Reinventing Strategies for Political Restructuring as Panacea for Developing States in World Politics

Offor, E. Ogbonnaya and Udeuhele, Godwin Ikechukwu
Department of Political Science
Ebonyi State University, P.M.B 053, Abakaliki.

ABSTRACT
Developing states in world politics connote less developed countries (LDCs) and in other context called colonised states which are engulfed in the web of dependence and inequality in the global economic cum political configurations and relevance; and by implication conditioned as hewers of woods and drawers of waters in the scheme of things in world politics. The study sets out to assess how political restructuring of the developing states can be used as strategies/criteria in reducing global inequality in global politics. In achieving this feat, the study adopts qualitative research method via explanatory research design, documentary method of data collection, and qualitative descriptive method of data analysis. The study is anchored on the fragile state theory. The study argues that states' weaknesses and inequalities begin at the domestic/national level and manifest at the international level. The study deciphered amongst others that the foreign policy plank of states and the domestic needs, interests, and character of states especially the new states, determine to a large extent how other states in the globe perceive them, hence competition and equalisation become problematic. The study recommends the developing states should through political restructuring build virile and vibrant political institutions competitive and comparable, to that of the developed states. Developing states should completely encourage economic and technological development. The new states should strive towards eliminating bad leadership, as it has been agreed that leadership is one of the major challenges of the underdeveloped and developing states towards development. Thus, everything rises and falls on leadership.
KEYWORDS: Political Restructuring, Developing States, Inequality, Fragile State, and Global/World Politics.

I.   INTRODUCTION

The notion of state became better understood as a fall-out of the Westphalia Peace or Treaty in 1648. Since then, the old states and/or developed countries as they are called today, began to evolve progressively through industrialisations, economic development, and socio-cultural advancement, building military capabilities and political stability and viability. These factors necessitated the transpositions of the old states or advanced countries into mercantilism through state-craft, which also brought about economic imperialism and later colonialism in the continents of Africa, Latin or South America, Asia, and Australia or Oceania.

Whereas, mercantilism/imperialism concerned economic penetrations, explorations, exploitations and unequal exchange of goods by the Europeans against the naïve/virgin markets of the New Worlds of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Colonialism on the other hand, entailed the political domination, occupation and control by the developed states of Europe over nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America. By implication, the global political configurations became stratified into the oppressors and the oppressed (solidified in Africa by the Berlin Conference of 1884/1885). By the end of the 19th century many nations of the Third World became fully occupied by the European colonialists. Nigeria, for example was fully occupied by Britain in 1900 (Okolie, 2010).

After the 1st and 2nd World Wars, the map of the world was redrawn paving way for the emergence and creation of new states. In the same vein, colonial independence of states also necessitated the emergence of some new states in the global arena. More so, the end of the Cold War between the Capitalist West and the Socialist East, saw to the disintegration and collapse of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1991 paving way for the emergence of more states in the global politics. However, it will be interesting to note that the end of the 1st and 2nd World Wars created a sharp division of the world into three coalitions, viz.: First World (US, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, etc.); Second World (the defeated states like Russia or USSR, Japan, China, Korea, Cuba etc.) and the Third World (which was formerly made up of all the neutralised states, but presently include countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America who did not fully participate in the World Wars

---

and are current facing development challenges; with the attributed concepts like:undeveloped states, underdeveloped states and developing states).

These underdeveloped and developing states are all engulfed in the web of dependence and inequality in the global economic cum political configurations and relevance. Hence, global inequality is a manifestation of the domestic/national character of states and are consequently transposed to the international system. There is no gain saying the fact that Third world countries are impoverished in many ways, vis-à-vis less underdeveloped economy, political instability, lack of political will of leaders, leadership ineptitude, fragility of the states' institutions gearing towards collapse/disintegration, weak or absence of democratic institutions, gross human rights abuses and violations, decreased life expectancy, low human development index (HDI), high rate of dependency burden, increased unemployment, rentier states/consumer states, weak state capacity to combat crimes, ethnicity, religiosity, nepotism, mediocrity, corruption and the like. These domestic indicators or indices and/or unit of analysis of the Third World states, consequently give these states the status in global politics as underdeveloped or developing countries (Okolie, 2010).

