International Journal of Human and Society (IJHS)

E-ISSN: 2710-4966	P-ISSN: 2710-4958
Vol. 4. No. 03 (Jul-Sep) 2024	Page 897-904

Data As Trade Currency: Reconciling Cross-Border Data Flows With National Sovereignty

Muhammed Islahuddin — Assistant Professor Law & Shariah University of Swat, Swatiadvocate@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article examines data's transformation into a trade currency and the legal tensions between cross-border data flows and national sovereignty. Using doctrinal and comparative analysis, it evaluates regulatory models and trade frameworks, finding that harmonized standards and cooperative governance can balance economic integration with sovereignty, privacy, and security concerns. The rapid expansion of the digital economy has transformed data into a critical economic asset, often referred to as "data as trade currency." While cross-border data flows fuel innovation, trade, and economic growth, they simultaneously challenge traditional notions of national sovereignty, privacy, and security. This research examines the legal, economic, and regulatory dimensions of cross-border data governance, highlighting the tensions between facilitating international data exchange and protecting national interests. By analysing existing international frameworks, domestic data localization laws, and emerging trade agreements, the study seeks to identify pathways for reconciling these competing imperatives.*

Keywords: Digital economy; Transnational information exchange; Data governance; Regulatory fragmentation; Digital trade law; State control; Privacy protection; Cybersecurity; International economic integration

Introduction

The exponential growth of the digital economy has fundamentally altered the nature of global trade, positioning information as a central driver of economic value creation. Data now underpins e-commerce, financial services, artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and digital platforms, enabling firms and states to participate in transnational markets with unprecedented speed and scale. In this evolving landscape, data functions not merely as a by-product of economic activity but as a strategic asset that facilitates and accelerates trade across borders. At the same time, states increasingly perceive cross-border data flows as implicating core sovereign interests, including regulatory autonomy, national security, and the protection of fundamental rights. The purpose of this article is to examine the legal and policy tension between the economic imperative for unhindered cross-border data flows and the sovereign right of states to regulate data generated within their jurisdictions. The study situates this tension within the broader context of digital trade governance, where traditional concepts of territoriality and sovereignty are challenged by the intangible, non-rivalrous, and easily transferable nature of data (Khan & Ullah, 2024). As states adopt divergent regulatory approaches ranging from liberal data-flow regimes to strict data localization and access controls the absence of a coherent global framework has resulted in regulatory fragmentation with significant implications for international trade and global economic integration. This research proceeds on the hypothesis that the perceived conflict between cross-border data flows and national sovereignty is not irreconcilable. Rather, it argues that sovereignty in the digital age is increasingly exercised through regulatory cooperation and standard-setting rather than absolute territorial control (Chen, 2021; Khan, 2024). The central research questions guiding this study are: to what extent can data be treated as a tradable economic resource without undermining state sovereignty, and what legal mechanisms can reconcile economic integration with legitimate public policy objectives such as privacy, security, and regulatory autonomy?

Methodologically, the article adopts a doctrinal and comparative legal approach. It analyses international trade agreements, soft-law instruments, and domestic data governance regimes to assess how different legal systems address cross-border data flows. Comparative references to major regulatory models, including those of the European Union, the United States, and selected Asian jurisdictions, are employed to illustrate competing approaches and emerging patterns. The study finds that while unilateral data localization measures may strengthen symbolic assertions of sovereignty, they often generate economic inefficiencies and legal uncertainty (Khan, 2024). Conversely, cooperative frameworks based on interoperability, mutual recognition, and conditional data mobility offer a more sustainable balance between trade facilitation and sovereign control. Structurally, this article is organized into six sections. Following this introduction, the second section conceptualizes data as an economic and regulatory resource within digital trade. The third section examines the relationship between cross-border data flows and national sovereignty. The fourth section analyses existing international and regional governance frameworks. The fifth section discusses pathways for reconciling trade liberalization with sovereign interests. The final section concludes by highlighting policy implications and directions for future research (Khan & Jiliani, 2023). The global digital ecosystem thrives on the seamless movement of data. Corporations, governments, and individuals increasingly rely on transnational data flows to drive economic activity, optimize services, and foster innovation. In this context, data is emerging as a strategic asset comparable to traditional commodities in international trade. However, this evolution poses a fundamental challenge: reconciling the economic benefits of cross-border data flows with states' sovereign interests in controlling and protecting their citizens' information. National regulations emphasizing data localization, privacy, and cybersecurity often conflict with the free flow of data necessary for global commerce (Chin & Zhao, 2022). This tension raises critical questions: How can data function as a trade currency while respecting national sovereignty? What legal and regulatory frameworks are necessary to balance these interests?

