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INTRODUCTION

The end of the Cold War and its associated ubiquitous ‘superpower rivalry’ was hailed as an opportune moment in the history of international system to promote cooperation between and among states. Specifically, in terms of ‘North-South relations,’ there was great optimism that the end of the Cold War would “untie the proverbial Gordian Knot” that laced the “box” in which ‘North-South’ relations were conducted. The resultant cooperation would then permeate all areas of the relationship between the two development poles—trade, investment, debt, etc. In order to create this ‘new epoch,’ the ‘North’ implored the ‘South’ to get fully integrated into the global capitalist economy, and to embrace the ‘new globalization,’ the post-Cold War phase of international capitalist development. According to the ‘Global North,’ the ‘new globalization’ would be a ‘positive sum game’ in which both the countries of the ‘Global North’ and ‘Global South’ would accrue mutual benefits. However, after more than two decades since the inception of the ‘new globalization,’ the repository of evidence shows that the ‘new globalization’ is cementing the exploitation and marginalization of the ‘Global South.’ In other words, the ‘new globalization’ is expanding the socio-economic gulf between the two poles. As the Draft Algiers Declaration of the Summit Meeting of the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity (now the African Union) correctly notes, “…Ushered in with the promises of progress and prosperity for all, (globalization) has today aroused fears, in that it poses serious threats to our sovereignty, cultural and historical identities as well as gravely undermining our development prospects.”
Clearly, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) was not designed to deal with the challenges and threats that the ‘new globalization’ is posing to the Third World. Instead, NAM was conceived and designed to operate in a Cold War environment that was distinct from its post-Cold War successor, especially in this age of the ‘new globalization.’ Against this background, the central argument of this article is that the Non-Aligned Movement needs to be rethought and reconstituted in light of the realities of the post-Cold War era, especially the intensification of the inherent inequities in the international system during the ‘new globalization.’

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
The article employs two major terms—non-alignment and pooled sovereignty—as its conceptual framework. Non-alignment is defined as an approach to international relations that rejected the ‘Cold War-based’ power bloc politics and its attendant antagonistic relations between and among the members of the opposing camps, and advocated the assertion of the decision-making independence of small and middle powers within a global framework of peaceful co-existence.

Using Mangala’s (2008:116) conceptualization, the study defines pooled sovereignty as “moving the centre of decision-making where both individual states and [the third world] as a whole can better achieve growth, development, peace and stability.”

THEORETICAL MODEL
The pooled sovereignty theory is used as the compass for providing direction for the study. The theory is based on several major arguments. At the vortex is an institutional arrangement in which sovereign states voluntarily transfer the authority over certain national and transnational policy areas to what Clausen and Nichol (2008:5) call a “collective entity.” It is important to note that the participating states maintain their individual sovereignty. In other words, this does not entail the creation of a new ‘super-state’ based on sovereignty only for the ‘centre’ as it is in domestic federal arrangements. Also, the participating states would play pivotal roles in collectively crafting the policies in the areas of collaboration.
Another major pillar is that the ‘collective entity’ consists of various institutions, rules and processes. The institutions are designed to serve as both the arenas for collective policy-making and implementation. The rules delineate, among other things, the specific areas of collective decision-making, and the responsibilities that are assigned to the institutions of the collective entity. Similarly, the processes, inter alia, stipulate the ways in which the collective entity and its institutions make decisions. Overall, the collective entity plays two sets of interlocking roles: It protect and promotes the common good, as well as reconciles and coordinates the various interests of the partner states (Seong-Chang, 2004: 76).

Also, a ‘community behavioral culture’ is critical to the success of the collaboration. Embodying such values as honesty, mutual respect and collective commitment to the greater good of the collectivity, the culture establishes the mutual expectations of the partners. The extent to which members fulfill the mutual expectations that originate from the culture’s values is a major determinant of the probability for the success or failure of the collective entity.

Yet, another major tenet revolves around the issue of the dividends to be accrued by the collaborating member states. Clearly, there are several benefits to be accrued, including ‘burden sharing’, solidarity, economic growth and development. That is, the partnership would yield several benefits at comparatively low transaction costs for the individual members.