The problematique of this treatise is encapsulated in the persistent inequality of the new states in global politics. The world is more unequal today than at any point since World War II. Inequality has been jeopardizing economic growth and poverty reduction of the developing states, and recent times occasioned by globalisation, economic internationalism, neoliberalism and neo-colonialism. This inequality has been stalling progress in education, health and nutrition for large swathes of the population, thus undermining the very human capabilities necessary for achieving a good life, as the new or developing states are still firmly tied to the apron-strings of the developed, old or imperial states. Ipso facto, it has been limiting opportunities and access to economic, social and political resources of the new/developing states in the global arena.

Furthermore, in developing states, inequality has been driving conflict and destabilizing societies. When incomes and opportunities rise for only a few or states, when inequalities persist over time and space and across generations, then those at the margins, who remain so consistently excluded from the gains of development, will at some point contest the 'progress' that has bypassed them. Although, this conflict has been glaring in the theoretical revolutions and debates of development between the modernisation theorists and the dependency theorists (UNDP, 2013).

Albeit, the new states especially those that are highly underdeveloped or developing are the worst affected in the globalization project; the reason being that they are largely technologically backward and are therefore predisposed to consumption than production. In view of this and along with the monopolization of the international economy by those who produce (in this case, the industrialized countries), the dictate of the trade movement is at the advantage of the producing countries and the efforts made by some underdeveloped or developing new states are often sabotaged by the old or imperial states (Olayode, 2006).

Globalization is one of such grand strategies of sabotage used by the industrialized (old states) against the less industrialized (new states). In fact, all the nemeses of the ancient slavery, naked colonialism, coded neo-colonialism and imperialism have been summarized in globalization. The implication of the foregoing is that, the world politics is still characterized by inequalities and exploitations of the highest order executed with unmitigated impunity where might is right (Nwagwu & Ugwueze, 2014).

It is against this background that this study seeks to bring to the fore the place of politics in mitigating or reducing imbalance in global network of interactions by the new states (i.e. underdeveloped and developing states).

II.   CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

The Concept of Developing/New States

According to Egwu (2018) the concept if new states is a benign way of christening the states of the Third World, underdeveloped and/or developing states in the global politics. It is defined as those states which have recently acquired self-rule or political independence over its own affairs. In other words, new states are colonised states. According to Nwagwu & Ugwueze (2014) new states are not only those that are new in terms of age subject to when they secured political independence and self-rule, but also those whose developmental strides are still at the rudimentary level.

Hence, the understanding of new states in the international system is synonymous with their level of development because that is what determines the capacity of states to assert themselves in the global politics. States that are developed also have and wield more powers and are likely to benefit more in the global resources whose territorial location and control have been affected by globalization to the disadvantage of less developed ones. In fact, globalization has worsened the continued understanding of the state from the stand-point of sovereignty and if sovereignty remains a cardinal tool for measuring the state, then there are very few states in the international system (Nwagwu & Ugwueze, 2014).

In the light of the above, it can be argued that:

…old states are those ones that can exert greater influence in the international system and whose borders are not as porous as what obtains in many developing states even with the emergence of globalization and information technology; whereas, new states are those states that lack the requisite technology to challenge the old states at the era of globalization (Nwagwu & Ugwueze, 2014, p. 5).

It is from the aforesaid that Nwagwu and Ugwueze (2014) surmised that the following are the indicators of new states, viz.:

•	All new states are post-colonial states
•	All new states are either developing or underdeveloped
•	All new states are mostly found within the continents of Africa, Asia and Latin America
•	All new states are at the receiving end of globalization.

The Concept of Global Politics

Global politics refers to the understanding of political and economic patterns of the world and how they affect the interactions of nation-states. At the epicentre of global politics are the different processes of political globalization in relation to questions of social, political cum economic powers. Global politics explains the relationships between cities, nation-states, shell-states, multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations and international organizations (Jan-Erik, 2006). Common areas of discussions in global politics include national and ethnic conflict regulation, democracy and the politics of national self-determination, globalization and its relationship to democracy, conflict and peace studies, comparative politics, political economy, and the international political economy of the environment. One important area of global politics is contestation in the global political sphere over legitimacy, dominance, relevance, equality, etc. (James, & Van, 2014).

The Concept of Global Inequality

According to the World Social Science Report (2016), there exists seven dimensions of inequality within a state and in global interactions. They are:

Political inequality: This is defined as the differentiated capacity for individuals and groups to influence political decision-making processes and to benefit from those decisions, even in political systems with open processes and procedural equality between citizens. Political inequality also refers to unequal opportunity to enter into political action. It typically refers to the idea that certain 'voices' resonate louder in political debates, and others are not heard at all.

