Global Journal of Applied, Management and Social Sciences (GOJAMSS); Vol.29, June 2024; P.338 – 347 (ISSN: 2276 – 9013)

INTERDEPENDENCE AND INEQUALITY: A SOCIOLOGICAL EXPLORATION OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS.

TONY-OKOLO CHILEZIE NGOZI
Department of Social Sciences, Federal Polytechnic Nekede, Owerri, Imo State
chileengoo@gmail.com
+2348035444387

Abstract
Historically, a significant gap existed between international politics and economics. From the 17th century onwards, political economists like Adam Smith began bridging this divide, establishing the field of international political economy. This paper explores how the integration of economic policies with political strategies has evolved, focusing on the sociology of economics to analyze underlying power dynamics. Key areas discussed include trade policies, foreign aid, debt crises, and the role of multinational corporations (MNCs). By examining case studies such as trade embargoes, the Principle of Triage in aid distribution, and OPEC's pricing strategies, the paper highlights the political motives driving economic decisions and their impact on global power structures. Observations indicate the need for stronger coordination between economics, diplomacy, and social policies to address global inequalities. The paper concludes with a call to implement the U.N. Pearson Committee's report, "Partners in Development," advocating for the internationalization of aid and equitable resource allocation. Such measures are essential for fostering a more inclusive and stable international economic system.
Keywords: Trade policy, Multinational Corporations (MNCs), Triage, Life Boat Ethics, Sociology of Economics, International Political Economy

INTRODUCTION

The concept of a unified political and economic order was never subscribed to, by the liberal economic theorists. According to them, all things being equal, the economic system and economic processes operate under natural laws while the political system does not obey natural laws. This led to the development of economics and political science as two separate disciplines. As a result of this, international political economy was fragmented into international politics and international economics. The economists completely ignored the role of the political factors in international economic process and policy, while scholars of international politics also ignored economic issues in relation between and among the various states of the world. However, both the economic and political development since the World War II, namely, the Bretton Woods system of international economic management, the Russia hegemony in Eastern Europe, the establishment of European Union, the problem of pound sterling and the dollar, as well as the sudden emergence of the third world countries into prominence made their impacts on scholars and compelled them to establish a firm and closer link between politics and economics (Turner and Holt, 1966).

The colonial expansion of European powers began in the 15th century, fueled by a combination of political, economic, and religious motivations. The fall of Constantinople in 1453, which blocked traditional trade routes to Asia, urged European powers to seek new routes to access Asian wealth. This desire for expansion also coincided with advances in navigation and ship technology, like the development of the caravel, which made long ocean voyages feasible. This period marked the transition from Medieval Universalism, which was largely focused on local and religious unity, to a new phase of aggressive territorial conquest, as European powers sought to assert dominance on a global scale.

Emergence of Mercantilism and Trade Surplus Ideology

The 16th and 17th centuries saw the rise of mercantilism, an economic doctrine that emphasized the importance of a favorable balance of trade. Mercantilist thinkers argued that for a nation to gain power, it had to export more than it imported, thereby ensuring a continuous influx of precious metals, particularly gold and silver. European states enacted strict regulations to protect their economic interests; they promoted domestic production of export goods and established trade monopolies through entities like the British East India Company and the Dutch East India Company. For example, Britain heavily regulated its American colonies, restricting their ability to manufacture goods that competed with British industries and mandating that key exports like tobacco and sugar be shipped only to England. These policies aimed to keep wealth circulating within the empire and prevent colonies from becoming economically self-sufficient, thus maintaining their dependence on the mother country.

The Shift from Mercantilism to Classical Economics

In the late 18th century, mercantilist principles began to face opposition from classical political economists, particularly Adam Smith, who criticized the limitations and inefficiencies of mercantilist practices. In his seminal work *The Wealth of Nations*, Smith argued that national prosperity was better achieved through free trade, where market forces could operate with minimal government intervention. Smith's ideas introduced the concept of the "invisible hand," suggesting that individual pursuit of self-interest in a free market ultimately benefits society as a whole. This marked a major shift from the belief that accumulating specie (gold and silver) alone could enhance national power. Smith's philosophy, however, initially faced resistance, as many governments and influential business elites were reluctant to relinquish control over trade and production. The ensuing debates between supporters of mercantilism and advocates for free trade would shape economic policies in Europe well into the 19th century.