2.Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative comparative legal research methodology to investigate the relationship between cross-border data flows and national sovereignty. Primary sources, including international trade agreements, domestic data protection laws, and policy instruments, are systematically analysed to identify prevailing legal principles and regulatory approaches. Secondary sources such as scholarly articles, reports of international organizations, and policy analyses are reviewed to contextualize and critically assess these frameworks. Comparative analysis is employed to examine differing regulatory models across selected jurisdictions, enabling an evaluation of convergences and divergences in data governance. This methodological approach is selected to provide a coherent legal understanding of the research problem and to support normative conclusions regarding the reconciliation of data-driven trade with sovereign regulatory interests (Khan & Usman, 2023).

3.Conceptual Framework: Data as Trade Currency

The conceptualization of data as a trade currency reflects a fundamental shift in how economic value is created and exchanged in the digital economy. Unlike traditional commodities, data is intangible, non-rivalrous, and capable of being replicated at negligible cost. Yet, despite these unique characteristics, data performs functions analogous to money and goods in international trade by enabling transactions, facilitating market access, and generating competitive advantage. This framework treats data not merely as information, but as an economic resource that underpins production, exchange, and consumption in digital markets. Data operates as a trade currency in three interrelated ways. First, it functions as an input in digital production processes. Businesses rely on cross-border data flows to optimize supply chains, personalize services, train artificial intelligence systems, and engage in data-driven decision-making. In this sense, data serves as a productive asset comparable to raw materials or capital in traditional trade (Khan et al., 2023). Second, data acts as a medium of exchange in digital markets. Many digital services are offered without direct monetary payment, with users instead "paying" through the provision of personal or behavioural data. This transactional role reinforces the notion of data as a currency, where value is extracted, traded, and monetized across borders, often beyond the awareness of data subjects. Third, data constitutes a store of value, as accumulated datasets enhance long-term economic power and market dominance. States and corporations that control large volumes of data can leverage it for economic growth, technological leadership, and geopolitical influence. This dimension underscores why data governance has become a strategic concern closely linked to national competitiveness and sovereignty (Yakovleva, 2024; Khan, 2023).

From a trade law perspective, treating data as a trade currency challenges conventional regulatory frameworks that were designed for tangible goods and clearly defined services. Data flows do not fit neatly within existing categories of trade regulation, raising questions about ownership, control, and jurisdiction. As a result, states seek to assert authority over data through regulatory measures such as localization requirements, transfer restrictions, and access controls, framing data governance as an extension of sovereign power. This conceptual framework highlights the dual nature of data: as a driver of economic integration and as an object of sovereign regulation. Understanding data as a trade currency provides a foundation for analysing the legal tensions explored in this article and supports the argument that effective governance must balance economic utility with public interest considerations such as privacy, security, and regulatory autonomy (Mercurio & Yu, 2022; Liu et al., 2023).

4. Cross-Border Data Flows and National Sovereignty

Cross-border data flows lie at the core of the global digital economy, enabling international trade in services, real-time communication, and transnational business operations. However, the unrestricted movement of data across jurisdictions poses significant challenges to the traditional understanding of national sovereignty, which has historically been grounded in territorial control and exclusive regulatory authority. In the digital context, data routinely transcends physical borders, complicating states' ability to exercise effective oversight and protection over information linked to their citizens, institutions, and strategic interests. National sovereignty in relation to data governance is increasingly expressed through regulatory control rather than physical territoriality (Khan & Ximei, 2022). States seek to assert authority over data through domestic legislation governing collection, storage, processing, and transfer. Measures such as data localization requirements, transfer approval mechanisms, and mandatory government access provisions reflect attempts to retain control over economically and politically sensitive data. While these measures are often justified on grounds of national security, public order, or privacy protection, they can conflict with the economic logic of seamless cross-border data flows that underpin digital trade. Data localization policies, in particular, illustrate the sovereignty–trade tension. By requiring certain categories of data to be stored or processed domestically, states aim to reduce foreign dependence and enhance regulatory enforcement. Yet such policies may increase compliance costs, fragment digital markets, and limit participation in global value chains. For multinational enterprises and digital service providers, inconsistent localization rules create legal uncertainty and undermine the efficiency of cross-border operations (Li, 2022; Khan et al., 2022).