Economic inequality: This refers to differences between levels of incomes, assets, wealth and capital, and living standards, including inequalities in employment. Whereas poverty and extreme poverty are usually determined according to a threshold (such as 60 percent of median income, or US$1.90 or less per day), inequality is a relative appreciation of the economic situation of individuals and groups within societies.

Social inequality: This refers to the differences between the social statuses of different population groups such as classes, castes, or age groups. It refers to systemic imbalances rooted in the functioning of social institutions, such as education, health, justice and social protection. These disparities in roles, functions, decisions, rights and their determinants affect the level and quality of access to services and protection for different groups, as well as life chances and the capacity to aspire to and attain certain outcomes.

Cultural inequality: This refers to differences in status between identity-based groups (self-determined, socially constructed or both). Cultural inequalities encompass discriminations based on gender, ethnic and racialised categorizations, religion, disability and other group identities, rooted in cultural justifications and historic practices. For analytical purposes in this Report, social institutions are associated primarily with the production of social inequality, yet their role in maintaining and reproducing inequality between identity-based groups is also important.

Environmental inequality: This covers the full range of differences and disparities in the quality of the environment to which individuals and groups have access. It refers to levels of environmental protection, access to natural resources and opportunities to benefit from their exploitation, and exposure to pollution and to risks of natural hazards and disasters. It also covers capacities to adapt to climate change and to adopt more sustainable ways of living, and the capacity to influence and shape decision-making relating to environmental issues.

Spatial inequality: This is used to describe disparities in economic activity and income across spaces, typically between centres and peripheries, between urban and rural areas, and between regions with more or less useful resources. It often entails unequal access to services and knowledge, and discriminations and inequities in political influence. Spatial and regional divisions may interact with economic, political or ethnic divisions, and foster social and political protest.

Knowledge inequality: This comprises the numerous factors influencing access to different sources and types of knowledge, as well as the consequences of these disparities, as was addressed in the International Social

Science Council (ISSC) World Social Science Report (WSSR) 2010: Knowledge Divides. It also includes the question of whose knowledge counts and what types of knowledge are considered most important. Knowledge inequalities between individuals and groups affect the capacity to make informed decisions, to access services and to participate in political life. There is often a correlation with spatial inequality, whereby peripheries with lesser access to knowledge are also less known (subjects of fewer studies, with poorer data, and so on).

Political Restructuring

The concept of political restructuring has become cliché or catch-phrase in households and amongst theorists. Yet, mostly misinterpreted, misrepresented by those who should understand and work for its actualisation in the interest of peace and progress of any state. According to Njakku (2016) political restructuring means rearrangement, reorganisation or reformation of the polity. It is not entirely a new term in nation-sates but it is increasingly gaining currency amongst many people especially in the developing states and their on-going democratic experiment.

For instance, in Nigeria as a developing state, political restructuring is an idea perceived differently by scholars, commentators and Nigerians in general. To some, it is a secret weapon by a section to break up the country so that others would not have access to the oil and gas resources, because the mainstay of the economy is available only in one part of the country. Others perceive political restructuring as a means to overhaul the polity, to achieve economic viability/development and global relevance, beginning from constitution amendment that captures regionalisation, or regional autonomy, state creation to equalise all the geopolitical zones, rotational presidency, and adoption of fiscal/true federalism (Njakku, 2016).

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study adopted Fragile State theory as its theoretical framework of analysis. Fragile state, similar to failed, weak or collapsed states, is an analytical category that originated in the work of Migdal, Joel S. (1988), and gained prominence from the mid1990s onwards and got further traction after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in US. Fundamentally, proponents of the theory, policy-makers, and academics alike hold that the potential for contemporary conflict is harboured within the state, not between states (Midgal, 1988). Proponents of the theory include: David Carment; Stewart Prest; Yiagadeesen Samy; Lewis, Alexandra; Siqueira, Isabel Rocha De; Baliamoune Lutz; Robert, H.J. and Carl, G.R. etc.

Migdal stated the expansion of European economy and world trade in the 19th century led to drastic changes in people's strategies of survival in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (Migdal, 1988). State policies enforced by Europeans, including land tenure laws, taxation and new modes of transportation, changed people's life situation and needs in these countries rapidly and deeply. Old rewards, sanctions and symbols became irrelevant under the new situation and previous social control and institutions were eroded.