Calls for State Intervention Amid Class Conflicts

The rapid industrialization and social changes of the early 19th century heightened class tensions, as landowners, industrialists, and workers competed for economic power. The laissez-faire ideals of Smith's philosophy, which favored minimal government interference, clashed with growing demands for state intervention to address inequalities and protect local industries. For example, Britain saw increased pressure from groups like the Corn Laws' supporters, who wanted tariffs on imported grain to protect domestic agriculture. Similarly, class struggles across Europe led to movements advocating for workers' rights and fair trade, revealing the limitations of unregulated markets in addressing social disparities. During the Napoleonic Wars, France imposed the Continental System, an economic blockade against Britain designed to cripple its economy by closing European ports to British goods. This embargo ultimately failed but underscored the lengths to which nations would go to protect their economic interests during periods of intense political rivalry.

The Impact of Colonial Policies on Global Trade

Under its colonial policy, Britain utilized its colonies as sources of raw materials and as exclusive markets for British goods. In India, for instance, the British colonial administration discouraged local textile production to eliminate competition with British textiles, forcing Indian weavers and artisans into economic dependency. These colonial policies not only strengthened Britain's economic power but also transformed global trade networks, redirecting the flow of goods and capital in ways that favored European economies. Additionally, the ideological justification for colonialism often relied on the concept of a "civilizing mission," where European powers framed their exploitation of foreign lands as a benevolent endeavor to bring progress and enlightenment to "lesser" societies. This justification masked the extractive practices that stripped colonies of their wealth and often led to social and economic disruption.

The Lasting Legacy of Colonialism and Economic Dependence

The effects of colonialism continued long after the formal end of European empires, influencing the political and economic structures of newly independent nations. Former colonies often struggled with economic dependency, having been integrated into global trade primarily as exporters of raw materials. This limited their ability to develop diverse economies and contributed to the establishment of neocolonialism, a system in which former colonial powers maintained influence over their former colonies through economic pressures and cultural dominance. The legacies of mercantilism and colonial exploitation can still be observed today in global trade patterns, where many developing nations remain suppliers of primary goods to developed countries, perpetuating a cycle of economic inequality.

Following the decline of colonial empires, Germany and the United States emerged as influential powers, each aiming to assert dominance in what some feared would be a new, economically driven form of imperialism. This era marked a shift in the global economic landscape where leading nations were part of the international gold standard, a system governed by tacit “rules of the game” that required international cooperation to function effectively (Knorr, 1975). However, as new industrial powers, Germany and the United States adopted protectionist strategies to nurture their domestic industries, a departure from the free-market ideals previously emphasized by laissez-faire economists. For instance, the U.S. followed Alexander Hamilton’s proposals for tariffs to safeguard its nascent industries (Peter, 1994). Similarly, German economic policy was influenced by thinkers like Guetzkow (1963), who argued for state intervention to promote industrial growth.

These protectionist policies reveal a sociological aspect to economics, where national interests and economic policies reflect social struggles over control of resources and industrial power. The sociology of economics highlights how the state functions not merely as an economic regulator but as an entity reflecting competing social classes and interest groups. The early 20th-century rise in protectionism, for example, was a reaction to economic nationalism and social pressures to secure employment and preserve local markets from foreign domination.

World War I’s disruption of the international gold standard was a pivotal event, with its breakdown symbolizing a collapse of economic interconnectedness. The subsequent Treaty of Versailles imposed reparations on Germany, resulting in a “transfer problem” as Germany struggled to meet these payments. This issue became central in economic debates, where John Maynard Keynes famously critiqued the treaty’s terms in The Economic Consequences of the Peace (1919), warning that such economic pressures would destabilize European peace and exacerbate social inequalities (Sachdeva & Gupta, 1977).