HISTORICIZING THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
The end of the Second World War witnessed a major shift in the global ‘balance of power’. The United States and the Soviet Union replaced European states as the two dominant global powers. With their new status as the global ‘superpowers’, the two countries made the determination that it was imperative for them to establish their suzerainty over the world. The resultant imperial competition, which was dubbed the ‘Cold War’, witnessed the undertaking of sustained efforts by the two superpowers to acquire client states to constitute their respective power blocs or ‘spheres of influence’. The two superpowers used various means to acquire and maintain client states and groups—military aid, economic assistance, diplomatic and political support.
The inception of the ‘Cold War’ coincided with the process of decolonization in the Third World. Due to various reasons—ranging from the impact of the anti-colonial struggles to the tension between colonialism and the dominant international capitalist order—the various colonial empires crumbled. Consequently, the various European colonial and imperialist powers were forced to abandon their respective empires (however, Portugal maintained its colonial empire in Africa until 1975). This was followed by a ‘wave of political independence’ that swept through the Third World like a whirlwind. The resultant was the emergence of several new states in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Central and South America.

Excited by the large numbers of independent Third World states, the two superpowers launched ‘full court presses’ to cajole, entice and convince these new states to join their respective ‘power blocs’. However, being cognizant of the polarizing, strangulating and exploitative nature of power politics, some of the leaders of the Third World made the determination that developing states’ interests would best be served by unequivocally rejecting the overtures from the United States and the Soviet Union. Alternatively, a policy of non-alignment was proffered as the Third World’s best route to participating in global politics and affairs. Accordingly, the Non-Aligned Movement was established more than four decades ago as the embodiment of the Third World’s independence and rejection of power politics. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Indian Prime Minister, provides an apt summation of the raisons d’etre for the organization:

*We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to two world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. We seek no domination over others and we claim no privileged position over other people (Nehru, 1946: 1).*

Like every organization, especially of sovereign states, NAM had successes and failures during the ‘Cold War’ era. NAM’s successes revolved around three major areas. First, the organization was a pivotal force in articulating the common issues that confronted small powers in the international system. One of the key issues was the positive role NAM played in pressing for the process of decolonization. As a result of NAM’s sustained efforts, several Third World states gained their
independence from the various European colonial powers. Similarly, as has been argued, NAM deserves credit for the collapse of the diabolical apartheid system and the subsequent emergence of a multiracial South African polity. NAM’s contributions spanned from the exertion of pressure on the Western patrons of the apartheid system in several areas to unswerving support for the forces of self-determination.

NAM also played a critical role in forcing the United States and the other Western powers to make little concessions to Third World states in the area of international trade, beginning in the 1970s. Based on the Third World’s call for the creation of a ‘New International Economic Order,’ NAM in collaboration with the Group of 77 pressured the advanced capitalist states, the ‘movers and shakers’ of the global economy, to establish the ‘Generalized Systems of Preferences’ (GSPs). Under this arrangement, selected exports from Third World countries could enter the domestic markets of the advanced capitalist states free from the imposition of tariffs for particular time intervals.

Another major success was NAM’s gallant role in advocating peaceful coexistence in a global environment that was plagued by the polarizing relationship between the two dominant power blocs. For example, NAM did this by developing cordial relations with the members of the two blocs. This action, among other things, helped to reduce global tensions (Jazia, 2005).

A related success was achieved in the promotion of bilateral arms control between the two superpowers and multilateral agreements among the states of the world. Ultimately, these efforts helped to move the two superpowers in the direction of undertaking talks, and subsequently signing various treaties that slowed down the spiraling military competition. Similarly, the various multilateral arms agreements helped to broaden the scope of NAM’s efforts to slow down the global arms race, and to address the underlying tensions and suspicions on which the competition was based.

On the other hand, NAM experienced several failures. First, the overwhelming majority of the members of the organization were actually aligned with either the Soviet or the American power bloc. This was a major problem
because it undermined the fundamental contour of non-alignment. As Fryer (1999:1) argues, “… [NAM] was a movement that basically set itself up as something which it is not, rather than something which it is.” Ultimately, this fundamental failure militated against NAM’s desire to emerge as an alternative to bloc politics as the pivot of international relations. In short, most of the members of NAM advocated non-alignment in their policy rhetoric, but practised alignment in their policy acts.

Similarly, it was quite commonplace for various members of NAM to manipulate ‘Cold War’ politics. One of the major ways in which this was done was the practice of some of NAM’s member states changing their patrons. For example, Egypt, which was one of the founding members of the organization, shifted from Soviet patronage under Nasser to the American one under Sadat.

