JOURNAL OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE
ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 2, Issue 2, No. 1 / June 2024
https://www.jopd.com.ng

EXAMINING THE BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GLOBAL NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE USING THE WORLD SYSTEMS THEORY

Fatima Mohammed Alkali
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State. Nigeria.
Email: alkali_fatima@ibbu.edu.ng
Phone: +2347059353388, 08132241188

Abstract
This study examines the concept of unequal bilateral relationships between the center (North) and the periphery (South) using world system theory as a framework for analysis. The paper provides a historical and theoretical background of world system theory, including its core-periphery model, and explores its relevance in understanding the dynamics of these relationships. By examining specific cases such as the relationships between the USA and Latin America, China and Africa, and the European Union and Eastern Europe, the paper highlights the drivers and mechanisms of inequality in these relationships, such as power imbalances, economic structures, and historical legacies. The study also identifies challenges and opportunities for addressing inequality in these relationships and explores alternative approaches and strategies for equitable partnerships, including mutual benefit, technology transfer, and capacity building. In conclusion, the paper argues that addressing the inequalities in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery is crucial for achieving global development goals and promoting shared prosperity. Through continued research, dialogue, and action, the paper suggests that more just and equitable partnerships can be developed between the center and periphery, leading to more sustainable and equitable development outcomes. The study contributes to the existing literature by offering a comprehensive analysis of the systemic factors that perpetuate inequality and proposing actionable solutions to foster more balanced and mutually beneficial international relations.

Keywords: world system theory, core-periphery model, bilateral relationships, inequality, global development

Background

The global political economy has been shaped by centuries of historical and systemic inequalities, which have resulted in the perpetuation of a power hierarchy between the center (North) and the peripheries (South). This unequal distribution of power and resources is particularly evident in bilateral relationships between countries, where the center exerts its economic and political dominance over the peripheries. The study of this inequality, using world system theory, offers a critical lens through which to understand the dynamics of global economic relationships and the persistence of the North-South divide. World system theory argues that the global political economy can be understood as a hierarchical system, with a core of dominant nations at the center and a periphery of exploited nations at the margins. The core nations, which are typically wealthy and industrialized, exert economic and political control over the peripheries, which are often resource-rich but economically dependent. This system has been shaped by centuries of colonization, imperialism, and economic exploitation, and it perpetuates a global power structure that reinforces the North-South divide. In the context of bilateral relationships, world system theory provides a framework for understanding how the center-periphery dichotomy plays out in practice. Bilateral relationships between developed and developing nations are often characterized by

unequal power dynamics, with the center using its economic and political influence to extract resources and labor from the periphery.

This often results in the exploitation and marginalization of the periphery, which is unable to fully benefit from its own resources and labor. The study of this inequality is of critical importance in our increasingly globalized world. Understanding the drivers and mechanisms of inequality in bilateral relationships can inform policy decisions and help promote fairer and more equitable economic relationships between nations. It can also empower marginalized communities and promote global justice, challenging the dominant narratives that perpetuate the North-South divide. By using world system theory to explore the inequality between the center and the peripheries in bilateral relationships, we can contribute to a more nuanced and critical understanding of the global political economy and work towards a more equitable and just world.