The emergence of the League of Nations attempted to address these tensions by creating a framework for economic cooperation to reduce the likelihood of future conflict. Yet, the interplay of protectionism, economic nationalism, and inter-state competition persisted, reflecting the sociological dimensions of economics wherein nations and their policies operate within social and political contexts that often prioritize collective over global interests. In this way, the era illustrates how economic policies are influenced not only by market principles but by complex social forces that shape national priorities and global power dynamics. Thus, this paper traces the historical undercurrents of how international economic relations were shaped by evolving political forces and social dynamics, emphasizing how economic policies were often reflective of underlying social struggles, national interests, and the power structures that emerged during this transformative period.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION: POLITICAL ECONOMY

The discipline of political science has evolved through diverse analytical frameworks, each reflecting social and economic changes over time. These stages offer insights into the “sociology of economics”, a field that examines how economic forces interact with social structures and influence political decisions (Nzenwa, 2015).

1. **From Human Nature to Power Relations.**

Early political thought was grounded in theories of human nature, aiming to understand fundamental motivations that shape authority. This focus reveals a sociological dimension: by studying human behaviour in relation to power, scholars could examine how personal interests and social forces mold political authority and economic choices. This stage reflects early ideas about the role of human behaviour in organizing resources and establishing governance, laying the groundwork for later explorations into social class and economic influence (Nzenwa, 2015).

2. **From Discussion to Analytical Approaches.**

As political inquiry formalized, it transitioned from general discussion to a more analytical approach, marking a move towards empirical study. This shift aligns with the broader societal trend of valuing evidence and systematic observation, as seen in the Enlightenment. The development of quantitative methods in political science and economics also underscored a sociological shift, aiming to objectively assess how collective behaviors impact state structures and economic outcomes (Lipset, 1966).

3. **Behavioral Studies to Developmental Analysis.**

With the advent of behavioral studies, political science began to quantify how individuals' political behaviors contribute to broader social trends. The next step, developmental analysis shifted the focus to how economic and political development drive societal advancement. This phase illustrates the sociology of economics by emphasizing that economic conditions influence political stability, growth, and social well-being, revealing a relationship between individual agency and collective economic outcomes (Lipset, 1966; Nzenwa, 2015).

4.**From Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology**

Moving from sociology of politics to political sociology introduced the idea that political systems shape social identities and hierarchies. Political sociology highlights how class structures, race, and social norms are affected by policy and state authority, bridging economics and sociology by analyzing how economic forces (like income distribution and access to resources) shape social status and opportunities. This phase deepens the understanding that politics and economics cannot be isolated from social dynamics, as each decision affects societal structure and individual lives (Lipset, 1966).

5. **Political Sociology to Political Economy**

Finally, political economy emphasizes the study of how politics and economics intersect, with attention to contemporary global issues such as poverty, resource allocation, and globalization. This field examines how economic policies influence social stratification and power, embodying the sociology of economics by recognizing that wealth distribution and economic priorities shape social hierarchies and governance. This phase brings the understanding that economic systems are inherently social and political, as they determine the distribution of resources and access to opportunities (Nzenwa, 2015; Lipset, 1966).

These stages of political science evolution underscore the interconnected nature of politics, economics, and sociology, revealing how social contexts shape economic systems and vice versa. Today, political economy remains central in analyzing how economic policies affect societies, reflecting an enduring integration of political science with sociology and economics.

A Brief Survey of the Politics of International Economic Relations

After World War I, one major challenge was determining the future of the international monetary system (Sachdeva & Gupta, 1977). Many countries sought to reinstate the gold standard but faced difficult choices between returning to pre-war parity and establishing new standards. This issue extended beyond pure economic reasoning, as it carried deep political implications for global relations. For Britain, with Winston Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer, re-adopting the gold standard at pre-war parity proved economically challenging, especially as the Great Depression impacted the fragile British economy. Meanwhile, the United States responded by increasing state intervention through the New Deal, revisiting the debate between free trade and protectionism. Consequently, many countries adopted "Beggar-thy-Neighbor" policies, which prioritized national gains over international cooperation, weakening global trade (Sachdeva & Gupta, 1977).

