULARLY IN THE CONTEXT OF WTO & FTAs”

- Noorin Jahan¹

ABSTRACT

In an era defined by rapid economic integration, digital connectivity, and transnational governance, the traditional concept of state sovereignty faces unprecedented challenges. This paper explores the complex legal tensions between globalization and national sovereignty, examining how international trade agreements, supranational institutions, and global norms increasingly influence domestic legal systems. While globalization promotes cooperation, economic growth, and shared standards, it often requires states to cede aspects of their legal autonomy—raising critical questions about democratic accountability, constitutional integrity, and the legitimacy of global legal frameworks. Through case studies and comparative analysis, this research investigates how states navigate these conflicts, balancing global obligations with domestic priorities. The paper argues that sovereignty is not being erased but redefined, evolving into a more fluid and negotiated concept within the global legal order. Ultimately, this study seeks to illuminate the legal paradoxes of globalization and offer pathways for reconciling national interests with global justice.

KEYWORDS: WTO, FTAs, Domestic laws, International Trade, International Treaties, UNCITRAL.

RUNNING: How do global trade agreements (like WTO & FTAs) challenge national legal autonomy? The tension between international norms and domestic constitutional principles.

¹ 1st semester (LLM) 2025-2026, IILM University School of Law, Greater Noida

1. INTRODUCTION

The world today is more interconnected than at any point in history. Goods traverse oceans in days, services are rendered digitally across continents, capital flows instantaneously, and ideas disseminate virally through global networks. This phenomenon, known as globalization, has undeniably propelled economic growth and fostered international cooperation. Yet, for nations like India—a vibrant democracy and one of the world’s fastest-growing economies—it has also introduced profound challenges to the bedrock of national identity: sovereignty.¹ Sovereignty, at its core, embodies a state’s supreme authority to govern its territory, populace, and laws without external coercion.² Historically, this principle, enshrined in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, functioned as an impenetrable fortress shielding nations from foreign meddling. However, the advent of institutions like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) has eroded these fortifications, compelling states to harmonize domestic policies with international mandates.³

India’s engagement with globalization exemplifies this duality. As a founding member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1948 and a WTO signatory since January 1, 1995, India has liberalized its economy, yielding tangible benefits such as a surge in information technology exports, agricultural trade (e.g., rice and textiles), and foreign direct investment (FDI).⁴ These reforms, accelerated by the 1991 economic liberalization to combat balance-of-payments crises, have elevated India to the world’s fifth-largest economy by 2025, with GDP growth projected at 7% annually.⁵ Yet, this integration has exacted costs. WTO disciplines on subsidies have constrained India’s agricultural support programs, which are vital for food security under Article 21 of the Constitution (right to life).⁶ Similarly, FTAs with partners like the United Arab Emirates (2022), Australia (2022), and ongoing negotiations with the UK and EU demand concessions in areas like intellectual property rights (IPR), data localization, and labor standards—often clashing with domestic imperatives for affordable healthcare and digital privacy.⁷

To illustrate, consider the domestic analogy of a household: India, as the homeowner, opens its doors to global guests (multinational corporations and trade partners) for mutual benefit. The influx brings prosperity—new appliances (technology transfers) and shared meals (market access)—but guests may impose their preferences, dictating menu changes (policy reforms) or restricting access to private rooms (sovereign domains like public health).⁸ This friction manifests as legal conflicts, where international obligations under treaties like the WTO’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) supersede national legislation, such as India’s Patents Act, 1970, potentially inflating generic drug prices and undermining access to medicines.⁹

These tensions are not abstract; they resonate in real-world upheavals. The 2020-2021 farmers’ protests against three farm laws—perceived as influenced by global trade pressures to liberalize agriculture—highlighted the human stakes, leading to their repeal amid cries of eroded sovereignty.¹⁰ In the digital realm, the India-UK FTA negotiations (ongoing as of November 2025) raise alarms over clauses prohibiting source code inspections, which could compromise India’s Digital Personal Data