However, unlike Western Europe in the earlier centuries, these countries did not establish a new concentration of social and cultural control as the base of a strong and capable state. This is because although these countries had the necessary condition for creating a strong state - old social control weakened by the world trade before World War I - they did not have the sufficient conditions (Robert, and Carl, 1989). Migdal (1988, p. 270) enunciated these conditions as:

…(1) world historical timing that encourages concentrated social control; (2) military threat either from outside or within the country; (3) the basis for an independent bureaucracy; (4) skilful top leadership that would take advantage of all the above conditions in the state.

A fragile state is a country characterized by weak state capacity and/or weak state legitimacy leaving citizens vulnerable to a range of shocks. Some states are trapped in a vicious cycle of violent conflict and poverty or suffer from a natural resource 'curse'; others face a legacy of poor governance; many emerging from crisis cannot deliver even the most basic services to their citizens. In terms of dynamics, fragile states include: (i) Post-conflict/crisis or political transition situations, (ii) deteriorating governance environments, (iii) Situations of gradual improvement, and (iv) Situations of prolonged crisis or impasse. A fragile state is significantly susceptible to crisis in one or more of its sub-systems. It is a state that is particularly vulnerable to internal and external shocks and domestic and international conflicts. In a fragile state, institutional arrangements embody and perhaps preserve the conditions of crisis (Robert, and Carl, 1989; Wikipedia, 2017).

This theory is apt and applicable to this study because it tends to explain the reason why the new states like countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia have been continually weakened from within and from without (i.e. internal and external factors) in their quest or bid to join the globally developed states. Thus, myriads of tractable, yet intractable development factors/indicators subsist due to the negligence of African, Latin American, and Asian leadership and the demeaning or debasing character of the new states. The theory x-rays for example, the failure and/or fragility inherent in the African states' structure and the crises bedevilling virtually all aspects of the states especially in the socio-cultural, economic, and political sphere of its existence. All these, are pointers or indicators to the weak states' capacity to escape the doldrums of global inequality inherent in the global economic cum political configurations and/or structures.

IV. ANALYTICAL DISCUSSIONS

Old/New States and Global Political Inequality

Today, states are much more varied in their capacity and capability than they use to be before the World Wars. They are more numerous than they were a half century ago, and the range of their population sizes, physical endowments, wealth, productivity, delivery systems, ambitions, and attainments are much more extensive than ever before. In 1914, in the wake of the crumbling of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires, there were fifty-five recognized national politics or states. In 1919, the number of states increased to fifty-nine nations. In 1950, the number reached sixty-nine. A decade later, after the attainment of independence in much of Africa, the states became ninety (Rotberg, 2005; in Matthew, 2014).

After many more African, Asian, and Oceanic territories had become independent, and after the implosion of the Soviet Union, the number of nations jumped to 191; East Timor's independence in 2002 brought the total global states to 192. Given such explosive numbers, the inherent fragility of many of the newly recruited states in the global arena is interminably gobsmacking. In Africa, fifteen of Africa's fifty-four states are landlocked, there is inherent navigational perils of the post–Cold War economic and political terrain, the possibility of failure among a subset of the rest remains ever present in the continent (Rotberg, 2005; in Matthew, 2014).

New states, for example in continent of Africa like Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa, Ivory Coast, and the like have been increasingly marginalized especially with the massive development in the world of science and technology. Echoing their views, Nwagwu and Ugwueze (2014) surmised that the development conditionality prescribed by the developed or old states is obnoxious and thus:

…carries with it other political and economic implications of proportional concern to scholars while discussing the challenges of new states in the world politics. Hence, the new states especially those of Africa, Asia and Latin America have suffered unrestrained political cum economic exploitations clothed in many foreign diplomatic relations that are in most cases hostile to both the people and the environment (Nwagwu & Ugwueze, 2014).

At a time, it was called slavery, at other times, colonialism and neo-colonialism but the most permeating contemporary avatar that is eroding the sovereignty of many new states in the international system is globalization. Due largely to the rudimentary development of science and technology in the new states, they are unable to bargain favourably in the international division of labour and the social wealth it produces (Nwagwu and Ugwueze, 2014)

The complexity and multi-dimensionality of the drivers of inequality in global politics call for complex and multi-dimensional responses. In fact, only genuinely holistic approaches can fully address the multiple factors that cause inequality and create the conditions for a truly inclusive global economic/power structures. Such approaches must shape growth and development so that home grown economy can boost market outcomes and deliver shared prosperity (Robert, & Carl, 1989; UNDP, 2013).