Amid these economic tensions, nationalism and imperialism resurged, especially in Germany, straining relations between major powers. The League of Nations struggled to maintain stability, leading to a breakdown in the balance of power, rising political alliances, and a growing sense that another world war was inevitable. London's role as the center of international finance dwindled, with the British pound losing value while the U.S. dollar gained strength.

Two key issues emerged globally: the need to manage post-war reconstruction, especially in Europe, and the demand for an international agency to maintain long-term peace. With the U.S. emerging as the primary financier of reconstruction through initiatives like the Marshall Plan, this era marked the start of foreign aid as a political instrument. Programs such as Lend-Lease not only provided funds but also created new markets for American goods, intertwining economics with geopolitical influence (Sachdeva & Gupta, 1977).

Before finalizing the United Nations, representatives from 44 nations convened at Bretton Woods in 1944 to establish a framework for international finance. At this conference, two contrasting plans emerged: the U.S. "White Plan," which favored rich creditor nations by imposing penalties on deficit countries, and Britain's Keynesian plan, which proposed an overdraft facility to recirculate payment surpluses. The Bretton Woods framework thus carried significant political overtones, as creditor nations sought to shape global finance to their advantage (Trevor & Taylor, 1979; Immanuel, 1979). By 1960, the IMF, a product of Bretton Woods, was heavily reliant on the U.S. dollar, placing it under American influence. This reliance prompted the establishment of the "Group of Ten" in 1961, initiating a period of multilateral central bank cooperation, albeit under U.S. leadership (Sachdeva & Gupta, 1977).

The period from 1967-1968 saw a gold crisis triggered by French demands to convert dollar holdings to gold, destabilizing the U.S. economy. As a result, the IMF adopted a two-tier system, maintaining a fixed price for gold in official markets while allowing fluctuation in open markets. This marked the beginning of gold's reduced role in monetary systems. The Smithsonian Agreement later devalued the dollar by 8% against gold, reflecting an era where U.S. domestic priorities began to compete with its global leadership role (Lewis, 1994).

The Politics of Oil and Economic Sovereignty

The politics of international economics was further shaped by OPEC's influence over oil prices, which surged from $1.80 to $11.65 per barrel within a few years (Harold, 1963). OPEC members accumulated substantial "petrodollars," leading to calls for "recycling" these funds to oil-importing nations. The sociology of economics became evident as OPEC's decisions, driven by both economic and political motives, challenged Western control over energy resources, signaling a shift in global power dynamics (Campbell, 2005).

In 1978, the IMF amended its charter to make Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) the main reserve asset, formally severing the SDR's link to gold. Countries were encouraged to link their currencies to a diverse set of currencies, increasing economic stability. Nonetheless, developing countries expressed dissatisfaction, pressing for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) under forums like UNCTAD and NAM. The NIEO sought to address global power imbalances, emphasizing that the prevailing order disproportionately favored powerful states, particularly the U.S. and its dollar dominance (Campbell, 2005).

Post-War Economic Alliances and the Cold War

The post-WWII period saw the formation of economic and political alliances such as NATO, SEATO, and the EEC, all shaped by Cold War dynamics. As U.S.-Soviet rivalry intensified, global economics became enmeshed with military strategies. Third-world countries voiced concerns over poverty, unequal trade, and dependence on foreign aid, demanding greater economic autonomy through North-South and South-South cooperation (Mackenzie, 1969; Rostow, 1972).

This period in international relations highlights the sociology of economics, where economic policies were embedded in social structures and political strategies, shaping national interests and global alliances.

Politics of International Economic Relations

The earlier survey reveals the embedded politics of international economic relations. A deeper analysis of specific cases provides a clearer insight into how economic policies are shaped by power dynamics and social contexts.