Statement of Problem

The global North-South divide continues to be marked by persistent inequalities in bilateral relationships between the center and peripheries. Despite numerous efforts aimed at promoting equitable partnerships and development, the gap between the center and peripheries remains substantial, with the former holding more power, influence, and wealth, while the latter struggle to achieve socio-economic progress. The problem addressed in this seminar paper is the structural and systemic factors that perpetuate the inequality between the center and peripheries in bilateral relationships, and the use of world system theory to explain this phenomenon. The global capitalist system, which underpins contemporary bilateral relationships, is characterized by uneven development, unequal exchange, and dependency, which create disparities in the distribution of wealth and power. The center, which includes the developed economies of North America, Europe, and Japan, dominates the peripheries, which comprise the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, in terms of economic and political influence. As a result, the peripheries are often relegated to the role of suppliers of raw materials and low-skilled labor, while the center controls the means of production, technology, and finance. This unequal distribution of power and wealth has far-reaching implications for bilateral relationships between the center and peripheries, including trade, investment, and aid. The peripheries often face unfavorable terms of trade, which exacerbate their economic vulnerabilities and hinder their efforts to promote industrialization and diversification. The center's dominance in investment and finance reinforces the dependence of the peripheries on external sources of capital, limiting their capacity to pursue independent economic policies. Moreover, the center's control of international institutions and norms often undermines the peripheries' ability to shape the global agenda and advance their interests. The aim of this seminar paper is to use world system theory to analyze the underlying structural and systemic factors that perpetuate the inequality between the center and peripheries in bilateral relationships. Specifically, the paper will explore how the global capitalist system shapes the center-periphery divide and examine the implications of this divide for global cooperation and development. By providing a comprehensive analysis of this issue, the paper seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of the challenges facing contemporary bilateral relationships and to inform policies that promote more equitable partnerships and development.

Research Questions

1 How does world system theory explain the unequal power dynamics in bilateral relationships between the center and peripheries, and what are the key drivers of this inequality?

2 How does the center-periphery dichotomy affect development outcomes in bilateral relationships, and what are the implications for promoting global justice? Based on this analysis, what policy recommendations can be made to address the drivers of inequality in bilateral relationships and promote more equitable partnerships between the center and peripheries?

Objectives of this Study

1. To analyze the drivers of inequality in bilateral relationships between the center and peripheries, using world system theory.
2. To assess the implications of the center-periphery dichotomy on development outcomes and the promotion of global justice, and to provide policy recommendations for addressing inequality in bilateral relationships

Methodology

This study uses world system theory to explain the inequality between the center (North) and the peripheries (South) in bilateral relationships through a mixed-methods approach. The methodology includes a comprehensive literature review to identify key concepts and gaps, systematic data collection from various sources, and rigorous data analysis using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The data collection involves gathering relevant data from academic articles, books, government reports, and statistical databases, guided by pre-determined inclusion criteria to ensure comprehensiveness and transparency. Findings will be interpreted to identify themes and patterns, leading to policy recommendations aimed at promoting equitable and sustainable bilateral relationships. The entire process will be conducted with transparency and rigor, ensuring validity and reliability.

World Systems Theory

World system theory, developed by Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970s, explains the global economic system's effects on different regions and nations. It posits a hierarchical global economy divided into the core (most developed and powerful nations) and the periphery (least developed and least powerful nations). This division is a result of historical processes like colonialism and imperialism, which concentrated wealth and power in certain regions while marginalizing others. The theory highlights the role of multinational corporations as primary actors in the global economy, often prioritizing profit over workers and the environment. Over time, world system theory has evolved, incorporating concepts such as core, periphery, and semi-periphery regions, uneven development, and the global commodity chain. It remains crucial for understanding economic inequality and marginalization, providing insights for developing fairer global policies. The core-periphery model, central to world system theory, describes the hierarchical structure of the global economy. The core includes the most developed and powerful nations with advanced technologies and resources, while the periphery comprises less developed nations dependent on the core. This model is applied to various economic and political issues, such as trade relationships and labor practices in multinational corporations. It explains how core nations often have greater bargaining power in bilateral trade, leading to unequal economic benefits and further marginalization of periphery nations.

Recent development and debates

In recent years, world system theory and the core-periphery model have sparked debates among scholars and policymakers regarding their relevance in the modern, interconnected global economy. Critics argue that the model is outdated due to the emergence of new power centers in Asia and Latin America, suggesting alternative frameworks like Jessop's "spatial fix." Proponents, however, maintain its utility in highlighting global inequalities and power dynamics, with extensions such as Robinson's global commodity chain concept. Recent

developments include Arrighi's "longue durée" and frameworks focusing on culture, ideology, and social movements. These debates underscore the theory's ongoing relevance in understanding economic inequality and guiding fairer global policies.