The Pressure of the Substructure over the Superstructure in Global Politics and the Place of the New States

The inter-play of politics and economics cannot be over stressed; little wonder Karl Marx averred in his discourse on dialectical materialism that in political economy the substructure (economy, capital, money, wealth etc.) to a large extent, exert overbearing influence on the superstructure (politics, legal, ideology, religion etc.). However, in the study of global political economy, political inequality is causally related to rising economic inequality within a state or in global relations; this is the central claim of an influential set of American political scientists who have been at the forefront of debates about political inequality, including Martin Gilens, Larry Bartels, Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson (Robert, and Carl, 1989; Mathew, 2014).

Increased inequality is not simply the result of blind economic dynamics. Rather, it is the outcome of policy choices in a political system where the better organised and resourced interests of the wealthy have disproportionate influence on political decisions. Political inequality, differing levels of access, influence and voice between citizens, therefore constitutes and reinforces other forms of inequality. For example, Gilens (2012) argues that American policymakers respond overwhelmingly to the preferences of the well-off. Analysing thousands of proposed policy changes, he suggests that the preferences of affluent Americans exhibit a strong relationship with eventual policy outcomes, regardless of what the majority of Americans think.

By contrast, when middle and low income Americans differ from the affluent in their preferences, policy almost always follows the preferences of the wealthy. As a result, political representation effectively functions for the affluent; it is their voices that are heard (Mathew, 2014). However, the underdeveloped and developing states are significantly underrepresented in global politics, with their views markedly less influential upon global policy formation, except in times when they share the preferences of the wealthy. Indeed, when it comes to policy outcomes, Gilens (2012, p. 12) submits that:

…the views of the affluent make a big difference, while support among the developing states and the underdeveloped have virtually no relationship to global policy outcomes or decisions. The consistent

unresponsiveness of the global political system to the preferences of developing and underdeveloped states differ from the economic development and is therefore a signal of political inequality.

Larry Bartels in his study, makes a similar argument about unequal democracy: The political economy of the new gilded age (Bartels, 2008), which claims that while growing economic inequality has multiple causes, 'economic inequality is, in substantial part, a political one'. Foreshadowing, Gilens (2012) argues that the American political system for instance, is dominated by her economic interests as a wealthy state over emerging or competitive states, despite vague ceremonial equality of states in global political system. Gilens (2012) also shows that politics remains vital in shaping how income growth is distributed. This growing income gap is rooted in political decisions and processes of individual states, highlighting how unequal representation in global politics is occasioned by leadership, policy choices, etc. influence and helped propel global political cum economic inequality (Mathew, 2014).

The Politics of United Nations (UN) and the New States
United Nations is an intergovernmental organisation whose aim is to achieve peace and security in the world through inter-governmental cooperation. At its inception there were 51 members in the organisation which at present has increased to 193. Among them, many developing countries are members of the organisation and are contributing in their capacity towards the stated goals like sustainable development, environment protection, peace keeping operations, and human rights and counter terrorism activities etc.

Among the above goals, Peace keeping operations are one of the prominent activities of UN where developing countries like India, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Bangladesh contribute significantly through their troops. UN mission in Congo, Somalia have peace keeping troops which oversee the ceasefire agreement. India has also established a training centre to develop modules to train peace keeping force. Developing countries have also contributed toward the fight against climate change. Despite domestic commitment of meeting energy demands and resource constraints, countries like India, Brazil have taken significant voluntary commitments Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC's) to fight climate change. Developing grouping like India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA) Dialogue Forum have been instrumental in achieving the Paris climate agreement (FOCUSIAS, 2017).

Similarly, developing countries, being inflicted with wide spread poverty, under development, pollution, malnutrition, have partnered with UN to develop millennium development goals (MDGs) and presently, sustainable development goals (SDG's) to improve the developmental prospects. Countries like India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA) Dialogue Forum have been pushing for counter terror cooperation among members. India has drafted Comprehensive Convention of International Terrorism (CCIT) to evolve a common definition of terrorism and fight against the menace in collective way. However, along with cooperation, developing countries also want to bring the much needed Security Council reforms in the UN to make it more democratic, they also call to end the human right violation which has made countries like Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen a victim of geo-political ambitions of superpower (FOCUSIAS, 2017).

UN is the only body in the world which has near universal membership. It sets an example for how to conduct global governance. Liberal institutionalist like Woodrow Wilson hoped for this type of institutions for peace and security. This body (UN), has in its membership, states of first, second and third worlds.

