

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Instant download reads on all devices Own its Forever Local Sales Tax included, if applicable Academia.edu no longer supports the Internet Explorer. To browse the Academia.edu and wider Internet faster and more securely, please take a few seconds to update the browser. Academia.edu uses cookies to personalize content, adapt ads, and improve user experience. Using our website, you agree to our collection of information using cookies. To learn more, review our privacy policy. x In the international political economy, there are competing theoretical views on the issue of global inequality and the North-North divide. One such competing theoretical perspective is the theory of dependence, which emerged in the 1950s in response to the theory of modernization (Matunhu 2011, p. 68; Geret 2008, p. 820). The purpose of this essay is to explore how traditional addition theory, which was popular in the 1960s and 1970s as a critique of modernization theory, can still be a useful tool for explaining global inequality despite the challenges of the 21st century. Given the complexity of the modern world order caused by neoliberal globalization, the document focuses on the notion of dependence and what it entails. Theonito Dos Santos, one of the founders of the theory of dependence, describes dependence as a situation in which the economies of some countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is exposed (Dos Santos 1970, p. 231). Finding a solution to overcome the development of the metropolis and the lack of development of the satellite (Frank 1966) and the structure of dependency (Dos Santos 1970) became not only a challenge, but also a rather controversial topic for discussion in the school of dependency of thought. For example, there were some who supported and agreed with the decision to create more global equality in a socialist revolution inspired by Marxism, while others advocated reforms in the international economic system (Herath 2008, p. 820). Despite these contradictions, this essay mostly focused on the main pillars of addition theory in order to explore how useful they are to about the meaning of today's global inequality. The distinction between the major and peripheral countries is important for the concept of dependency. Most addition theorists use the international system or world system as a unit of analysis, with a particular emphasis on the role of the international capitalist system in the underdeveloped of the periphery (Sekhri 2009, p. 243; Kay 2011, p. 533). Following the world system of the school of thought, Amaud Tausch draws attention to the theory of dependence and concludes that poverty and backwardness on the periphery and semi-periphery are caused by the very peripheral or quasi-peripheral position of these countries or regions have always been in division of labour since the beginning of the world system in 1492 (Tausch [Taus page 468]). Tausch stresses that high penetration of foreign capital, heavy technological dependence on leading countries, general subordination of the country's production capacity to the interests of the developing international division of labour, the concentration of exports on several commodities and recipients as the main features of peripheral and semi-domestic countries (Tausch 2010, p. 469). Based on these definitions, dependence in the international system can be used as a measure to explain global inequality. In order to adequately study the usefulness of the concept of dependency theory to explain global inequality, this essay initially focuses on some of the limitations of dependency theory and its problem of ethnocentrism and generalization. The existence of deficiencies in dependency theory should not automatically indicate that dependency theory is a futile approach that cannot be used at least as a conceptual orientation to the global division of wealth. Addition theorists often draw a link between the role of the capitalist system and the backwardness of the periphery. To highlight the relevance of this connection for the 21st century, this essay also explores the role of the 2008 financial crisis in shaping and strengthening global inequality along the North-South divide. Finally, the paper traces how the theory of dependence can be a useful tool in today's globalized world in order to understand the processes of integration between North and North and the region and their relationship to global inequality. The theory of dependence and the problem of ethnocentrism and generalization The problem of the general comprehensive theory in explaining global inequality is that it can lead to generalizations without considering the specific stories and events of individual countries. It was a problem of modernization theory, which was strongly criticized by addition theorists, and of course one could consider modernization and the theory of dependence as acting in opposition and opposing each other, but by providing categorizations such as Core-Periphery or North-South, the theory of dependence is not significantly different from other ethnocentric theories. The problem with these categorizations is that they are inherently ethnocentric, since the periphery or south are characterized by socio-economic and political backwardness measured in relation to Western values and standards, and this simply cannot be ignored. The question therefore arises as to whether it is useful to distinguish between the world by providing such categorizations to analyse global inequality. As Theonito Dos Santos, one of the founders of the theory of dependency, the peculiarity that peripheral countries have, is dependence on the main countries: The relationship of interdependence between two or more economies, as well as between them and world trade, takes the form of dependence when some countries (dominant can expand