Center-Periphery Dichotomy

The center-periphery dichotomy, central to world systems theory, describes the global economy as divided between a dominant core of wealthy, technologically advanced nations and a subordinate periphery of less developed nations. This dichotomy results from historical exploitation by core nations, leading to a global division of labor where periphery nations produce raw materials and core nations dominate high-value industries. Despite criticisms of oversimplification and neglecting the agency of periphery nations, the concept remains useful for understanding global power dynamics and addressing economic inequalities.

Examples of bilateral relationships between the center and periphery

Bilateral relationships between the center and periphery can take various forms, depending on the specific actors involved and the nature of their interaction. Some examples include:

- **Trade agreements**: Core nations often establish trade agreements with periphery nations, which can benefit the core by providing access to cheap raw materials and low-cost labor, while the periphery gains access to markets for their products. However, such agreements may also perpetuate patterns of dependency and unequal exchange, as periphery nations often receive lower prices for their exports than they pay for imports from core nations.
- **Investment flows**: Core nations may also invest in periphery nations, either through direct investment or through financial markets. This can provide needed capital for development, but may also result in the exploitation of labor and resources in the periphery, as well as the transfer of profits to the core.
- **Political alliances**: Core nations may establish political alliances with periphery nations, either as a means of securing access to resources or as a way of maintaining political influence. These alliances may involve military cooperation, foreign aid, or diplomatic support, and may reinforce existing power relations between core and periphery nations.
- **Cultural exchange:** Core nations may also engage in cultural exchange with periphery nations, through media, tourism, or other means. While such exchange can lead to mutual understanding and appreciation, it can also perpetuate cultural imperialism and the dominance of core cultural values and norms. Overall, bilateral relationships between the center and periphery are complex and multifaceted, and can reinforce patterns of inequality and exploitation, as well as offer opportunities for mutual benefit and cooperation. Understanding the dynamics of such relationships is important for identifying ways to promote greater fairness and equity in global economic and political systems.

Drivers and mechanisms of inequality in bilateral relationships

The drivers and mechanisms of inequality in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery are complex and multi-faceted. A number of factors contribute to the perpetuation of unequal power relations, including historical legacies, economic structures, political institutions, and cultural norms. One key driver of inequality is the legacy of colonialism and imperialism. Many periphery nations were colonized by core nations in the past, and the structures of colonialism created enduring patterns of economic and political domination. For example, colonial powers often imposed export-oriented economies on their colonies, leading to a focus on producing raw materials for export rather than developing domestic industries. This legacy of dependency continues to shape patterns of trade and investment today,

perpetuating the dominance of core nations in the global economy (Amin, 2014). Another key mechanism of inequality is the structure of the global economy itself, which is characterized by unequal exchange and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few powerful actors. Core nations control the majority of global financial and trade flows, and the terms of trade are often skewed in their favor. This means that periphery nations receive low prices for their exports and pay high prices for their imports, leading to a net outflow of resources from the periphery to the core (Wallerstein, 2011). Political institutions also play a role in perpetuating inequality, particularly in the form of international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These institutions often impose neoliberal economic policies on periphery nations, such as privatization and deregulation, which can lead to social and economic dislocation (Harvey, 2005). Moreover, they may privilege the interests of core nations over those of periphery nations in decision-making processes, further entrenching patterns of domination. Finally, cultural norms and values also contribute to the perpetuation of inequality in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery. Western cultural values and norms are often privileged over those of other cultures, leading to a homogenization of global culture and the marginalization of non-Western perspectives (Said, 1979). This can reinforce patterns of cultural imperialism and contribute to the perpetuation of unequal power relations. In conclusion, the drivers and mechanisms of inequality in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery are multiple and interrelated. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for developing strategies to promote greater fairness and equity in global economic and political systems.