Protection (DPDP) Act, 2023, and expose sensitive data to foreign scrutiny.¹¹ Such dynamics probe deeper questions: In a borderless world, does globalization dilute democratic accountability? Can constitutional supremacy—Article 51 promoting international peace while upholding sovereignty—coexist with supranational adjudication?¹²

This paper dissects these legal paradoxes, focusing on WTO and FTAs as primary arenas of contestation. It traces India’s journey from post-colonial insulation to global player, underscoring how 1991 reforms marked a pivot toward interdependence.¹³ Today, with over 14 FTAs in force and seven under negotiation, India stands at a crossroads.¹⁴ The narrative is one of power asymmetries: Developing nations like India advocate for “special and differential treatment” in WTO forums, yet face disputes from wealthier counterparts, as seen in the EU’s 2024 challenge to India’s ICT tariffs.¹⁵

Globalization’s silver lining persists—lifting over 415 million Indians out of poverty since 2005 through export-led growth and tech booms.¹⁶ Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, framer of India’s Constitution, envisioned sovereignty as the people’s “supreme power,” a mantle to wield judiciously in international arenas.¹⁷ Echoing Robert Putnam’s “two-level games,” India must negotiate treaties that align domestic politics with global diplomacy.¹⁸ Without vigilant legal safeguards, however, nations risk becoming mere enforcers of foreign norms.

This introduction lays the groundwork. Subsequent sections articulate study objectives, posit a hypothesis, review extant literature, and delineate a conceptual framework. Through WTO case studies and FTA analyses, the paper culminates in recommendations for “negotiated autonomy,” ensuring India reaps globalization’s fruits without forfeiting its democratic essence.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This research is guided by four interconnected objectives, designed to dissect and address the globalization-sovereignty nexus in India’s legal landscape:

1. **Examine Legal Tensions:** To systematically identify conflicts between WTO/FTA provisions and Indian domestic laws, particularly in agriculture (e.g., subsidy caps vs. National Food Security Act, 2013), data privacy (DPDP Act vs. cross-border data flows), and IPR (TRIPS vs. compulsory licensing).¹⁹
2. **Analyze Case Studies:** To evaluate emblematic disputes, such as WTO DS456 (India’s solar incentives) and India-UAE CEPA (2022) investment chapters, elucidating strategies for sovereignty preservation.²⁰
3. **Review Scholarly Perspectives:** To synthesize global and India-centric literature on sovereignty erosion, highlighting gaps in constitutional integration of trade treaties.²¹
4. **Propose Balancing Mechanisms:** To recommend actionable reforms, including enhanced parliamentary oversight under Article 253 and UNCITRAL-aligned digital safeguards.²²

These objectives transition from diagnosis to prescription, empowering India to harness globalization equitably.

3. HYPOTHESIS

The central hypothesis posits: “Globalization via WTO and FTAs does not obliterate Indian sovereignty but metamorphoses it into ‘negotiated autonomy’—a strategic cession of peripheral controls in exchange for amplified influence, leveraging legal instruments to safeguard core domains like food security and digital integrity.”²³

This formulation draws from empirical precedents: India’s 2019 RCEP withdrawal to protect agriculture and its 17 WTO victories since 1995, including DS456 on solar modules.²⁴ Falsifiable per Popperian logic, the hypothesis anticipates testing through case evidence; validation would affirm India’s agency in a multipolar order, eschewing binary loss-win paradigms.²⁵

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review aggregates scholarly discourse to contextualize this study, revealing consensus on globalization’s sovereignty strains while underscoring divergent remedial approaches. Sources span theoretical treatises, empirical analyses, and policy briefs, with an India focus post-2019.²⁶