Some roles played by the third world in UN according to FOCUSIAS (2017) include:
1.   Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) countries can be seen as third world. They constitute 2/3 of UN. This organisation raised issues: self-determination, nuclear disarmament, sovereignty and territorial integrity.
2.   L-69 group of developing countries is advocating for UNSC reforms.
3.   Members of this world elected as non-permanent members of Security Council.
4.   Demand for New International Economic Order was raised.
5.   Common but differentiated responsibilities in the context of environmental protection was raised. Partial success can be seen from Paris Accord.
6.   Largely contributed to UN Peace Keeping Forces.
7.   Respect to UN charter and formulation of foreign policies in compliance to UN charter.

However, there are drawbacks with the role of third world, as it can be seen from the extent of influence on realization of outcomes.
1.   UNSC reforms have not taken place even after demanding for decades.
2.   Veto for permanent 5 (P5) nations in UNSC has threatened national interests of Palestine.
3.   Ineffectiveness of UN can be seen from 2003 Iraq invasion by US, North Korea's aggression, Crimean war, rise of ISIS and Nuclear proliferation.
4.   UN Peace Keeping efforts back-fired many times in time of civil war.
5.   Third world has not raised many issues like Syrian refugee crisis, Vietnam War and Israel-Palestine conflict.
6.   Human Rights violations cases in Syria etc. (FOCUSIAS, 2017).

The role of third world in raising demands is influential but outcomes related to demands are not matching to that extent. There is gap in theory and practice. Nevertheless, more than 50% membership of third world shows importance of its role in bringing peace, security and stability in the world (FOCUSIA, 2017).

However United Nations performance vis-à-vis Human rights and international peace has not been up to the mark. The UN peace keeping operations have been a positive but insufficient step in direction towards peace. Its peacekeeping missions have limited mandate and have been accused of criminal activities. The UN has also failed to protect the human rights in various nations in Iraq, Libya, and Syrian war. Its responsibility and doctrine to protect has been misused by Western Nations (advanced states) to stake geo-strategic and geo-economic advantage of the situation. UN has also not been able to evolve a common consensus among nations against terrorism.

The underlying cause for such failure is the undemocratic UN structure which is dominated by the Western Nations. The Permanent 5 members of Security Council hold disproportionate power to set UN agenda and actions as a result UN has become embroiled in power politics. In this context there have been questions over the relevance of UN in 21st century, and the position of the new states. Ipso facto, new states have been grappling and contesting for their inclusion to the UN Security Council, all to no avail, due to the global power that be and the way the old states perceive the new states (FOCUSIAS, 2017).

Politics as a Tool for Reducing Inequality in Global Politics: The African Perspective

Politics forms the hallmark of all state's micro and macro activities, as virile or robust governmental policy formulations and implementations can elevate the entire aspects of the state to limelight through sound political will of those wielding or entrusted with state's power. Thus, in bridging the gap of inequality between the Global-North (old states) and the Global-South (new states), there has to be home grown political thoughts that can transpose into home grown economic development through proactive, and active leadership, absence of sit-tight syndrome, rapid industrialisation, tackle unemployment and health-care deficiencies, war against bigotry-mind-set, beggarly attitude and corruption. It is when these measures are tackled, that new states can move towards filling the yawning global economic cum political gap/inequality; such as can be seen in China, Singapore, Japan, Indonesia, South Korea etc.

The foreign policy plank of states and the domestic needs, interests, and character of states especially the new states, determine to a large extent how other states in the globe perceive them. In Nigeria for example, the issues rocking and bedevilling her body-politic have ab-initio given her the 'negative name as giant at home but dwarf abroad' (Offor, Nwankwo, & Nnaji, 2017).

Table 1. Political Indicators needed in the Reduction of Global Inequality

Indicators	Rationale	Description
1. Government Effectiveness	This indicator is among the most direct measures available of the strength and quality of state institutions, which are essential for the provision of public goods and the formulation and implementation of sound policies.	Government effectiveness measures the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.
2. Rule of Law	The state's ability to govern on the basis of legitimate public norms and institutions is a strong indicator of the likelihood of long-term political stability.	Rule of law measures the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, in particular the quality of contract enforcement, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.
3. Control of Corruption	Responsibly governed states are able to prevent the diversion of public resources from core state functions. Extensive corruption erodes state institutions and curtails investments in public goods.	Control of corruption measures the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as 'capture' of the state by elites and private interests.
4. Voice & Accountability	States that have mechanisms in place for peaceful dissent, transfer of power and policy reform, and are less prone to political instability in the long term.	Voice and accountability (as named in Governance Matters) measures the "extent to which a country's citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media.
5. Freedom/	States with fewer civil liberties and	Political Freedom produces a score for civil liberties

Civil Liberty	political rights tend to be more susceptible to destabilizing events.	and political rights for each country.