How the center-periphery dichotomy affects development outcomes

The center-periphery dichotomy has significant implications for development outcomes in periphery nations. Because of the unequal power relations that characterize bilateral relationships between the center and periphery, periphery nations often struggle to achieve sustainable and equitable development. One key way in which the center-periphery dichotomy affects development outcomes is through the concentration of wealth and resources in the hands of a few powerful actors in the center. This can lead to a situation in which periphery nations are unable to access the resources and technologies they need to achieve development goals such as poverty reduction, improved health outcomes, and increased access to education (Bello, 2009). Moreover, the center-periphery dichotomy can also contribute to the perpetuation of a global division of labor in which periphery nations are relegated to the production of low-value-added goods, while core nations control the production of high-value-added goods (Gereffi et al., 2005). This can limit the capacity of periphery nations to diversify their economies and increase their levels of economic development. Another way in which the center-periphery dichotomy affects development outcomes is through the imposition of neoliberal economic policies on periphery nations by international institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These policies often prioritize the interests of core nations over those of periphery nations and can lead to social and economic dislocation (Harvey, 2005). For example, privatization of state-owned enterprises and deregulation of markets can lead to job losses and reduced access to social services for many people in periphery nations. The center-periphery dichotomy can also have significant cultural and social implications for development outcomes. Western cultural values and norms are often privileged over those of other cultures, leading to a homogenization of global culture and the marginalization of non-Western perspectives (Said, 1979). This can contribute to the perpetuation of patterns of cultural imperialism and can limit the capacity of periphery nations to develop their own unique cultural and social institutions. In conclusion, the center-periphery dichotomy has significant implications for development outcomes in periphery nations. Addressing this dichotomy requires a

multifaceted approach that seeks to redress unequal power relations, promote diversification of economies, and challenge cultural and social norms that perpetuate patterns of domination.

Case Studies

USA and Latin America

The unequal bilateral relationship between the United States of America (USA) and Latin America can be analyzed using the world system theory. According to this theory, the global economic system is structured around a core-periphery dichotomy in which the core countries dominate and exploit the peripheral countries (Wallerstein, 1974). In the case of the USA and Latin America, the USA can be considered a core country, while Latin America can be seen as a peripheral region. One key driver of the unequal bilateral relationship between the USA and Latin America is economic dependence. Many Latin American countries rely heavily on the export of primary commodities such as oil, minerals, and agricultural products to the USA. This has led to a situation in which the USA holds significant economic leverage over Latin American countries (Chomsky, 1999). Furthermore, the USA has historically used its economic power to extract favorable trade agreements from Latin American countries, while imposing protectionist policies that limit the ability of these countries to export manufactured goods to the USA (Frank, 1972). Another factor contributing to the unequal bilateral relationship between the USA and Latin America is political and military intervention. The USA has a long history of political and military intervention in Latin America, often in support of authoritarian regimes that serve US interests (Grandin, 2014). This has contributed to a situation in which Latin American countries have been unable to pursue their own political and economic agendas and have been forced to align with US foreign policy objectives. Furthermore, the USA has also been involved in supporting counter-insurgency and anti-narcotics operations in Latin America, often through the provision of military aid and training (Leech, 2014). This has contributed to a situation in which the USA has significant influence over the internal affairs of many Latin American countries, further perpetuating the unequal bilateral relationship. In conclusion, the unequal bilateral relationship between the USA and Latin America can be explained using the world system theory. Economic dependence, political and military intervention, and unequal trade agreements have all contributed to a situation in which the USA holds significant power over Latin America, perpetuating patterns of domination and exploitation.

China and Africa

The unequal bilateral relationship between China and Africa can also be analyzed using the world system theory. China can be considered a core country while Africa can be seen as a peripheral region. This relationship is characterized by economic dependence, political and military intervention, and unequal trade agreements. Economic dependence is a key factor in the China-Africa relationship. Many African countries rely heavily on exports of raw materials such as oil, minerals, and agricultural products to China. China has become the largest trading partner of Africa, with trade volumes exceeding $200 billion in 2020 (Brautigam, 2021). However, this has led to a situation in which China holds significant economic leverage over African countries. Furthermore, China has also used its economic power to extract favorable trade agreements from African countries while imposing protectionist policies that limit the ability of these countries to export manufactured goods to China (Brautigam, 2011). Additionally, Chinese firms have been accused of exploiting African labor and resources through extractive industries and infrastructure projects. Political and military intervention is another driver of inequality in the China-Africa relationship. China has been accused of supporting authoritarian regimes in Africa in exchange for access to natural resources (Brautigam, 2021). Additionally, China has become increasingly involved in peacekeeping operations in Africa, with Chinese troops deployed to conflict