Another dimension of sovereignty arises from the extraterritorial application of domestic data laws. Regulations that impose obligations on foreign entities handling a state's data, regardless of location, expand sovereign influence beyond national borders. While this approach strengthens regulatory protection for individuals and national interests, it may generate jurisdictional conflicts and raise concerns about overlapping or contradictory legal obligations. National security considerations further complicate the relationship between data flows and sovereignty. Governments increasingly view data as a strategic asset, the exposure of which may threaten critical infrastructure, electoral processes, or defence capabilities. As a result, restrictions on cross-border data transfers are often framed as necessary safeguards against espionage, cyber threats, and foreign interference. This section demonstrates that cross-border data flows do not erode sovereignty per se, but rather transform its exercise. Sovereignty in the digital age is no longer defined solely by control over territory, but by the capacity to regulate, cooperate, and negotiate within interconnected data ecosystems. The challenge for states lies in designing governance frameworks that protect sovereign interests without unduly constraining the economic and social benefits derived from global data exchange (Cao, et al., 2022; Lin & Khan, 2021).

5.International Regulatory Landscape

The international regulatory landscape governing cross-border data flows remains fragmented and evolving, shaped by a mix of binding trade agreements, regional frameworks, and non-binding soft-law instruments. Unlike traditional trade in goods and services, data flows are not comprehensively regulated under a single multilateral regime, resulting in divergent national approaches and overlapping regulatory standards. This regulatory diversity reflects differing state priorities regarding economic openness, privacy protection, and national security, complicating efforts to reconcile data-driven trade with national sovereignty. At the multilateral level, the World Trade Organization WTO provides only limited guidance on cross-border data flows. Existing agreements such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services GATS were drafted before the emergence of the modern digital economy and do not explicitly address data governance. While ongoing negotiations on e-commerce aim to fill this gap, progress remains slow, and consensus on binding rules governing data transfers has yet to be achieved. Consequently, states increasingly rely on bilateral and regional trade agreements to regulate digital trade. Regional and bilateral trade agreements have emerged as key instruments for shaping data governance norms. Agreements such as the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership CPTPP, the United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement USMCA, and the EU–Japan Economic Partnership Agreement include provisions promoting the free flow of data across borders while allowing exceptions for legitimate public policy objectives, including privacy and security. These agreements attempt to strike a balance between economic integration and regulatory autonomy by recognizing states' rights to adopt protective measures, provided they are not arbitrary or disguised trade restrictions (Barrett, 2022; Khan, 2022).

Beyond trade agreements, international organizations have played an important role in developing normative guidance. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD has issued recommendations emphasizing interoperability, trust, and accountability in data governance. Similarly, the Group of Twenty G20 has endorsed principles supporting data free flow with trust, highlighting the need to combine economic openness with robust safeguards. While influential, these instruments remain non-binding and rely on voluntary adoption by states. Soft-law mechanisms further complement formal agreements. Frameworks such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation APEC Cross-Border Privacy Rules CBPR system promote regional interoperability by facilitating data transfers among participating economies that meet agreed privacy standards (Khan et al., 2021). These mechanisms aim to reduce regulatory fragmentation while respecting domestic legal differences. Despite these developments, the absence of a universally binding global framework continues to pose challenges. Divergent regulatory models, varying enforcement capacities, and competing sovereignty claims create uncertainty for states and market actors alike. The international regulatory landscape thus reflects an ongoing struggle to balance the economic value of cross-border data flows with the preservation of national sovereignty, underscoring the need for greater coherence and cooperation in global data governance (Burns, et al., 2022; Khan & Wu, 2021).

6. Reconciling Data Flows with Sovereignty

Reconciling cross-border data flows with national sovereignty requires a shift from rigid, territorially anchored regulation toward cooperative and adaptive governance models. The perceived conflict between economic openness and sovereign control is not inherent but arises from fragmented legal frameworks and unilateral regulatory responses. A balanced approach recognizes that sovereignty in the digital era is exercised not through absolute data confinement, but through the ability of states to shape, influence, and participate in transnational regulatory arrangements. One key pathway toward reconciliation is regulatory interoperability (Abdelrehim Hammad et al., 2021; Kahn et al., 2020). Rather than imposing uniform global standards, states can develop mechanisms that allow different legal systems to interact coherently. Mutual recognition of data protection regimes, adequacy determinations, and standardized contractual safeguards enable lawful data transfers while preserving domestic regulatory objectives. Such approaches respect national differences while reducing compliance burdens and legal uncertainty in international trade. Another important mechanism is the use of conditional data mobility**.** Under this model, cross-border data flows are permitted subject to compliance with predefined safeguards related to privacy, cybersecurity, and accountability. This approach allows states to maintain oversight and enforcement capacity without resorting to blanket localization measures. Conditional mobility aligns economic efficiency with public interest protections and reflects a more nuanced exercise of sovereignty (Hummel, et al., 2021; Usman et al., 2021).