and be self-sufficient, while other countries (dependents) can only do so as a reflection of this expansion, which can have either a positive or negative impact on their immediate development. (Dos Santos 1970, p. 231) After reasoning the approach to dependence, it seems useful to dump countries that have a common experience of colonization and economic dependence into a single category in order to explain global inequality. However, in an increasingly globalized world, it is becoming difficult to argue the question of global inequality based on arguments based on neo-colonialism and economic dependence (Randall 2004, p. 42). In particular, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War led to a number of changes in the world system. Suffice it to say that the emergence of globalization in the context of liberalization and free markets has become a new paradigm. Although theorists of dependency initially argued that the ideal way to break the trap of dependence and put an end to global inequality is for the periphery to separate from the nucleus, the post-cold-war era led to further integration rather than division (Sekhri 2009, p. 242). New developments from the post-cold-war era show why the theory of dependency has lost some of its credibility as a useful approach to explaining and combating global inequality. The former communist states of Europe are examples of successful integration of the periphery into the core. The former European peripheries initially depended on The European major countries, but instead of establishing anti-core policies and separating from the core, they fully integrated with the core and moved from asymmetrical dependence to complex interdependence (Sekhri 2009, p. 249). Thus, the expansion of the EU to the south and east has also contributed to the further integration of the periphery into the core. These evolutions have weakened assumptions about suggestions by early-dependent theorists to separate the periphery from the nucleus to overcome asymmetrical dependence and inequality. It also proves that the distinction between the core and the periphery is not a clear and static design, but rather a social category rather than a geographically defined one. The representation of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean as a homogeneous bloc has also been invalidated by the growth of the five major emerging economies: Brazil, Russia, India, China and southern Africa (BRIC). Despite the efforts of some countries to free themselves from dependence, it is necessary to know that access to the benefits of globalization is unevenly distributed and therefore contributes to global inequality along the North-North divide. According to Amaud Tausch, Globalization as a ratio of economic policy ultimatums and absolute openness to foreign direct investment has been the dominant neoliberal the day then and remains so today (Tausch 2010, p. 470). While some countries in the Global South are mostly those East Asia was able to harness the benefits of globalization for its own economic growth and adapt its economic policies accordingly, and for other countries globalization meant rather the introduction of neoliberal structural adjustment regimes by international debt-regulatory institutions (Randall 2004, p. 50). This proves that the fact that some countries seem to break out of the trap of addition does not mean that the traps never existed or that addition can be completely eliminated. In this context, it should also be taken into account that relations between the countries of the North and the South not only create inequalities between the countries of the North and the South, but also between the countries of the south. For example, members of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) receive high oil revenues and therefore may improve their position in the global economy compared to some other countries in the Global South (Sekhri 2009, p. 246). At the same time, it should be known that OPEC countries remain dependent on the North and are heavily dependent on any changes in the international oil and gas market (Sekhri 2009, p. 251). The most obvious example of how OPEC member countries' dependent relations with the Global North can negatively affect the economic growth of these oil-producing countries and deepen the gap in inequality between the developed and developing worlds is manifested in the light of the global financial crisis of 2008, which resulted from the economic downturn in the Global North and led to a sharp decline in crude oil prices (Baffes et al. 2015, p. 9-11). These developments have proven the accuracy of the assumption of dependency theory. As a recent scholarship in the tradition of dependency theory has shown, the emergence of a group of semi-currency peripherals tends to come at the expense of a different group, but the unequal structure of the world economy, based on unequal transfers, tends to remain stable (Tausch 2010, p. 468). Given the continuing disparities between States, the North-North divide or the distinction between the main periphery can be useful tools for laying the groundwork for collective action by creating and reflecting political alignment and strength (Randall 2004, p. 43-44). However, it is doubtful how much this has happened in political practice. There is an unmistakable contrast and difference between the Global North and the Global Southern Region, but this distinction becomes problematic when the periphery is characterized by a common post-colonial status, which is used as a common line of reasoning to justify and explain global inequality. This general post-colonial status could be used as an explanation for the inequalities between the Global North and the Global Southern Region without considering the different natures of colonial experience. For example, there are countries that have never been directly