zones such as South Sudan and Mali (Taylor, 2019). This has contributed to a situation in which China has significant influence over the internal affairs of many African countries, perpetuating the unequal bilateral relationship. Unequal trade agreements are also a key factor in the China-Africa relationship. Many African countries have complained about the unfair terms of trade with China, which often benefit Chinese companies and workers at the expense of African ones (Adepoju, 2016). Furthermore, Chinese firms have been accused of engaging in corrupt practices and avoiding taxes in Africa, exacerbating the unequal relationship. In conclusion, the unequal bilateral relationship between China and Africa can be explained using the world system theory. Economic dependence, political and military intervention, and unequal trade agreements have all contributed to a situation in which China holds significant power over African countries, perpetuating patterns of domination and exploitation.

EUROPEAN UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

The relationship between the European Union (EU) and Eastern Europe can also be analyzed through the lens of world system theory. The EU can be considered a core region while Eastern Europe is seen as a semi-peripheral region. This relationship is characterized by economic dependence, political and social inequality, and uneven development. Economic dependence is a key factor in the EU-Eastern Europe relationship. Many Eastern European countries rely heavily on the EU for trade and investment, which has led to a situation in which the EU holds significant economic leverage over these countries. The EU has become the largest trading partner of many Eastern European countries, with trade volumes exceeding €250 billion in 2020 (European Commission, 2021). However, this has led to a situation in which Eastern European countries are economically dependent on the EU, and are vulnerable to economic shocks in the EU. Furthermore, the EU has also used its economic power to extract favorable trade agreements from Eastern European countries while imposing protectionist policies that limit the ability of these countries to export manufactured goods to the EU (Bohle & Greskovits, 2012). Additionally, EU countries have been accused of engaging in corrupt practices in Eastern Europe, which exacerbates the unequal relationship. Political and social inequality is another driver of inequality in the EU-Eastern Europe relationship. The EU has been accused of imposing its political and social values on Eastern European countries, which has led to tensions and resentment in some countries (Börzel & Risse, 2018). Additionally, the EU's enlargement process has been criticized for being slow and bureaucratic, which has led to a situation in which Eastern European countries feel excluded from the EU decision-making process. Uneven development is also a key factor in the EU-Eastern Europe relationship. The EU's policies and funding priorities have favored Western European countries, which has led to a situation in which Eastern European countries lag behind in terms of economic development (Bohle & Greskovits, 2012). Additionally, the EU's austerity policies have had a disproportionate impact on Eastern European countries, which has exacerbated social inequality in these countries. In conclusion, the unequal bilateral relationship between the EU and Eastern Europe can be explained using the world system theory. Economic dependence, political and social inequality, and uneven development have all contributed to a situation in which the EU holds significant power over Eastern European countries, perpetuating patterns of domination and exploitation.

Analysis of Similarities and Differences in these Cases

The cases of unequal bilateral relationships between the center and periphery - USA and Latin America, China and Africa, and EU and Eastern Europe - share some similarities but also have some differences. Similarities: Economic dependence: In all three cases, the center (USA, China, and EU) holds significant economic leverage over the periphery (Latin America, Africa, and Eastern Europe), which has led to economic dependence and