Multilateral and plurilateral cooperation also play a central role in reconciling data flows with sovereign interests. Expanding existing forums such as the WTO e-commerce negotiations, OECD initiatives, or G20 processes can facilitate the development of shared principles and minimum standards for data governance. While binding global rules may be difficult to achieve, incremental convergence through shared norms can reduce fragmentation and build trust among states (Khan et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2020). Public–private collaboration further contributes to effective reconciliation. Given the central role of private actors in generating and managing cross-border data, regulatory frameworks that incorporate industry expertise can enhance compliance and innovation. Regulatory sandboxes and co-regulatory models allow governments to test data governance solutions in controlled environments while maintaining sovereign oversight. Ultimately, reconciling data flows with sovereignty requires reimagining sovereignty itself. In an interconnected digital economy, sovereignty is increasingly relational and cooperative, exercised through participation in global governance rather than isolation. By adopting flexible, interoperable, and trust-based regulatory approaches, states can protect legitimate sovereign interests while enabling the economic and social benefits of cross-border data flows (Catanzariti, 2024; Khan & Wu, 2021).

7.Conclusion

This research underscores the growing importance of data as a foundational element of the global digital economy and as a central facilitator of international trade. By conceptualizing data as a trade currency, the article demonstrates that cross-border data flows are no longer peripheral technical issues but core legal and policy concerns with significant implications for economic integration, regulatory autonomy, and state sovereignty. The analysis reveals that attempts to assert absolute sovereign control over data through restrictive or localization-centric measures often undermine the very economic benefits that data-driven trade promises to deliver. The study's key contribution lies in highlighting that sovereignty and cross-border data flows need not be mutually exclusive. Sovereignty in the digital age is increasingly exercised through regulatory capacity, cooperation, and norm-setting rather than strict territorial confinement. Interoperable legal frameworks, conditional data mobility, and multilateral cooperation emerge as viable mechanisms for balancing trade facilitation with legitimate public interests such as privacy, cybersecurity, and national security. These findings are particularly relevant for policymakers, regulators, businesses, and scholars seeking sustainable models of digital governance in an interconnected world. From a policy perspective, the article suggests that states should move beyond unilateral and defensive regulatory strategies toward cooperative approaches that emphasize trust, transparency, and accountability. Strengthening participation in international and regional data governance initiatives can help reduce regulatory fragmentation and enhance legal certainty for cross-border economic activity. For developing and emerging economies, in particular, calibrated data governance frameworks can support digital inclusion while safeguarding sovereign interests.

Future research may build upon this study by examining the implications of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and decentralized data architectures on cross-border data governance and sovereignty. Empirical research assessing the economic and social impacts of data localization measures across different jurisdictions would further enrich the debate. Additionally, exploring the role of global south perspectives in shaping international data norms represents a critical avenue for ensuring more inclusive and equitable digital governance frameworks. Data has unequivocally emerged as a critical trade currency in the digital era. While cross-border data flows drive economic growth, innovation, and global trade, they also challenge traditional notions of national sovereignty, privacy, and security. Reconciling these interests requires an integrated approach: harmonizing regulatory standards, fostering international cooperation, and adopting innovative governance mechanisms. Only through such measures can states preserve sovereignty while enabling data-driven trade to flourish.

References

Abdelrehim Hammad, A. A., Khan, A., & Soomro, N. E. (2021). Digital Economy Barriers to Trade Regulation Status, Challenges, and China's Response. *International Journal of Social Sciences Perspectives*, *8*(2), 41-49.

Barrett, J. S. (2022). Global Regulatory Landscape. *Fundamentals of Drug Development*, 61.

Burns, L., Le Roux, N., Kalesnik-Orszulak, R., Christian, J., Hukkelhoven, M., Rockhold, F., & O'Donnell, J. (2022). Real-world evidence for regulatory decision-making: guidance from around the world. *Clinical Therapeutics*, *44*(3), 420-437.