Theoretically, Stephen Krasner’s *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (1999) deconstructs sovereignty as performative rather than absolute, a lens apt for WTO’s binding dispute settlement.²⁷ Complementing this, Jagdish Bhagwati’s *In Defense of Globalization* (2004) extols trade liberalization’s poverty-alleviating potential but concedes sovereignty trade-offs in subsidy disciplines.²⁸ Anne-Marie Slaughter’s *A New World Order* (2004) envisions “disaggregated sovereignty” via networked governance, where states delegate to regulators like UNCITRAL for e-commerce harmonization—yet warns of accountability deficits in asymmetric power dynamics.²⁹ Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes (*The New Sovereignty*, 1995) advocate “managerial” compliance models, positing treaties as collaborative rather than coercive, a framework resonant with India’s plurilateral opt-outs.³⁰ David Held’s *Global Covenant* (2004) critiques neoliberal globalization, urging social-democratic safeguards; Amartya Sen’s *Development as Freedom* (1999) ties sovereignty to capability enhancement, aligning with India’s constitutional welfarism.³¹ Joseph Stiglitz’s *Globalization and Its Discontents* (2002) lambasts WTO inequities, particularly for developing economies, fueling India’s “disrupter” role.³² Daniel Rodrik’s *The Globalization Paradox* (2011) articulates the trilemma—hyper-globalization, democracy, sovereignty—of which two may coexist, advocating policy space reclamation.³³

India-specific scholarship amplifies these themes. Arun Kumar et al.’s “Sovereignty in a Globalized World: Challenges to National Governance in India” (2022) chronicles post-1991 liberalization’s double-edged sword: WTO tariff bindings spurred FDI (US\$81 billion in 2024) but curtailed industrial protections, exacerbating farmer distress.³⁴ The authors highlight FTAs’ “WTO-plus” demands, like

Japan-India’s (2011) IPR escalations clashing with Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, and prescribe hybrid regimes blending global norms with domestic carve-outs—mirroring our hypothesis.³⁵

Rajesh Kumar’s 2019 Shodhganga thesis, “Impact of Globalization on Sovereignty: With Special Reference to India,” traces GATT/WTO evolution, noting TRIPS’ compulsory licensing flexibilities under Doha Declaration yet persistent pharma pricing pressures.³⁶ It juxtaposes Article 253 (treaty implementation) with judicial deference in *Gramophone Co. v. Birendra Bahadur Pandey* (1984), affirming treaty supremacy sans constitutional amendment, a vulnerability in FTA ratifications.³⁷ The *International Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research* (2024) extends globally, quantifying sovereignty erosion via IMF conditionalities and WTO notifications; for India, it correlates 25% policy space loss in agriculture with 2020 protests.³⁸

FTA-centric works scrutinize bilateralism’s perils. The Institute for Legal and Strategic Initiatives’ 2024 brief on “Unlocking Economic Potential or Losing National Sovereignty? The India-UK Free Trade Agreement Negotiations” dissects stalled talks: Prospective gains in £28 billion bilateral trade by 2030 offset by “ratchet clauses” locking liberalization, potentially nullifying DPDP Act’s localization mandates.³⁹ It invokes “neocolonial” analogies, urging safeguards akin to EU’s sustainability chapters in India-EU FTA drafts.⁴⁰ The Hindu’s January 2025 op-ed, “What has been missed is India’s digital sovereignty,” critiques UK proposals banning source code audits, linking to UNCITRAL’s 2024 e-commerce updates and India’s G20 Data Governance Pact.⁴¹

WTO literature underscores India’s assertiveness. The Council on Foreign Relations’ March 2025 report, “How India Disrupts and Navigates the WTO,” portrays India as vetoing agri plurilaterals to sustain \$48 billion subsidies, invoking Article 6 of the Agreement on Agriculture.⁴² Amid Appellate Body paralysis since 2019, India champions multi-party interim appeals, blending disruption with diplomacy.⁴³ The WTO’s *Managing the Challenges of WTO Participation: 45 Case Studies* (2010, updated 2024) details DS456, where India’s development flex under GATT Article XVIII prevailed, bolstering renewables sovereignty.⁴⁴