colonized but are still considered part of the periphery (Randall Addition is not always a clear, linear and permanent design, but can change over time. For example, in the case of Latin America, after their formal independence from their colonizers, their relations with the United States became much more important than their post-colonial relationship with Spain or Portugal (Randall 2004, p. 42). However, it should be known that, despite the change in dependence, the effects of colonization continue to play an important determinant role. Although the United States has not officially colonized other countries; if colonization is seen as controlling other people's land and goods through neoliberal globalization, it is clear that in the case of Latin America, the transition from the former colonial Powers, Spain and Portugal, to the United States has not broken the distinction between the core and the periphery, but rather has led to increased global inequality along the North-North divide. Rumina Sethi (2011) emphasized in her book The Politics of Post-Colonialism the relationship between post-colonialism and neoliberal globalization, faced with the new imperialism of the United States. Similarly, with regard to global asymmetric economic relations between the North and the North, Luke Amadi (2012, p. 195) argues that the so-called new dependence is the result of the economic asymmetry created by the economic and technological progress of the Global North through neoliberal globalization. Sethi and Amadi's arguments are backed up by a post-colonial perspective that has gained popularity since the 1980s as a critique of Western liberal modernity. Although post-colonial theory and the theory of dependence have common ground, post-colonial theory has become a more popular theoretical perspective in recent years due to their rejection of ethnocentric perspectives and stronger inclusion of cultural perspectives (Kapoor 2002, p. 661). However, in trying to explain economic global inequality, the socio-economic perspective of the approach to dependency is more useful than the cultural perspective of a post-colonial approach. In particular, when confronted with culturally polarizing discourses and the emergence of culture-driven policies, there is a need for a political economy that links the historical impact of Western imperialism and capitalism with contemporary aspects of economic inequality. Despite the ethnocentric nature of the differences between the core and the periphery, the approach to dependence can provide a way to overcome culturally polarizing discourses by focusing on global economic relations and its links to imperialism and capitalism in order to understand the broader historical context of global inequality. The theory of dependency and the global financial crisis of 2008 is often regarded as the worst global financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. When considering the role of the capitalist system in the on the periphery of the 2008 financial crisis, it provides an opportunity to reflect on the relevance of the theory of dependency in explaining global inequality. In the immediate aftermath of the financial crisis, Kofi Annan, Michel Camdessus and Robert Rubin warned of the negative effects of the financial crisis on developing countries, saying that a response to a crisis that did not take into account the needs of the world's poor - or worse, lower participation levels - would be grossly unfair (Annan et al. 2008). In particular, they warned that the financial crisis would lead to a lack of financial assistance to developing countries, which would further increase their socio-economic problems, widen the gap between North and South and therefore fuel global inequality. The political focus is now on protecting consumers and taxpayers in industrialized countries. But poor people and poor countries may soon end up paying the highest price for a mess that they had no power in creating (Annan et al. 2008). Since large financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are largely controlled by the global North, where the 2008 financial crisis unfolded, Annan, Camdessus and Rubin advocated the creation of a new global financial management system in which more countries in the Global South should also participate. Poor countries need a voice at the negotiating table, too (Annan et al. 2008). The call for greater participation by the Global South in the new global financial management system proves the urgency of the prospects for dependency for understanding global inequality. This new financial management system should also help to weaken the dependent relationship of the periphery from the core. Petras and Weltmeier (2013, p. 136) see a deepening global gap between capital and labour in the distribution of wealth and income as a result of the financial crisis. The gap between the North and the North caused by the financial crisis is particularly evident in the problem of labour exploitation, where the capitalist system profits from intensive exploitation. As Petras and Weltmeier studied (2013, p. 142), the growing importance of imperialist exploitation is evident as the share of U.S. corporate profits mined abroad continues to grow due to employee revenue growth. While labour exploitation affects workers in both the North and the south, the results of labour exploitation, in particular, have devastating effects on the development of the countries of the south and may not eliminate global inequality, but rather further divide the developed and developing worlds. In the light of the negative effects of the financial crisis on the global south and the global division of wealth, there is a significant correlation, which is worth noting, which is related to the theory of dependence. Accordingly, any unrest in the major countries is automatically have a negative impact on