Politics of Trade Policy

Since the era of Adam Smith, debates on "free trade" versus "protectionism" have shaped global trade policies. These discussions reflect underlying social structures, as trade policies often prioritize national interests over global cooperation. For instance, during the Napoleonic Wars, trade embargoes were used strategically, demonstrating the power of economic sanctions as political tools. Similarly, the League of Nations imposed sanctions on Italy following its invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, and the U.S. has frequently used trade embargoes against communist states. During the Suez Canal crisis, Britain froze Egyptian assets, exemplifying how economic measures are wielded to influence political outcomes (Brandt, 1980). The Arab oil embargo of 1973 further illustrated the political dimensions of trade policy, as Arab nations used economic leverage to pressure the U.S. and its allies over their stance on Israel.

Beyond embargoes, other trade instruments like dumping, most favored nation (MFN) clauses, and trade liberalization under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) showcase the political undercurrents of international trade. These policies reveal a sociology of economics perspective, where economic decisions are shaped by power relations and serve as mechanisms for asserting political dominance (Brandt, 1980).

Politics of Foreign Aid

Foreign aid is often utilized by wealthy nations as a political strategy rather than a purely humanitarian effort. Countries like the U.S., France, and China use aid to advance geopolitical interests, employing controversial concepts such as the "Principle of Triage" and "Life Boat Ethics" (UNO Year Book, 2000). The "Triage" approach, likened to battlefield strategies, involves categorizing aid recipients based on their perceived chances of success. For instance, during the Third Plan, the U.S. applied this concept to India, freezing aid based on a negative assessment of its economic prospects. This decision pressured India into devaluing its currency and suspending its development plans (Spero & Hart, 2003). Sociologically, this reflects how aid reinforces dependency and exerts control over recipient nations, highlighting the asymmetric power dynamics in international relations.

Politics of Debt Crisis

The debt crisis facing many developing countries underscores the political nature of international finance. With combined debts exceeding a trillion U.S. dollars, many Afro-Asian and Latin American nations found themselves trapped by harsh loan terms. In 1984, Argentina's refusal to repay its debts sparked a wave of collective bargaining efforts, as debtor nations formed cartels to strengthen their negotiating power. In response, creditor nations like the U.S. and France began writing off some of these debts, recognizing the political instability such financial burdens could cause (Pearson, 1992). This situation exemplifies the sociology of economics, where debt becomes a tool of control, limiting the economic sovereignty of less developed countries and perpetuating their reliance on external financial systems.

Politics of Oil

The pricing strategies of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) highlight the coercive power of resource control. OPEC's decision to raise oil prices in the 1970s led to significant shifts in global economic power, prompting Western nations to consider drastic measures, including military action to secure oil supplies. The U.S. even contemplated deploying a Rapid Development Force (RDF) for this purpose. Alternatively, plans were made to immobilize OPEC's petro-dollar reserves held in Western banks (Ciment, 1999). The sociological implications are clear: control over natural resources allows nations to exert significant political and economic influence, reshaping global power dynamics and creating new forms of economic dependency.

Politics of Multinational Corporations (MNCs)

Multinational corporations (MNCs) have become powerful players in global economics, often challenging the sovereignty of nation-states. According to Nzenwa (2005), MNCs operate beyond the regulatory reach of individual governments, with turnovers exceeding the GDP of many countries. The ethno-centric, poly-centric, and geo-centric strategies of these corporations illustrate their ability to adapt and dominate, posing significant threats to the economic stability of host countries. Sociologically, the rise of MNCs reflects a shift in power from national governments to corporate entities, influencing labor markets, social policies, and economic priorities in ways that favor corporate interests over national development goals.

Politics of Economic Conflict Resolution

Conflict resolution in international economic relations often takes place within three main subsystems; West, North-South, and East-West. The Western subsystem is based on interdependence, with wealthy capitalist nations relying on complex financial systems and powerful MNCs. Political economists argue that this setup raises critical issues, such as the challenge of controlling MNC operations and the risk of dominance by a few powerful nations, threatening the balance of interdependence (Blosomstorm, 1988).