Another failure was that NAM could not effectively referee superpower competition. This was because NAM lacked the economic and military power that was the pre-condition for mediating U.S.-Soviet rivalry. As a collection of economically and militarily weak and dependent states, NAM lacked the leverage that was exigent for becoming a ‘buffer power bloc’.

Yet, the various conflicts between some of NAM’s member states helped undermine the solidarity that was critical for the organization’s rise as a ‘third force’ in the global ‘balance of power’. For example, India and Pakistan fought three wars during the ‘Cold War’. To make matters worse, both countries drew in external powers: the Soviet union sided with India, and China intervened on behalf of Pakistan.

TOWARD RETHINKING THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

Background

Is the Non-aligned Movement still relevant in light of the end of the Cold War? I argue that it is not in light of the major purpose for which it was established. However, Third World solidarity is now even more urgent, against the background of the new challenges. Accordingly, I suggest that NAM needs to be rethought and restructure in order for Third World states to be well positioned to meet the emergent imperatives of the ‘post-Cold War’ era as embodied in the
nature and dynamics of the ‘new globalization’. As the former Malaysian Foreign Minister Syed Hamid Albar aptly notes, “…the challenge facing NAM in ensuring its continual relevance is, inter alia, one of repackaging and retooling itself in the context of the realities of the international order, which is in a state of flux” (Asian Political News, 2003: 1).

The “New Globalization” and its Challenges to the Third World

Against this backdrop, what are the challenges being posed to Third World countries by the ‘new globalization’? Clearly, the emergent nature of the ‘new globalization’ is akin to bloc politics during the ‘Cold War’. That is, the ‘new globalization’ is cementing and institutionalizing the global division of states into major powers, middle powers and small powers; powerful versus weak states; and core, semi-peripheral and peripheral states. The crux of the matter is that the ‘new globalization’ is consolidating the dominant political and economic positions of the industrialized capitalist states—United States, Japan, Germany, Britain, France and Italy.

In terms of its dynamics, the ‘new globalization’ is transforming the global political economy in fundamental ways. At the vortex is the ubiquity of the capitalist mode of production. This is reflected in the fact that every actor in the international system—state and non-state—has been incorporated into the system (Kieh, 2008). Accordingly, every activity in the global political economy is conditioned by the capitalist logic—the maximization of profit for the benefit of the members of the transnational ruling classes, especially the segment that owns the various multinational corporations based in the core states.

Based on the suzerainty of the capitalist logic, there are several derivatives. First, the core states and the international financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank—have launched concerted efforts to undermine and eventually ‘roll-back the state’ in the Third World through their various neo-liberal programs such as the ‘Structural Adjustment Programs’ (SAPs). The overriding purpose is to give the metropolitan-based multinational corporations carte blanche to exploit the natural resources of the Third World. In other words, with a weakened state, multinational corporations can, among other things, exploit labor, siphon off wealth through the unrestricted transfer of profits, and destroy the environment.
Second, the ‘movers and shakers’ of the global political economy are determined to force Third World states to dismantle their various social safety nets. The ostensible purpose is the capitalist imperative of privatizing every facet of life in the Third World. For example, the privatization of water in Third World states will force citizens to buy water from private corporations usually at an exorbitant price. Under this arrangement, these corporations are then able to generate profits. The resultant danger is that this will make life unbearable for the members of the subaltern classes (the lower classes), who do not have the financial resources. Ultimately, the rate of abject poverty will increase, and the masses of citizens in the Third World will continue to live perilously on the margins. Undoubtedly, this will be a recipe for fomenting increased violent conflicts in various Third World countries. Consequently, the assault on human security will contribute to the fueling of political instability and events such as civil wars.

Third, the ‘international division of labor’ in which Third World states are assigned the role of producing raw materials, while the core states produce manufactured goods is being institutionalized. That is, Third World states are being transformed into permanent enclaves for the production of raw materials to feed the industrial-manufacturing complexes of the core states. The major drawback is that under the perennial ‘system of unequal exchange’, Third World states will continue to receive less for their raw materials, while being required to pay more for manufactured goods from the core states. The resultant would be dwindling revenues from trade, and their concomitant adverse impact on the capacity to invest in basic human needs programs such as public education, health care, public housing, clean drinking water and sanitation.