Cao, S., Boyen, X., Deane, F., Miller, T., & Foth, M. (2022). Enabling cross-border trade in the face of regulatory barriers to data flow–the case of the blockchain-based service network. In *Blockchain for Industry 4.0* (pp. 285-303). CRC Press.

Catanzariti, M. (2024). *Disconnecting sovereignty: how data fragmentation reshapes the law* (Vol. 65). Springer Nature.

Chen, S. (2021). Research on data sovereignty rules in cross-border data flow and Chinese solution. *US-China L. Rev.*, *18*, 261.

Chin, Y. C., & Zhao, J. (2022). Governing cross-border data flows: International trade agreements and their limits. *Laws*, *11*(4), 63.

Hummel, P., Braun, M., Tretter, M., & Dabrock, P. (2021). Data sovereignty: A review. *Big Data & Society*, *8*(1), 2053951720982012.

Kahn, A., & Wu, X. (2020). Impact of digital economy on intellectual property law. *J. Pol. & L.*, *13*, 117.

Khan, A. (2022). E-commerce Regulations in Emerging Era: The Role of WTO for Resolving the Complexities of Electronic Trade. *ASR Chiang Mai University Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanities*.

Khan, A. (2023). Rules on Digital Trade in the Light of WTO Agreements. *PhD Law Dissertation, School of Law, Zhengzhou University China*.

Khan, A. (2024). The Emergence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and its Impact on International Trade. *ASR: CMU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (2024) Vol*, *11*.

Khan, A. (2024). The intersection of artificial intelligence and international trade laws: Challenges and opportunities. *IIUMLJ*, *32*, 103.

Khan, A., & Jiliani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding The Boundaries Of Jurisprudence In The Era Of Technological Advancements. *IIUMLJ*, *31*, 393.

Khan, A., & Ullah, M. (2024). The Pakistan-China FTA: legal challenges and solutions for marine environmental protection. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *11*, 1478669.

Khan, A., & Usman, M. (2023). The effectiveness of international law: a comparative analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 780-786.

Khan, A., & Wu, X. (2021). Bridging the Digital Divide in the Digital Economy with Reference to Intellectual Property. *Journal of Law and Political Sciences*, *28*(03), 256-263.

Khan, A., & Wu, X. (2021). Reforms for culmination of the deadlock in appellate body of WTO: An agenda of saving the multilateral trading system. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, *2*(1), 50-62.

Khan, A., & Ximei, W. (2022). Digital economy and environmental sustainability: do information communication and technology (ICT) and economic complexity matter?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *19*(19), 12301.

Khan, A., Abd Elrhim, A. A., & Soomro, N. E. (2021). China Perspective in Reforming of the World Trade Organization. *J. Pol. & L.*, *14*, 104.

Khan, A., Amjad, S., & Usman, M. (2020). The Role of Customary International Law in Contemporary International Relations. *International Review of Social Sciences*, *8*(08), 259-265.

Khan, A., Jillani, M. A. H. S., Abdelrehim Hammad, A. A., & Soomro, N. E. H. (2021). Plurilateral negotiation of WTO E-commerce in the context of digital economy: Recent issues and developments. *Journal of Law and Political Sciences*.

Khan, A., Usman, M., & Amjad, S. (2023). The digital age legal revolution: taped's trailblazing influence. *International journal of contemporary issues in social sciences*, *2*(4), 524-535.

Khan, M. I., Usman, M., Kanwel, S., & Khan, A. (2022). Digital renaissance: Navigating the intersection of the digital economy and WTO in the 21st century global trade landscape. *Asian Social Studies and Applied Research (ASSAR)*, *3*(2), 496-505.

Li, S. (2022). Towards digital money interoperability: Data governance coordination for cross-border payments. *Hous. J. Int'l L.*, *45*, 107.

Lin, S., & Khan, A. (2021). The Concept of E-sports in Digital Era: A Case Study of China.

Liu, X., Khan, M., & Khan, A. (2023). The Law and Practice of Global ICT Standardization by Olia Kanevskaia [CUP, Cambridge, 2023, xxvi+ 361pp, ISBN: 978-1-0093-00575,£ 95.00 (h/bk)]. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, *72*(4), 1094-1097.

Mercurio, B., & Yu, R. (2022). *Regulating Cross-Border Data Flows: Issues, Challenges and Impact*. Anthem Press.

Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D., Khan, A. S. I. F., & Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L. (2021). State Responsibility and International Law: Bridging the Gap.

Yakovleva, S. (2024). *Governing cross-border data flows: Reconciling EU data protection and international trade law*. Oxford University Press.