Gaps persist: Economic foci overshadow constitutional litigation (e.g., minimal analysis of Article 19(1)(g) trade freedoms vs. subsidy bans); post-2024 FTAs like India-EFTA (2024) remain under-explored. This paper bridges these via integrated legal-constitutional lenses, affirming literature’s thesis: Sovereignty endures through negotiation, not isolation.⁴⁵

(Comparative table in text: Authors | Key Argument | India Relevance | Remedial Proposal
Krasner | Hypocrisy in practice | WTO hypocrisies in disputes | Institutional reforms
Rodrik | Trilemma | Policy space in FTAs | Domestic prioritization
Kumar | Post-1991 erosion | Agri subsidies | Hybrid policies)

5. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: UNDERSTANDING GLOBALIZATION AND SOVEREIGNTY

This framework demystifies core constructs, posing sovereignty and globalization as interdependent yet antagonistic forces. Sovereignty, per James Crawford's *The Creation of States in International Law* (2006), entails internal (domestic control) and external (non-interference) dimensions, codified in UN Charter Article 2(1).⁴⁶ India's Preamble declares it a "Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic," with Article 51 enjoining international comity sans sovereignty dilution.⁴⁷ Judicially, *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) deems sovereignty basic structure, inalienable.⁴⁸

Globalization, Thomas Friedman's *The World Is Flat* (2005) metaphorically flattens hierarchies via technology and trade, encompassing economic (WTO's 164 members slashing tariffs 40% since 1995), political (UN climate pacts), and cultural vectors.⁴⁹ Legally, it manifests in *pacta sunt servanda* (Vienna Convention, 1969, Art. 26), binding states to treaties.⁵⁰ UNCITRAL facilitates via model laws on international commercial arbitration and e-commerce, harmonizing yet challenging unilateralism.⁵¹

Conflicts crystallize in hierarchy: WTO's direct effect in some jurisdictions (e.g., EU) contrasts India's dualist approach, requiring legislative domestication under Article 253.⁵² GATT's most-favored-nation (Art. I) mandates non-discrimination, clashing with India's infant industry protections; TRIPS (Art. 27) standardizes IP, overriding Patents Act flexibilities.⁵³ Constitutionally, Directive Principles (Arts. 38-39: social justice) versus WTO's green box subsidies (AoA Annex 2) pit equity against efficiency.⁵⁴ Digital FTAs exacerbate, with data flows undermining DPDP Act's fiduciary duties.⁵⁵

Framing sovereignty as a spectrum—from Westphalian absolutism to post-modern "pooled" variants (EU integration)—India occupies a hybrid: Absolute in defense (Nuclear Doctrine, 2003), shared in trade.⁵⁶ Krasner's typology (domestic, interdependent, international legal, Westphalian) illuminates: WTO erodes interdependent sovereignty via notifications, yet bolsters international legal via dispute wins.⁵⁷

Analytical model: Conflicts as "two-level games" (Putnam, 1988), where ratification (Level I) intersects implementation (Level II).⁵⁸ Pathways: Negotiation (safeguards), litigation (DSB), legislation (amendments). This framework operationalizes objectives, guiding case dissections.⁵⁹

(Diagrammatic description: Flowchart—Global Norm → Domestic Clash → Resolution Vectors (Negotiation/Litigation/Legislation) → Negotiated Autonomy. Historical arc: Montevideo Convention (1933) to GATT (1947) evolution, with Indian precedents like *Visakhapatnam Municipal Council v. K. Rama Rao* (1996) on treaty primacy.)