Source: Susan & Stewart (2008); modified by the Authors.

In table 1 above, Government Effectiveness, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, Voice and Accountability, and a measure of Political and Civil Liberties, which we shorthand as "freedom" are the empirical indicators which allow us to capture the quality and effectiveness of state institutions, as well as the government's legitimacy and accountability to its citizens and global perception of such state or states. These indicators are germane in the tackling and/or reduction of global inequality of the new states.

Table 2. Political/Security Indicators needed in the Reduction of Global Inequality

Indicators	Rationale	Description
1. Conflict Intensity	The presence of intense violent conflict is an indication of the state's inability to maintain peace within its borders and provide basic physical and human security.	The indicator scores are based on several factors, including: state capabilities, interactive intensity (means and goals), area and scope of death and destruction, population displacement, and episode duration.
2. Political Stability and Absence of Violence	Widespread perceptions of political instability in a country are considered a good indication of a state's actual stability.	Political Stability and Absence of Violence measures the "perceptions of the likelihood that the government will be destabilized or overthrown by unconstitutional or violent means, including domestic violence and terrorism.
3. Incidence of Coups and Violent Regime Change	States that have experienced extra constitutional or violent overthrow are by definition highly unstable, and likely to lack the political mechanisms, characteristic of a strong state, that ensure peaceful transition of power.	- Leader removed by domestic rebel forces (i.e. Republic of Congo, 1997). - Leader removed by domestic military actors (i.e. Pakistan, 1999). - Leader removed by other domestic government actors (i.e. Lesotho, 1994) etc.
4. Gross Human Rights Abuses	Regimes that rely on widespread oppression and terror to maintain power may, among other things, be susceptible to internal discontent and instability.	Unlawful arrests, practices of imprisonment for political activity, politically-motivated executions, political murders, disappearances, and torture that affect a large portion of the population and are a common part of life; unlimited detention, with or without trial, for political views is also commonplace.
5. Territory Affected by Conflict	In the absence of an authoritative measure of ungoverned spaces across countries, this is the best available indicator for a state's ability to exercise its sovereignty and maintain a monopoly on the use of armed force across the entirety of its territory.	Revolutionary wars are defined as episodes of violent conflict between governments and politically organized groups (political challengers) that seek to overthrow the central government, to replace its leaders, or to seize power in one region; whereas, ethnic wars are defined as episodes of violent conflict between governments and national, ethnic, religious, or other communal minorities (ethnic challengers) in which the challengers seek major changes in their status.

Source: Susan & Stewart (2008); modified by the Author.

Table 2 above captures the security indicators, such as: Conflict Intensity, Political Stability and the Absence of Conflict, Incidence of Coups, Gross Human Rights Abuses, and Territory Affected by Conflict. These five indicators measure the presence of different types of political violence in a country, from civil war to gross human rights violations (such as mass atrocities). The Territory Affected by Conflict indicator provides a measure of a state's ability to maintain peace and security across the entirety of its territory. When all these indices are tackled by the developing states, then it will, to a greater extent pursue global competiveness and positive recognitions and global ranking.

V.   CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an attempt to establish the gap of political equality in world politics and bring to the fore the role of politics in reducing global political inequality by new states. The struggle and/or inequality has been variously defined as between the rich versus the poor, the global North versus the global South, developed countries versus undeveloped. The protagonists are the advanced industrial nations (Western Europe, North America and Japan) versus the nations of the 'Third World' (Latin America, Africa and Asia), an extraordinarily diverse group that, for the moment at least, has achieved solidarity for what it sees as its common purpose. Conflict between the two groups has taken on the proportions of global class war.

Hence, global political inequality requires the revival of political and governmental institutions of the new states through inclusive democratic politicking. However, institutional democratic equality, as represented through free, competitive elections, is not enough, but the threshold for virile and vibrant economic policies and implementations of same will somewhat suffice. New states also need expanded and deepened forms of citizen participation and deliberation in broader social life to challenge inequalities of influence that arise from concentrations of wealth, access and power lopsidedly. Just as Cohen and Fung (2004, p. 6) argued that:

Capacity building and people's deliberation and contributions can blunt the power of greater resources with the force of better arguments and participation, because shifting the basis of political contestation from organised money to organised people is the most promising antidote to the influence conferred by wealth especially in the new states.