vulnerability to economic shocks. Political and social inequality: The center has also imposed its political and social values on the periphery, which has led to tensions and resentment in some cases. Uneven development: The periphery lags behind the center in terms of economic development, and the center's policies and funding priorities have favored their own countries. Differences: Historical context: The historical context of the relationships is different in each case. The relationship between the USA and Latin America dates back to the 19th century, while the relationship between China and Africa has developed rapidly in recent decades. The EU's relationship with Eastern Europe has evolved since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Type of relationship: The nature of the bilateral relationship differs in each case. The USA and China have a more complex relationship as they are both major economic powers, while the relationship between the EU and Eastern Europe is more closely tied to the EU's enlargement process. The relationship between China and Africa is more focused on resource extraction and investment. Regional context: The relationship between the center and periphery is also shaped by the broader regional context. Latin America is in the Western Hemisphere, while Africa is in the Global South, and Eastern Europe is geographically located between the EU and Russia. In summary, while the cases of unequal bilateral relationships between the center and periphery share some commonalities, such as economic dependence, political and social inequality, and uneven development, their historical context, type of relationship, and regional context differ, which leads to variations in the dynamics of these relationships.

Identifying the challenges and opportunities for addressing inequality in bilateral relationships

The analysis of unequal bilateral relationships between the center and periphery - USA and Latin America, China and Africa, and EU and Eastern Europe - reveals several challenges and opportunities for addressing inequality in these relationships. Challenges: Power imbalance: The center holds significant economic and political power over the periphery, making it difficult to negotiate fair terms of trade and investment. Historical legacies: Historical legacies of colonization and imperialism have contributed to the unequal power dynamic and shaped the current relationship between the center and periphery. Domestic political pressures: Domestic political pressures in the center, such as protectionism, can also complicate efforts to address inequality in bilateral relationships. Opportunities: Global institutions: The existence of global institutions such as the United Nations, World Trade Organization, and International Monetary Fund provide a forum for addressing the challenges of inequality in bilateral relationships. South-South cooperation: The rise of emerging powers such as China and India has created opportunities for South-South cooperation, which can help to balance the power dynamic in bilateral relationships. Civil society and advocacy: Civil society groups and advocacy organizations can play a vital role in raising awareness about the impacts of inequality in bilateral relationships and advocating for policy changes that address these issues. Fair trade agreements: Fair trade agreements can provide a framework for negotiating trade deals that are more equitable for both the center and periphery. In conclusion, addressing inequality in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery presents several challenges, including power imbalances, historical legacies, and domestic political pressures. However, opportunities such as global institutions, South-South cooperation, civil society and advocacy, and fair trade agreements provide avenues for addressing these challenges and promoting more equitable bilateral relationships.

Developing alternative approaches and strategies for equitable partnerships

To achieve more equitable partnerships in bilateral relationships, alternative approaches and strategies need to be developed. Some of these approaches and strategies include: Mutual benefit: Partnerships should be based on mutual benefit, where both the center and periphery

benefit from the relationship. This means that the center should not only focus on its own interests, but also consider the interests of the periphery. Empowerment: Partnerships should empower the periphery to take charge of their development agenda. This means that the periphery should have a say in the partnership and be involved in decision-making processes. Technology transfer: Technology transfer can help to bridge the gap between the center and periphery by sharing knowledge and expertise. This can help the periphery to develop its own capabilities and become more self-sufficient. Capacity building: Capacity building can help the periphery to develop its own institutions and systems to support its development agenda. This includes developing human resources, institutions, and infrastructure. Investment in social sectors: Investment in social sectors such as health, education, and social protection can help to reduce inequality and promote human development in the periphery. Regional integration: Regional integration can help to build stronger partnerships between the center and periphery by creating larger markets and enhancing cooperation in areas such as trade, investment, and infrastructure. Development aid: Development aid can be used to support the development agenda of the periphery. This aid should be provided in a way that empowers the periphery and promotes their self-sufficiency. In conclusion, developing alternative approaches and strategies for equitable partnerships in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery is essential for promoting more equitable development outcomes. These approaches and strategies should be based on mutual benefit, empowerment, technology transfer, capacity building, investment in social sectors, regional integration, and development aid. By adopting these approaches and strategies, the center and periphery can work together to promote sustainable and equitable development.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the world system theory provides a useful framework for understanding the unequal bilateral relationships between the center (North) and the periphery (South). The core-periphery model helps to explain how power and resources are distributed in these relationships, with the center often benefiting at the expense of the periphery. By examining specific cases, such as the relationships between the USA and Latin America, China and Africa, and the European Union and Eastern Europe, we can see how these dynamics play out in practice. The drivers and mechanisms of inequality in these relationships are multifaceted, including historical legacies, power imbalances, and economic structures. These factors result in unequal distribution of resources, limited opportunities for the periphery, and challenges in addressing inequality. However, the discussion also reveals opportunities for addressing these challenges through alternative approaches and strategies for equitable partnerships. These include mutual benefit, empowerment, technology transfer, capacity building, investment in social sectors, regional integration, and development aid. By adopting these approaches and strategies, more equitable partnerships can be developed between the center and periphery, leading to more sustainable and equitable development outcomes. It is clear that addressing the inequalities in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery is crucial for achieving global development goals and promoting shared prosperity. Through continued research, dialogue, and action, we can work towards creating a more just and equitable world for all.