Fourth, with the end of the ‘Cold War’, the United States is determined to build a ‘global empire’ in which virtually every Third World country will become an American neo-colony. As neo-colonies, Third World states will be forced by the United States to serve the latter’s imperialist agenda, including the establishment of control over major sources of natural resources—oil, etc. Importantly, any Third World country that resists American imperialism could run the risk of incurring military action, including a preemptive military strike as embodied in the illegal “Bush Doctrine of Pre-emption.” Clearly, the American imperialist project poses a grave danger to the sovereignty of Third World states,
especially their right under international law to make their own domestic and foreign policy decisions.

Repositioning the Third World through Pooled Sovereignty

Given the challenges currently being posed to Third World countries by the ‘new globalization’, they need to adopt ‘pooled sovereignty’ as the new collective strategy for repositioning themselves, so that they can effectively resist and address the deleterious effects of the ‘new globalization’. Fundamentally, the strategy of ‘pooled sovereignty’ needs to be embodied in a new ‘collective entity’ to which decision-making in some critical policy areas would be transferred by the participating states. The new ‘collective entity’ could be created by merging the Non-Aligned Movement and the ‘Group of 77’. This new ‘collective entity’ will serve as the overarching framework for promoting solidarity, development and peace within, and between and among the various Third World states, and for advocating for the imperative of restructuring the international system and its embedded structures, rules, processes and modes of interactions that are intrinsically based on asymmetries between the core states, on the one hand, and the semi-peripheral and peripheral states, on the other.

Based on their respective domestic objective conditions, the participating states would then make the determination regarding the policy areas that would be transferred to the collective entity within the context of the ‘pooled sovereignty strategy’. However, some of the critical policy areas must include the restructuring of the international system, research and technological development, economic and social development. In the area of advocacy for the restructuring of the international system, this would involve two major dimensions: the transformation of international institutions, especially the power relations between the core states, and the semi-peripheral and peripheral states, and the transformation of the global economy. In the case of the former, for example, the collective entity would build on the efforts currently being made by the Non-Aligned Movement for the reconfiguration of the power relationships in the Security Council with the ostensible goal of allotting permanent seats with ‘veto power’ to the various regions of the Third World. Despite its limitations, such a new arrangement would end the monopoly of the major powers by giving the Third World a major role in the promotion of international peace and security. Similarly, the ‘collective entity’
would lead the effort to restructure the World Trade Organization, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In all of these organizations, the locus of the effort would be to reconfigure the power relationships and expand the agendas. The resultant effects would be real and meaningful decision-making roles for the Third World, and the discussion and ultimate resolution of trade and lending issues that are important to the Third World.

As for the restructuring of the global economy, several specific areas would need to be addressed. In the area of trade, the restructuring must seek to, among other things, reconfigure the ‘international division of labour’, and the ‘system of unequal exchange’. In terms of the ‘international division of labour’, it needs to be transformed so that Third World states are no longer permanently assigned the role of producing raw materials to feed the industrial-manufacturing machines of the core states, and consuming the manufactured goods from the developed states. Among other things, the restructured framework would help enable Third World states to develop the technological base that would allow them to produce manufactured goods. Also, the predatory ‘system of unequal exchange’ under which the core states, based on their hegemony, make the determination to pay Third World states less for their primary products, but require them to pay more for the manufactured goods from the industrialised capitalist states must be changed. Under the new arrangement, the Third World would participate in setting the prices for manufactured goods and raw materials.

Another area is the imperative of halting the perennial predatory and exploitative policies of metropolitan-based multinational corporations, including the poor treatment of workers in Third World states, the siphoning of profits without making significant re-investment in the host Third World countries, the depletion of natural resources, and the destruction of the environment. The ‘collective entity’ could shepherd the process of developing a uniformed ‘code of conduct’ to govern the operations of metropolitan-based multinational corporations in Third World host countries.

Also, the nature and dynamics of technology transfer from the core to the semi-periphery and the periphery need to be transformed. The changes must include pricing and relevance. That is, the ‘collective entity’ would negotiate the
formulation of a new arrangement under which the usual inflated prices of various pieces of technology would be reduced, so as to reflect an approximation of their real production costs. Furthermore, efforts would be made to establish common standards for the purpose of ensuring that the technology purchased by Third World states is contemporary and relevant to the development need for which it is acquired.