The North-South subsystem is marked by dependence, with developing countries often subject to unfavorable trade terms and investment patterns dictated by the North. This imbalance has led to calls for a New International Economic Order (NIEO), aiming to restructure global economic systems to address inequality and give the South a greater voice in decision-making (Nzenwa, 2005).

The East-West subsystem, rooted in principles of independence, reflects the ideological divide of the Cold War. The strategic rivalry between these power blocs shaped global economic policies, creating a buffer zone to prevent direct conflict. The end of the Cold War and improved relations between the East and West have gradually transformed this dynamic, fostering a new era of economic cooperation and interdependence.

Observations, Recommendations and Conclusion

The survey and analysis of the complex interplay between politics and international economic relations reveal several key observations:

1. **Integration of Economics and Politics**: There is a global recognition of the need for strategic coordination between economic policies and political strategies. The sociology of economics suggests that international economic decisions are deeply embedded within social power structures. To address issues like economic inequality, global institutions must bridge the gap between diplomatic, economic, and military policies to create a coherent framework for managing international relations (Collier, 2007).
2. **Crisis Management and Rapid Response:** The management of economic crises, whether driven by debt, resource conflicts, or geopolitical tensions, requires a comprehensive approach. The rapid evolution of global threats like the Arab Spring, ISIS, and Boko Haram underscores the political and economic complexity of contemporary crises. Effective management must include mechanisms for swift coordination across international bodies, integrating economic relief measures with political stabilization efforts to address both immediate and structural causes of instability (UN Year Book, 2015).
3**. Reforming the International Economic Order:** Political economists argue that the current international economic order must be broadened to include more equitable representation, particularly for developing countries. However, a complete overhaul is unlikely to succeed without careful, incremental changes. Instead, restructuring should focus on expanding the decision-making role of the Global South within existing institutions like the IMF and World Bank, rather than dismantling established frameworks (Nzenwa, 2005). This approach would foster greater inclusivity and address power imbalances while avoiding the disruption of global economic stability.
4. **Reducing North-South Dependency:** The South's dependence on the North remains a critical issue. To reduce this dependency, enhanced South-South cooperation should be prioritized, enabling developing nations to share resources, technology, and knowledge without relying solely on aid or investment from the North. Strengthening regional economic blocs and trade agreements among Southern nations would also help diversify their economic ties and build resilience against external shocks (Pearson, 1992).
5. **Strengthening East-West Cooperation:** The improved relationship between Eastern and Western blocs offers a unique opportunity to develop a cooperative global economic framework. Enhanced dialogue and joint initiatives can help mitigate the risks of geopolitical tensions and support sustainable economic growth. This cooperation must focus on shared challenges, such as climate change and technological advancements, requiring a collective approach that transcends national interests (Blosomstorm, 1988).
6. **Public Control of Multinational Corporations** (MNCs)**: Given the growing influence of MNCs, it is essential for national governments and international bodies to implement stronger regulatory measures. Public oversight can ensure that corporate activities align with broader social and economic goals, reducing the risk of exploitation and protecting national sovereignty. International frameworks for corporate

governance, such as stricter compliance standards and fair taxation policies, should be established to mitigate the adverse impacts of unchecked corporate power (Ciment, 1999).