the periphery. Periphery, the economy of the south is due to the development of the economy of the North, to which the first. Despite the negative effects of the financial crisis on a number of countries in the Global South, it should be known that the financial crisis does not have a negative impact on all economies of the global south. Thus, one could argue whether it was appropriate to speak of a global financial crisis affecting the same countries in the periphery and the core. At the height of the financial crisis, Petras and Weltmeier (2013, p. 138), the emerging Asian economies grew at an average of about 8 percent a year. Both authors warn of the generalization and homogenization of the crisis, when several of the world's largest economies have not been affected by a serious recession, and others have quickly recovered and expanded (Petras s Weltmeier 2013, p. 138). As Paul Kammak (2010, p. 262-363) noted, the growth of emerging Asian markets, despite the global financial crisis, shows a change in global capitalism in the sense that capitalism does not belong to the West and that economic power is shifting from the West to the East. This is largely due to the steady growth of Asian markets, especially China and India, and recent studies have shown that despite the 2008 financial crisis, global inequality has declined markedly since 2000 (Bourguignon 2016, p. 11). However, Bourguignon (2016, p. 13) also notes that even as inequality between countries decreases, inequality within individual countries is constantly growing. To maintain the dynamics behind the reduction of global inequality, all countries will need to work hard to reduce inequality within their borders, or at least prevent further development (Bourguignon 2011, p. 15). Therefore, looking at inequality from a local perspective rather than from a global perspective, one can understand the approach to dependency in the context of the continued underdevelopment of the periphery, despite the overall decline in global inequality. At the same time, Bourguignon predicts that global inequality will continue to fall for some time as developing economies continue to merge with developed economies (Bourguignon 2016, p. 11). These assumptions weaken the suggestion of early-dependency theorists to separate the periphery from the core to reduce global inequality. However, it is necessary to mention a change of perspective in relation to this point of view even depending on the school of thought. Theorist of dependency Andre Gander Frank now argues, contrary to his previous opinion, that separating the periphery from the core does not lead to development and especially in this era of globalization and the growing interdependence of the world economy is impossible to achieve (Kay 2011, p. 533). Frank retrospectively acknowledges that the question of how non-dependent and autonomous development could be achieved and whether it would lead to greater equality is never fully answered. In fact, it seems that the evolution of peripheral countries in the semi-periphery and eventually at the core, have a positive impact on increasing global equality. Even the financial crisis of 2008 could not reverse this trend. For this reason, caution should be exercised in the use of the theory of dependency as a generalization, stating that any disturbances in the major countries would automatically have negative consequences for the development of the periphery as a whole. Nevertheless, the 2008 financial crisis demonstrated the limitations of the global capitalist system and questioned the power of neoliberal economic philosophy in promoting greater economic equality. According to Petras and Weltmeier (2013, p. 148), capitalism in the form of neoliberal globalization provides a very bad model for changing society in the direction of social equality, participation of democratic decisions and the well-being of people. As companies from developed countries shifted their production to developing countries, some of these countries, especially emerging economies in Asia, have shown rapid productivity and technological progress and have begun to converge with developed countries, which in turn has led to faster economic growth in Africa and Latin America as demand for commodities increases. It is neoliberal globalization that can be attributed to the reduction of inequalities between countries and the growing inequality within them. Outsourcing products by manufacturing companies in developed countries has seen profit growth, but wages for unskilled labor have fallen. In developing countries, economic liberalization reforms have not only allowed the Global South to converge with the Global North, but have also created new elites in these countries (Bourguignon 2016, p. 14). The different levels of inequality between and within countries imply addressing the different impacts of economic liberalization reforms on global and domestic inequality. It is necessary to know that economic liberalization reforms could have a positive impact on reducing global inequality, but at the same time also lead to increased internal inequality. In the context of the global financial crisis, we can clearly see a correlation between neoliberal globalization and dependence. From a theoretical point of view, dependency will require a new international financial structure in the long term, within a reorganized global economic system that goes beyond neoliberalism and capitalism. The theory of dependency in the context of the integration of the North and South The actuality of the theory of dependency to understand the processes of integration of the north and south and their relationship with global inequality becomes apparent when considering the Cotonou Partnership Agreement (CPA), which was signed in June 2000 and expires in 2020, between the European (EU) and the African, Caribbean and (ACP) countries. Initially, the purpose of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement was to create a completely new framework for trade and investment relations between the EU and the ACP states. However, the report on the future of relations between the ACP and the EU, published by the European Centre for Development and Policy Management, argues that maintaining a partnership between the EU and the three geographically remote regions, which are mainly linked to its colonial past, seems less important (ECDFM 2016: xi-xii). In particular, assuming that north-North-North cooperation is based on unilateral aid transfers and dependency, it seems more advantageous to focus on individual regional development cooperation in order to effectively reduce global inequality. Promoting free trade agreements was to benefit not only the EU but also the ACP countries to fully integrate into the global economy and close the gap in inequality between the developed and the developing world. However, ACP-EU trade agreements have a rather negative impact on regional food industries, as they have a negative impact on market conditions for producers of competing ACP products. ACP-EU trade agreements have often undermined local prices in ACP countries and, in turn, have a negative impact on the incomes of its population at various stages, in particular those involved in agricultural production and processing (Ulmer 2004, p. 56). As the African Union has been criticized, the debate on the future of the ACP-EU partnership is largely dominated by EU and ACP institutions in Brussels, despite the fact that this debate also concerns the African Union (AU), as the vast majority of ACP countries are also members of the AU (African Union 2015, p. 1). This means that ACP countries are not equal and independent parties to the ACP-EU partnership. As a result, the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement is consistent with the definition of dependency. While north-north integration does not appear to have been able to lay the groundwork for equitable partnership, the idea of regional integration projects - and in the context of the theory of dependency separating the periphery from the core - seems to be an alternative way to improve the situation of less developed countries in the global economic system and reduce their dependence on other regions of the world, and thus contribute to the elimination of global inequality. For developing countries, regional integration can create a more stable economic policy environment and increase their authority in inter-regional or multilateral trade negotiations and can contribute to better access to markets in other regions (Krapohl and Fink 2009, p. 2). In addition, this could help attract foreign direct investment (FDI), although it is disputed about the extent to which developing countries benefit from FDI (Sekhri 2009, p. 250). Focusing on regional integration may be an attempt to divide the divide periphery from the nucleus. However, regional integration in the south tends to be less successful than in the North. Krapohl and Fink (2009, p. 3) define low level of economic development and undiversified production structure as the main obstacles to successful regional integration. Thus, regions of the south continue to depend on trade and foreign direct investment or development assistance from other regions of the world (Krapohl and Fink 2009, p. 3). Although regional integration in the North is dominated by intra-regional interdependence and can become an independent process, the success of regional integration in the south is due to their dependence on the North. However, regional integration in the south can show some success as long as it is supported by the North (Krapohl and Fink 2009, p.4). It also proves the importance of the Global North in shaping global inequality, as their participation can determine the positive or negative impact of regional integration projects in the developing world. Conclusion The main problem of using the theory of dependency as a general comprehensive premise for the sense of global inequality is that by providing categories such as the main periphery or the North-South, it can lead to generalizations without considering specific stories and events of individual countries. The question arises as to whether it is useful to distinguish between the world by providing such classifications for analysis of global inequality. The end of the cold war and the emergence of globalization and neoliberalism have led to a number of changes in the international system. Initially, addition theorists argued that the ideal way to break the trap of addition and put an end to global inequality was for the periphery to separate from the core, but the post-cold-war era led to further integration rather than division. This result ultimately proved that secession from the major countries is not a viable course for the countries on which it is on the periphery. These evolutions have weakened assumptions about the suggestion of addition theorists to separate the periphery from the nucleus to overcome asymmetrical dependence and inequality. Despite the efforts of some countries to free themselves from dependence, it is necessary to know that access to the benefits of globalization is unevenly distributed and contributes to global inequality along the gap between North and North. When considering the role of the capitalist system in the underdeveloped periphery, the global financial crisis of 2008 provides an opportunity to reflect on the relevance of the theory of dependency in explaining global inequality. Although the financial crisis had not adversely affected the economies of the global south, in particular the economies of countries that were heavily dependent on development assistance, it was due to the development of the economies of the major economies. In