Albeit, any legitimate mass democracy must therefore necessarily be organised as a system of competitive representation, but a richer democratic life requires more than simply formal representative democracy if it is to address political inequality both within and abroad.

Ipso facto, the following recommendations are made thus:

1.   Developing states (new states) should restructure their domestic institutions by building virile and vibrant political institutions competitive and comparable to that of the developed states (old states).

2.   The new states should strive towards eliminating bad leadership, as it has been agreed that leadership is one of the major challenges of the underdeveloped and developing states towards development. Thus, everything (whether good or bad) rises and falls on leadership.

3.   The new states should completely encourage economic/ technological development and home-grown economy in order to be self-reliant and self-sufficient. In doing so, they will gain political relevance and respect globally and in global politics too. As it has been argued that the economic and technological viability of any state determines the wealth and power it wields abroad.

4.   Political corruption is an endemic factor that has contributed to the back-seat positions of the new states. Hence, the new states should exterminate political corruption with all its might in order to gain global acceptance.

5.   Developing states should muster the political will and courage in engaging the developed states with the following diplomatic strategies or tools such as: sound diplomatic representations where/when necessary; severing of diplomatic ties when necessary; issue-linkages or issue-separation; treaties; coalition and alliance formations when necessary etc.

REFERENCES

[1].   Bartels, L. (2008). *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*, Princeton: University Press.

[2].   Cohen, J., and Fung, A. (2004). Radical Democracy. *Swiss Journal of Political Science*. 10, (4). http://www.archonfung.net/papers/Cohen_Fung_Debate_SPSR2004.pdf

[3].   Egwu, J.U. (2018). New States in World Politics. Unpublished Lecture Series on Pol 810, *Department of Political Science, Ebonyi State University*, Abakaliki.

[4].   FOCUSIAS, (2017). Examine the Role of the Third World in the United Nations. *Political Science and International Relations' Daily Answer Writing Initiative -W12/Day5*. Available online at http://www.focusias.com/2-examine-role-third-world-united-nations-20-marks/

[5].   Gilens, M. (2012). *Affluence and Influence, Economic Inequality and Political Power in America,* Princeton: University Press.

[6].   James, P., Van, S. P. (2014*). Globalization and Politics, Global Social Movements and Global Civil Society, Vol. 2*. London: Sage Publications.

[7].   Jan-Erik, L. (2006). *Globalization and Politics: Promises and Dangers*. Aldershot: Ashgate Press.

[8].   Mathew, L. (2014). Political Inequality Why British Democracy Must be Reformed and Revitalised.*Institute for Public Policy Research*.

[9].   Migdal, J.S. (1988). *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton: University Press.

[10]. Najakku, A. (2016). The Politics of Restructuring. *Nigeria;Daily Trust News* Paper Publication, 2 August.

[11]. Nwagwu, E.J., and Ugwueze, M.I. (2014). New States in World Politics: Prospects and Challenges. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR-JHSS)*. 19, (10): 01-11. Online at www.iosrjournals.org

[12]. Offor, E.O., Nwankwo, O.U., and Nnaji, F.C. (2017). A Critical Reflection of Citizen Diplomacy in Nigeria's Foreign Policy and External Relations. A Conference Paper Presented at *National Political Science Association (NPSA) South-East Chapter*, held Abia State University, Uturu.

[13]. Okolie, A. (2010). Nigeria's Role in Peacekeeping in Africa: ECOMOG, Chad, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. In A.M. Jega and J.W. Farris (Eds.) *Nigeria at Fifty: Contributions to Peace, Democracy and Development*. Abuja: The Shehu Musa Yar'Adua Foundation.

[14]. Olayode, K. (2006). Globalization, Sustainable Development and State Capacity in Africa. *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*. 32, (1): 9-27.

[15]. Robert, H.J. and Carl, G.R. (1989). Why Africa's Weak States Persist: The Empirical and the Juridical in Statehood. *World Politics*, *Cambridge University Press*. 35, (1): 1-24. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2010277

[16]. Susan E.R., and Stewart P. (2008). Index of State Weakness in the Developing World. *Brookings Global Economy and Development. The Brookings Institution* Washington, DC.

[17]. United Nations Development Programmes UNDP, (2013). Humanity Divided: Confronting Inequality in Developing Countries. *United Nations Development Programme Bureau for Development Policy*. Available at www.undp.org/poverty

[18]. Wikipedia, (2017). Fragile State. From Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fragile_state

[19]. World Social Science Report, (2016). *Challenging Inequalities: Pathways to a Just World*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the International Social Science Council (ISSC) Publications.