Recommendations

To address the inequalities in bilateral relationships between the center and periphery, this study recommends the implementation of policies focused on fostering mutual benefits and sustainable development. Key strategies include enhancing technology transfer and capacity building initiatives to empower periphery nations, ensuring fair trade agreements that promote equitable economic growth, and investing in education and infrastructure to reduce dependency on core nations. Additionally, fostering inclusive dialogue and cooperation

between nations can help identify shared goals and develop tailored solutions that address specific regional challenges. By prioritizing these approaches, policymakers can create more balanced partnerships that contribute to global development goals and shared prosperity.

References

Adepoju, A. (2016). *China-Africa economic relations: perceptions of a new partnership*. Springer.

Amin, S. (2014). *Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism*. Verso Books.

Arrighi, G. (2010). *The long twentieth century: Money, power, and the origins of our times.* Verso Books.

Bello, W. (2009). *Dilemmas of domination: The unmaking of the American empire.* Zed Books. Gereffi,

Bohle, D., & Greskovits, B. (2012). Capitalist diversity on Europe's periphery. Cornell University Press. European Commission. (2021). Eastern Partnership. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/eastern-partnership_en

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2018). *From Europeanization to diffusion: introduction.* West European Politics, 41(2), 283-304.

Brautigam, D. (2011). *The dragon's gift: the real story of China in Africa.* Oxford University Press.

Brautigam, D. (2021). *The China Africa Research Initiative.* Retrieved from https://www.sais- cari.org/

Chase-Dunn, C., & Grimes, P. (1995). World-systems analysis. *Annual review of sociology*, 21(1), 387-417.

Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: neoliberalism and global order*. Seven Stories Press.

Frank, A. G. (1969). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical studies of Chile and Brazil.* Monthly Review Press.

G., Humphrey, J., & Sturgeon, T. (2005). The governance of global value chains. *Review of International Political Economy*, 12(1), 78-104.

Grandin, G. (2014). *The empire of necessity: slavery, freedom, and deception in the New World.* Macmillan.

Gunder Frank, A. (1971). *The development of underdevelopment*. Monthly Review Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press. Said, E. W. (1979).
Orientalism. Vintage Books.

Jessop, B. (2019). Spatial fixes, temporal fixes, and spatio-temporal fixes. *Development and Change*, 50(1), 17-38.

Leech, G. (2014). *Drug war capitalism*. AK Press.

Lumpenbourgeoisie, lumpendevelopment: *dependence, class, and politics in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.

Moghadam, V. M. (2018). *Globalization and social movements: Islamism, feminism, and the global justice movement.*

Robinson, W. I. (2014). *Global capitalism and the crisis of humanity*. Cambridge University Press.

Rowman & Littlefield. Robinson, W. I. (2014). *Global capitalism and the crisis of humanity*. Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, I. (2019). *China's new role in African peace and security.* International Affairs, 95(1), 97-113.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system I: capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1980). *The modern world-system II: Mercantilism and the consolidation of the European world-economy, 1600-1750*. Academic Press.