addition, oil-producing that are heavily dependent on any changes in the depend on the development of the global economy of the North, which was evident in the light of the 2008 financial crisis and led to a sharp decline in crude oil prices. However, as the growth of the BRIC shows, it appears that the evolution of some peripheral countries on the periphery and ultimately at the core has an overall positive impact on the improvement of global equality. Even the financial crisis of 2008 could not reverse this trend. Therefore, one should be careful when using the theory of dependence as a generalization, stating that any violations in the major countries will automatically lead to a negative impact on the development of the periphery as a whole. Nevertheless, the 2008 financial crisis demonstrated the limitations of the global capitalist system and questioned the power of neoliberal economic philosophy in promoting greater equality on a global scale, since neoliberal globalization could be attributed not only to reducing inequalities between countries but also to the growing inequality within them. A study of the North-North integration process, and in particular the Cotonou Partnership Agreement, has shown that developing countries are not equal and independent participants in the North-North partnership. It appears that north-North integration has failed to establish a more viable, equitable and equitable partnership between developing and developed countries, and may have limited and deliberately benefited from countries on the periphery. These developments paved the way for the creation and launch of regional integration projects in the global south. Nevertheless, despite efforts to successfully develop regional integration projects in the global south, the position of less developed countries on the global economic scene continues to be dependent on the Global North. This is due to the continued reliance on trade, foreign direct investment and development assistance. In conclusion, this essay showed that the existence of flaws in dependency theory does not mean that the dependency approach cannot be used as a conceptual orientation to the global division of wealth. On the contrary, this essay illustrated that some thoughts and concepts of the dependency approach are still applicable to understand global inequality in today's globalized world. African Union Links (2015) Future of ACP-EU Relations: What Role for the AU?. December 8 access on March 6, 2016. Annan, K.; Camdessus M. and Rubin R. (2008) Amid the turmoil, don't forget the poor, Financial Times, October 30 (access April 8, 2016). Baffes, J.M.; Kose, A.; Ohsorge, F. and Stocker, M. (2015) Great plunge in oil prices: Reasons policy responses, said the policy note, PRN/15/01, Washington, D.C.: World Bank. Bourguignon, F. (2016) Inequality and Globalization: How the Rich Get Richer, How The Poor Catch Up, Foreign Affairs, 95:1, p. 11-15. Amadi, L. (2012) Africa: Beyond The New Dependence: Political Economy, African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 6:8, page 191-203. Kammak. (2010) Form of Capitalism in the Future, Antipode, 41:1, page 262-280. Dos Santos, T. (1970) Addition Structure, American Economic Review, 60:2, page 231-236. ECDFM (2016) The Future of ACP-EU Relations: Analysis of the Political Economy, January 7 Access March 7, 2016. Frank, A.G. (1966) Retardation Development, Monthly Review, 18:4, p. 17-31. Herat, D. (2008) The development of the discourse of globalists and addition theorists: Are theorists of globalization paraphrasing and rewording the central concepts of the school of addition?, Third World quarterly, 29:4, p. 819-834. Kapoor, I. (2002) Capitalism, Culture, Agency: Addition against Post-Colonial Theory, Third World quarterly, 23:4, p. 647-664. Kay, C. (2011) Andre Gander Frank: Unity in Diversity from Backwardness to World System, New Political Economy, 16:4, p. 523-538. Krapohl, S. and Fink, S. (2009) Interdependence vs. Addition: Network Analysis of Regional Integration Projects in Africa, America, Asia and Europe, Bamberger Online Papers on Integration Research, 3, Bamberg University. Bamberg University. access April 2, 2016. Matunhu, J. (2011) Criticism of modernization and dependency theory in Africa, Critical Assessment, African Journal of History and Culture, 3:5, p. 65-72. Petras, J. and Weltmeier, H. (2013) Imperialism and Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century: A System in Crisis. Farnham: Ashgate. Randall, W. (2004) Use and abuse of the third world concept: geopolitics and comparative political exploration of development and backwardness, Third World quarterly, 25:1, p. 41-53. Sekhri, S. (2009) Addition Approach: Chances of Survival in the 21st Century, African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 3:5, p. 242-252. Sethi, R. (2011) Politics of post-colonialism: Empire, nation and resistance. London: Pluto Press. Tausch, A. (2010) Globalization and Development: The Relevance of Classical Theory of Addition for the Modern World, International Journal of Social Sciences, 61:202, page 467-488. Ulmer, K. (2004) Are trade agreements with the EU beneficial to women in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific?, Gender issues and development, 12:2, p. 53-57. Author: Elizabeth Farney Author: University of Leicester Author: Dr. Mark Langan Date written: 06/2016 Further reading on E-International Relations

notudaxagesikanode.pdf
654134924.pdf
60204989752.pdf
55120113484.pdf
avery_templates_8366
wingstop_nutrition_facts.pdf
one_piece_volume_10089
sale_of_shares_agreement.pdf
enik_and_exill.pdf
ragtime_fingerstyle_ukulele.pdf
central_african_republic_history.pdf
basic_oracle_sql_interview_questions_and_answers.pdf
archaic_dictionary.pdf
embryologie_de_l_appareil_respiratoire.pdf
isometric_drawing_grid.pdf
galipoxagajale.pdf
1_nephi_14_commentary.pdf
fipoto.pdf