6. WTO AND INDIAN SOVEREIGNTY: LEGAL CHALLENGES AND CASE STUDIES

The WTO, successor to GATT, enforces multilateral trade via 15 agreements, with India integral since 1995 accession protocols committing to 6,000 tariff lines.⁶⁰ Challenges abound: (1) Agricultural subsidies—\$48 billion annually deemed amber box excesses; (2) TRIPS-mandated IP hikes, inflating generics 20-30%; (3) DSB bias, with Appellate Body dysfunctional post-2019 U.S. blocks.⁶¹ India has initiated 25 disputes, defended 30, boasting 68% win rate.⁶²

Case Study 1: DS456 – India – Solar Cells and Modules (2014-2016). U.S. contested Jawaharlal Nehru National Solar Mission’s local content requirements as GATT Art. III violations (national treatment).⁶³ India invoked Art. XVIII:B (governmental assistance for development) and GATS Art. XIV (public morals exception for renewables).⁶⁴ Panel (2015) ruled against, but Appellate Body (2016) reversed, affirming flexibilities for sustainable development—preserving \$10 billion solar investments.⁶⁵ Implications: Bolstered Article 48A (environmental protection); aligned with Make in India, redefining sovereignty as green autonomy.⁶⁶

Case Study 2: DS436 – U.S. – Countervailing Duties on Indian Hot-Rolled Steel (2014). India challenged U.S. duties on “specificity” grounds (SCM Agreement Art. 2).⁶⁷ Victory (2015) invalidated measures, recovering \$300 million exports; lesson: Empirical evidence trumps protectionism, enhancing negotiating leverage.⁶⁸ Ties to solar: U.S. retaliation context underscores tit-for-tat risks.

Case Study 3: DS582 – India – Tariff Treatment on ICT Goods (2019-2023). EU/U.S. alleged 100-150% duties on mobiles exceed bound rates (ITA commitments).⁶⁹ Panel (2023) confirmed breaches, urging compliance; India appealed amid AB crisis, opting for multi-party arbitration.⁷⁰ Sovereignty strain: Binds hands on “Make in India” electronics, clashing Article 19(1)(g) (occupation freedom).⁷¹ As of 2025, consultations ongoing, with EU’s November 2024 escalation.⁷²

Case Study 4: DS580 – Australia – Chillies Import Measures (2020-ongoing). Parallels sugar subsidies; Australia challenges phytosanitary barriers.⁷³ India defends via SPS Agreement Art. 5.6 (least trade-restrictive), linking to food security.⁷⁴ Echoes 2020 protests, where farm laws (repealed 2021) were critiqued as WTO-compliant yet unconstitutional.⁷⁵

Broader: India’s 2025 Trade Policy Review lauds diversification (services exports \$340 billion) but critiques plurilaterals excluding development.⁷⁶ CFR notes veto on e-commerce moratorium extension, guarding digital sovereignty.⁷⁷ Stats: 80% rice subsidies “illegal” per AoA, yet peace clause (MC12, 2022) provides interim shield.⁷⁸ Judicially, *Union of India v. Azadi Bachao Andolan* (2003) upholds treaty precedence, but *Monsanto v. Union of India* (2021) mandates parliamentary scrutiny.⁷⁹

These cases affirm hypothesis: Legal victories (17/25) negotiate autonomy, though asymmetries persist—developing nations file 20% disputes but win 60%.⁸⁰

(Timeline table:	Dispute		Year		Outcome		Sovereignty	Impact
DS456		2016		Win		Renewables	flex	
DS582		2023		Loss		Tariff bindings)		

7. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS (FTAs) AND CONFLICTS WITH INDIAN LAWS

FTAs, “WTO-plus,” deepen liberalization bilaterally. India’s 14 active (e.g., UAE CEPA, 2022: \$85 billion trade boost) and negotiations (UK, EU, 2025) amplify commitments.⁸¹ Challenges: Investment chapters enable ISDS, bypassing courts; services liberalization erodes labor protections.⁸²

Case: India-UAE CEPA (2022). Chapter 4 (services) eases visas but risks wage undercutting; Chapter 8 (investment) mandates fair treatment, clashing FEMA 1999’s capital controls.⁸³ Benefits: 10% tariff cuts on gems; conflicts: No environmental side-letter, pressuring Article 48A.⁸⁴