Recommendations

In light of the observations, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Adopt Inclusive Economic Policies:** International bodies like the IMF and World Bank should implement reforms that provide greater representation for developing countries in decision-making processes. This includes revising voting rights and creating advisory panels from the Global South to ensure that policies reflect diverse economic realities (Collier, 2007).
2. **Promote Regional Economic Integration:** Developing countries should enhance regional trade agreements and economic integration to reduce reliance on Northern markets. Strengthening economic ties within the Global South will increase self-sufficiency and foster shared economic growth, reducing vulnerability to external economic pressures (Pearson, 1992).
3. **Encourage Sustainable Foreign Aid Practices:** Foreign aid should be depoliticized and focused on long-term developmental goals rather than short-term political gains. Adopting principles of transparency and accountability, as outlined in the UN Pearson Committee's report "Partners in Development," will help ensure aid is distributed based on genuine need rather than strategic interests. This would align with ethical guidelines, avoiding the political manipulation of aid (UNO Year Book, 2000).
4. **Enhance Regulatory Frameworks for MNCs:** National and international regulatory bodies must establish comprehensive guidelines for MNC operations, focusing on labour rights, environmental standards, and equitable taxation. By enforcing compliance through international cooperation, countries can protect their economic interests and reduce the social costs of corporate influence (Nzenwa, 2005).
5. **Strengthen Global Cooperation on Crisis Management:** International organizations must prioritize multilateral responses to crises, combining economic relief with political solutions. Collaborative frameworks that integrate the expertise of various international agencies can provide a more effective response to complex challenges, supporting both economic recovery and political stability (Blosomstorm, 1988).

In conclusion, addressing the politics of international economic relations requires a nuanced approach that balances economic, social, and political considerations. By implementing these recommendations, the global community can work towards a fairer, more stable international economic system, fostering constructive interdependence and sustainable growth for all participating nations.

REFERENCES

Blomstrom, M. (1930), *Development Theory in Transition: The Dependency Debate and Beyond.* Third World Responses, London, Zed Booka.

Brandt, W. (1980), *North-South: A Programme for Survival*, London: Plan Books Ltd.

Campbell, Grey (2005). *The Price of Barrel of Oil and Economic Diplomacy in Nigeria*, Daily Times of Nigeria.

Ciment, J. (ed), (1999), *Encyclopedia of Conflicts Since World War II*, Vol. 2, London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publisher.

Collier, P. (2007), *The Bottom Billion; Why the Poorest Countries are Falling and What Can be Done About It;* London: Oxford University press.

Guetzkow, Harold (1963), *Stimulation in International Relations*, Prentice Hall

Englewood Cliffs.

Immanuel, W. (1979), *The Capitalist World Economy*: London, Cambridge University Press.

Knorr Kalu, (1975). *The Political Economy of International Relations*. New York: Basic Books, Inc Publisher.

Lewis, P. (1994), The Politics of Economics: Africa Report, May/June.

Lipset, S. M. (1963), *Political Man*: Garden City, New York. The Social Basis of Politics. Doubleday.

Mackenze, W. J. M. (1969), *Politics and Social Sciences*, Penguin Books. London.

Miss, L. S. (1985), "*Mercantilism in Adam Smith and Jessica Cupper* .The Social Science Encyclopedia, London: Oxford Rosl (eds). University Press

Nzenwa, B. N. (2015), *Political Sociology, (Analysis of Fundamental Concepts*), Centre for Research and Manpower Development (CREMD) Owerri (in print)

Osagie, E. (1988). *A survey of the Nigerian Economy Since Independence*, in G. O. Ostheimer, John M. (1973) Nigerian Politics, New York, Harper and Rostow Publishers.

Pearson, (1992), *International Relations: The Global Condition in the Late Twentieth Century*, New York McGraw-Hill Inc.

Robert, T. Holt & John, E. Turner (1966), *The Political Basis of Economic Development*, Van Nostrand, Princeton.

Rostow, W. W. (1972). *Politics and the Stages of Growth*, M. I. T. press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Sachdev & Gupta, (1977), *A Simple Study of International Relations and Affairs*, Ajanta Prakashan, Delhi -1 1 0006.

Smith, Adam. (1776) *The Wealth of Nations*. Modern Edition: Edited by Edwin Cannan, University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Spero, J. and Hart, M. (2003), *The Politics of International Economic Relations*, 6th Ed, Belmont California: Thompson Wads Worth.

Taylor, T. (1979), *Approaches and Theory in International Relations*, London: Longman Group Ltd.

UNCTAD World Investment Report, (1993)

United Nations Year Book 2000.

United Nations Year Book 2015.

Walerstin, I. (1979). *The Capitalist World.* Cambridge's University Press. Economny: London,