In the area of debt relations, the ‘collective entity’ would develop a common approach that would have as its ultimate goal the cancellation of all debts. Given the fact that an appreciable amount of the debt owed by Third World states to core-based commercial banks is odious, the ultimate solution to the debt crisis that has bedeviled the Third World for more than two decades is debt cancellation.

Another policy area that should be under the purview of the ‘collective entity’ is research and technological development. Clearly, in order to ensure that the ‘international division of labour’ and the ‘system of unequal exchange’ are transformed into new arrangements based on equity, Third World states would need to industrialize. Central to industrialization is the development of a technological base. This would require investments in research. Rather than designing and implementing myriad individual research and development blueprints, Third World states would be best served to transfer this policy area to the ‘new collective entity’. This would be cost effective because the participating states would share the ‘burden’. Additionally, the creation of a central research and development institute would attract a host of ‘scientific minds’ from around the Third World. The technology that gets developed can then be shared among the participating states, and importantly be used to improve the lives of their respective citizens.

International economic policy is a major area that needs to be transferred to the ‘new collectivity’. Specifically, this would involve such issues as trade, investment and debt. In terms of trade, the ‘collective entity’ would devise ways in which the volume of trade and the types of goods and services that are exchanged between and among the participating states can be increased. Certainly, as previously discussed, the development of a technological base would
help to increase both the quantity and quality of trade. As for investment, the ‘collectivity’ would formulate common policies for dealing with private investors, especially multinational corporations from the core states. One of the major benefits would be that the formulation of a common investment policy would make it difficult for multinational corporations to evade control. In the area of debt, the ‘collectivity’ would play the lead role in strengthening the participating states’ advocacy for the cancellation of all debts from the core states, including their commercial banks.

The community culture should be based on several values. At the core must be the development of human-centred and pro-people public policies that are designed to address the basic human needs—jobs, education, health care, housing, clean drinking water and acceptable sanitation—of the citizens of the participating states. In other words, the resources of the state should be primarily invested in the improvement of the material conditions of the citizens. Undoubtedly, a healthy and educated citizenry would be indispensable to the development of the knowledge base that is critical to pursuing the research that would lead to the development of technology. By adapting such a value, the participating states would be rejecting neo-liberal orthodoxy and its emphasis on ‘profits over people’.

Another value must be the requirement that all member states consistently demonstrate a sense of integrity. This would require that, among others, all member states must demonstrate honesty in their dealings with one another, and with the broader ‘collective entity’. For example, a member state cannot be a neo-colonial agent of a major power within the organization, whose purpose is to ostensibly serve the interest of the neo-colonial patron. There is a repository of evidence that shows that several Third World state-based organizations have been weakened by member states that have worked to undermine those organizations from within as agents acting on behalf of various imperial powers.

Also, the ‘solidarity value’ must be a bedrock norm of the organization. Individual member states should be expected to assist fellow member states that are experiencing problems such as natural disasters, beyond the assistance of the collective organization. In other words, depending on its means, each member
state should provide moral, human, financial and other assistance. Such a communal ethos would be critical to decreasing Third World states’ preponderant reliance on the major powers to help assist with addressing problems that confront the former. While the assistance of the major powers should be welcomed, Third World states need to provide the leadership and make meaningful contributions in human and material terms. By decreasing the reliance on the metropolitan powers, Third World states would reduce their vulnerability to manipulation by the major powers.

In terms of the institutional architecture, no matter the particular design, the community-wide entities, the rules and the processes must be fundamentally designed to promote the individual interests of the participating states, as well as those of the ‘collectivity’. However, in order to militate against the dominance of the individual interests of states, the participants should not have, inter alia, ‘veto power’ over community-wide decisions. Instead, through the establishment of transparent and accountable institutions, rules and processes, member states would have the opportunity to articulate their positions on various issues. Then, once a vote is taken, the ‘collectivity’ should pursue the choice decided by the majority of the participating states.