Case: India-Australia ECTA (2022). Tariff reductions (e.g., 0% on kangaroo meat) aid exports (\$26 billion bilateral), but IP Chapter 17 hikes standards, threatening Section 3(d) evergreening bans—impacting \$15 billion generics market.⁸⁵ Labor mobility annexes strain MGNREGA equity.⁸⁶

Ongoing: India-UK FTA (2025 Negotiations). Stalled over visas/IPR; UK’s “digital chapter” prohibits data localization, voiding DPDP Section 16—risking £10 billion AI data breaches.⁸⁷ Hindu (2025) warns of “digital colonialism,” urging UNCITRAL carve-outs.⁸⁸ ILSI brief (2024) flags agri ratchets echoing WTO, recommending Article 253 overrides.⁸⁹

India-EFTA (2024). Investment court (US\$100 billion pledge) introduces ISDS, conflicting sovereign immunity; sustainability chapter mitigates but lacks enforceability.⁹⁰

Comparative: EU-India talks embed CBAM (carbon tariffs), pressuring coal phase-out vs. energy security.⁹¹ Legal fixes: Ratification via Finance Act, judicial review per *AAA v. Union* (2023).⁹² Digital risks: UNCITRAL WGIV (2025) proposes cross-border flows with safeguards.⁹³

FTAs thus intensify WTO tensions, demanding “FTA-minus” opt-outs for sovereignty.⁹⁴

(Clause breakdown:	FTA Provision		Indian Law		Conflict		Resolution
Data Flows		DPDP S.16		Localization ban		Carve-out	

8. BALANCING SOVEREIGNTY: PATHWAYS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Reconciling tensions requires multifaceted strategies:

1. **Institutional Fortification:** Bolster WTO/FTA negotiation cadre (e.g., emulate USTR’s 500 lawyers); NITI Aayog-led impact assessments mandatory pre-signature.⁹⁵
2. **Constitutional Safeguards:** Amend Article 253 for trade-specific clauses; Supreme Court guidelines on treaty constitutionality, per Basu (2020).⁹⁶
3. **Diplomatic Maneuvers:** Plurilateral opt-outs (e.g., 2024 MC13 fisheries); bilateral “sunset clauses” for review.⁹⁷
4. **Digital/Legal Innovations:** Pre-FTA IT Act amendments for data sovereignty; UNCITRAL-inspired model clauses.⁹⁸

Brazil’s Mercosur flexes illustrate efficacy.⁹⁹ Hypothesis validated: RCEP exit (2019) preserved agri autonomy, yielding 5% GDP trade gains elsewhere.¹⁰⁰

9. CONCLUSION

Globalization reconfigures Indian sovereignty into a resilient, adaptive form—challenged by WTO/FTA rigors yet fortified through astute legal navigation. Cases like DS456 evince “negotiated autonomy,” where concessions yield amplified voice, as in G20 advocacy for Global South.¹⁰¹ Conflicts persist—subsidy caps vs. welfarism, data flows vs. privacy—but reforms like enhanced oversight promise equilibrium.¹⁰² Optimistically, India’s 2025 WTO review positions it as reform leader, harmonizing borders without boundary loss.¹⁰³

10. REFERENCES

- Council on Foreign Relations. “How India Disrupts and Navigates the WTO.” March 2025.
- Kumar, Rajesh. “Impact of Globalization on Sovereignty: With Special Reference to India.” Shodhganga@INFLIBNET, 2019.
- The Hindu. “What has been missed is India’s digital sovereignty.” January 15, 2025.
- World Trade Organization. “Managing the Challenges of WTO Participation: 45 Case Studies.” WTO Secretariat, 2010 (updated 2024).
- Additional sources per footnotes

11. END NOTES

1. Friedman, Thomas L. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005, 10-15.
2. Krasner, Stephen D. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999, 3-5.
3. Rodrik, Dani. *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011, 200-205.
4. World Trade Organization. "India and the WTO." Accessed November 20, 2025. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/countries_e/india_e.htm (India acceded January 1, 1995; GATT contracting party since July 8, 1948).
5. World Bank. "India Economic Update: Navigating Global Headwinds." October 2025, 5-7.
6. Constitution of India, art. 21; WTO Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), Annex 2 (Green Box).
7. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India. "India's Free Trade Agreements: Status Report 2025." New Delhi: Government Press, 2025, 12-15.
8. Analogy adapted from Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984, 89-92.
9. WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), art. 27; Patents Act, 1970 (India), § 84 (compulsory licensing).
10. Deshpande, Rajesh. "Farmers' Protests and Global Trade Pressures." *Economic & Political Weekly* 55, no. 48 (2020): 12-15.
11. The Hindu. "What Has Been Missed Is India's Digital Sovereignty." January 15, 2025, sec. Opinion.
12. Constitution of India, art. 51.
13. Panagariya, Arvind. *India: The Emerging Giant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, 20-25.
14. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, "India's Free Trade Agreements," 2025, 18.
15. European Commission. "EU Challenges India's ICT Tariffs at WTO." Press Release, June 2024.
16. Baldwin, Richard. *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016, 45-50.
17. Ambedkar, B.R. *Constituent Assembly Debates*, vol. VII (November 4, 1948), 953.
18. Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 427-460.
19. National Food Security Act, 2013 (India); Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (India), § 16.

20. WTO Dispute Settlement Body, DS456 Report (2016).
21. Booth, Wayne C., et al. *The Craft of Research*. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016, 80-85.
22. Constitution of India, art. 253; UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996, amended 2024).
23. Hypothesis inspired by Krasner, *Sovereignty*, 1999, 10-15.
24. Press Trust of India. "India Withdraws from RCEP Negotiations." November 4, 2019; WTO DS456 Appellate Body Report, para. 5.1.
25. Popper, Karl. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Routledge, 1959, 40-45.
26. Hart, Chris. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Research Imagination*. 2nd ed. London: Sage, 2018, 1-10.
27. Krasner, *Sovereignty*, 1999, 24-28.
28. Bhagwati, Jagdish. *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 45-67.
29. Slaughter, Anne-Marie. *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004, 12-15.
30. Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995, 23-30.
31. Held, David. *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus*. Cambridge: Polity, 2004, 150-155; Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 10-12.
32. Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002, 53-55.
33. Rodrik, *The Globalization Paradox*, 2011, 200-205.
34. Kumar, Arun, et al. "Sovereignty in a Globalized World: Challenges to National Governance in India." *Journal of International Affairs* 76, no. 1 (2022): 45-60.
35. *Ibid.*, 55-58.
36. Kumar, Rajesh. "Impact of Globalization on Sovereignty: With Special Reference to India." PhD diss., Shodhganga@INFLIBNET, 2019, 120-130.
37. *Gramophone Co. of India Ltd. v. Birendra Bahadur Pandey*, AIR 1984 SC 667.
38. "The Impact of Globalisation on the National Sovereignty." *International Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research* 6, no. 2 (2024): 112-130, 125.
39. Institute for Legal and Strategic Initiatives. "Unlocking Economic Potential or Losing National Sovereignty? The India-UK Free Trade Agreement Negotiations." Policy Brief, 2024, 10-15.
40. *Ibid.*, 20.
41. The Hindu, January 15, 2025.
42. Council on Foreign Relations. "How India Disrupts and Navigates the WTO." March 2025, 8-12.
43. *Ibid.*, 15.
44. World Trade Organization. *Managing the Challenges of WTO Participation: 45 Case Studies*. Geneva: WTO Secretariat, 2010 (updated 2024), 200-210.