Regarding the dividends that can be accrued through ‘pooled sovereignty’, they are legion. However, since it is not possible to discuss all of them in this article, few of them will be explicated. The overarching dividend is that participating states would benefit immensely from drawing from the collective resources of all of the member states in dealing with the deleterious effects of the ‘new globalization’. As has been argued, the ‘new globalization’ is accentuating the intrinsic inequities and injustices that are ensconced in the structures, rules, and processes of the international political economy. Thus, given the peripheral position of Third World states in the global power matrix, they certainly cannot address the vagaries of the ‘new globalization’ singularly through an unrealistic reliance on individual sovereignty. Alternatively, by establishing a new organization that combines the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 through the pooling of their sovereignties, Third World states would be better positioned. The derivatives would be cultural, economic, political, social and solidarity benefits. For example, member states would accrue tremendous benefits
from shared technological development. The technology would be used to help improve the standard of living of millions of the citizens of the participating states.

**Framing the Strategies**

Undoubtedly, the success of the ‘pooled sovereignty’ model will require the formulation of strategies for the establishment of a new pan-Third World organization, and for waging the campaign for fundamentally restructuring the totality of the global political economy. Clearly, this would be a Herculean task given the political, economic and other differences between and among the current members of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77, and the unwillingness of the metropolitan powers to accept change. Accordingly, there is no existing ‘cook book’ from which ‘recipes’ can be pulled. Hence, the development of strategies would require the consideration of several variables. Despite the complexities that are associated with the framing of strategies, especially given the nature and dynamics of the international system, some general steps can be suggested. First, since the success of the proposed new Third World-based organization will depend on committed members, the focus should be to mobilize a group of such members. This is better than uncritically encouraging all Third World states, including those that are currently members of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77, to join. The point is that interested states should demonstrate their commitment to the organization by voluntarily transferring sovereignty over a policy area or areas to the collective organization. This should be the non-negotiable pre-requisite for membership. In other words, states that do not meet the aforementioned requirement should not be given provisional membership with the hope that they would at some point fulfil the pre-requisite for membership. Importantly, if the membership requirement becomes the major obstacle for disbanding the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 and merging them into the proposed organization, then the two organizations should be left intact and the new organization should be independently formed.

As for the challenges of dealing with the major powers, the framing of the appropriate specific strategies would need to take cognizance of both the strengths and the weaknesses of the collectivity of the membership of the new organization. Notwithstanding, the member states would need to maximize their numerical and
natural resources strengths. The numerical strength can be used to institute changes in the various international organizations that are based on ‘one country-one vote’. For example, the United Nations General Assembly, within its limitations, can be used, as it has been in the past, to institute changes in the organization. In those cases where the limitations of the General Assembly pose obstacles to the institution of fundamental changes, the numerical strength could be used as a bargaining instrument to help bring about the desired changes. Another consideration is that natural resources—oil, minerals, etc.—should be used as effective bargaining tools as well. If necessary, these natural resources should be used to impose sanctions against intransigent metropolitan powers that are resistant to the transformation of the global political economy.

CONCLUSION
The article has attempted to argue that the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM) needs to be rethought in light of the end of the Cold War. Specifically, the article argues that because NAM was designed within the context of the Cold War, it is no longer suitable to deal with the post-Cold War era, especially the ‘new globalization’, the current phase of international capitalism. Accordingly, it is suggested that NAM and the Group of 77 should be disbanded and folded into a new Third World-based organization.

The pivot of the proposed organization should be ‘pooled sovereignty’, which basically entails member states transferring sovereignty over particular policy areas to a ‘new centre’. Based on the ‘pooled sovereignty’ model, the new organization should be anchored on a set of common community institutions, rules and processes, and culture. This architecture would provide the conditions under which the interests of the participating states and the ‘collectivity’ can be harmonized. If this can be done, several benefits would be accrued by the participating members. The overarching dividend is that the member states would be better positioned to deal effectively with the deleterious effects of the ‘new globalization’ by benefiting from collective resources. Undoubtedly, given the marginal positions of Third World states in the ‘global division of power’, they do not have the capacity to deal effectively with the pathologies of the ‘new globalization’.
Finally, the article stressed the importance of the development of effective strategies for actualizing the strategy of ‘pooled sovereignty’. While recognising the complexities that attend the development of strategies against the backdrop of the nature and dynamics of the international system, the article suggests that the strategy formulation project must consider both the assets and liabilities of the ‘collectivity’. Notwithstanding, the ‘collectivity’ should take full advantage of the numerical and natural resource assets as instruments of negotiation with the major powers.
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