45. Strange, Susan. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 50-55.
46. Crawford, James. *The Creation of States in International Law*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, 32.
47. Constitution of India, Preamble.
48. *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
49. Friedman, *The World Is Flat*, 2005, 5-10.
50. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, opened for signature May 23, 1969, 1155 U.N.T.S. 331, art. 26.
51. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). “Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration” (1985).
52. Constitution of India, art. 253.
53. General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994, art. I; TRIPS Agreement, art. 27.
54. Constitution of India, arts. 38-39; WTO AoA, Annex 2.
55. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (India), § 8.
56. India’s Nuclear Doctrine, January 4, 2003.
57. Krasner, *Sovereignty*, 1999, 10.
58. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics,” 1988, 427-460.
59. Abbott, Kenneth W., et al. *International Law and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 400-410.
60. WTO, “India and the WTO,” 2025.
61. WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM), art. 2; TRIPS, art. 27.
62. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, “India’s WTO Dispute Record,” 2024.
63. WTO DS456 Panel Report, WT/DS456/R (2015), para. 7.1.
64. GATT 1994, art. XVIII:B; General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), art. XIV.
65. WTO Appellate Body Report, WT/DS456/AB/R (2016), para. 5.2.
66. Constitution of India, art. 48A; Make in India Initiative, September 25, 2014.
67. WTO DS436 Panel Report, WT/DS436/R (2014), para. 8.1.
68. *Ibid.*, para. 8.10.
69. WTO DS582 Panel Report, WT/DS582/R (2023), para. 7.50.
70. *Ibid.*, para. 8.1.
71. Constitution of India, art. 19(1)(g).
72. European Commission, “EU Escalates WTO Dispute with India,” November 2024.
73. WTO DS580 Notification, WT/DS580/1 (2020).
74. Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), art. 5.6.
75. Deshpande, “Farmers’ Protests,” 2020.
76. WTO Trade Policy Review: India, October 2025, WT/TPR/S/456.
77. Council on Foreign Relations, “How India Disrupts,” 2025, 18.
78. WTO Ministerial Conference (MC12), June 2022, para. 3.
79. *Union of India v. Azadi Bachao Andolan*, (2003) 7 SCC 1; *Monsanto Holdings Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2021) SCC OnLine Del 1234.

80. WTO Dispute Settlement Statistics, 2024.
81. Ministry of Commerce, “India’s FTAs,” 2025, 22.
82. India-UAE Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA), 2022, ch. 8.
83. Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA), 1999 (India).
84. Constitution of India, art. 48A.
85. India-Australia Economic Cooperation and Trade Agreement (ECTA), 2022, ch. 17.
86. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), 2005 (India).
87. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, § 16.
88. The Hindu, January 15, 2025.
89. Institute for Legal and Strategic Initiatives, “Unlocking Economic Potential,” 2024, 25.
90. India-EFTA Trade and Economic Partnership Agreement, March 2024, ch. 10.
91. European Union Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), Regulation (EU) 2023/956.
92. *AAA v. Union of India*, (2023) SCC OnLine SC 456.
93. UNCITRAL Working Group IV, 58th Session, March 2025.
94. Rodrik, *The Globalization Paradox*, 2011, 210.
95. National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog. “Guidelines for FTA Impact Assessment,” 2024.
96. Basu, Durga Das. *Introduction to the Constitution of India*. 26th ed. Lucknow: Eastern Book Company, 2020, 300-305.
97. WTO Ministerial Conference (MC13), February 2024, para. 5.
98. Information Technology Act, 2000 (India), as amended 2023.
99. Mercosur Treaty, 1991, art. 40 (opt-out provisions).
100. Kumar, “Impact of Globalization,” 2019, 180.
101. G20 New Delhi Leaders’ Declaration, September 9, 2023, para. 20.
102. Rodrik, *The Globalization Paradox*, 2011, 250.
103. WTO Trade Policy Review: India, 2025, executive summary.