



Article

Globalization: The Politics of ‘We’ and ‘Them’

Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of
Political Science (NAJOPS).
2014, Vol. 4(2)
ISSN: 2992-5924
©NAJOPS 2014
Reprints and permissions:
www.najops.org.ng

**Osita AGBU, PhD,
Nigerian Institute of International Affairs,
Lagos State, Nigeria.**

Abstract

This research scrutinises the political dimensions of globalisation and its repercussions on the disparity between advanced and emerging economies, frequently denoted as the "North" and "South". It is posited that globalisation has engendered a divide between the “haves” and the “have-nots”, thereby exacerbating marginalisation, mistrust, and instability globally. The study traces the historical evolution of globalisation, its theoretical foundations, and its manifestations in diverse spheres such as commerce, finance, culture, and global governance. It is contended that globalisation is not solely propelled by market dynamics but also by political considerations and interests, often disproportionately benefiting the wealthier nations at the expense of the poorer ones. The research pinpoints areas of contention where the interests of the developed and developing nations collide and deliberates on the reactions from the South, including renegotiating their involvement in the process of globalisation. The author champions a more balanced global system that caters to the needs of developing nations and mitigates the adverse effects of globalisation on disadvantaged societies.

Keywords

Globalisation, North-South divide, Inequality, Trade imbalances, Cultural imperialism.

Introduction

It is our conception of development and societal goals that determine the veracity or otherwise that globalization is either positive or negative. In short, viewed from the simple criteria of physical well-being, self-actualization and societal cohesion, globalization has been a destructive force of immense dimensions.

“What is needed is not globalization of world economy but globalization of development” (Iman Ill-Hague, Pakistani Ambassador, 1999).

Let us begin by clarifying what ‘We’ and ‘Them’ mean, though this appears obvious in the context of the globalization discourse. By ‘We’, we mean the developing countries, the poorer countries of the South: while by ‘Them’, we mean the advanced industrialized countries, the rich countries of the North. Globalization and its meaning could be taken for granted considering the avalanche of literature that exists in this field of study. However, this will be a mistake, as Globalization is such an overarching and multi-dimensional concept that it simply cannot be taken for granted.

This paper therefore, approaches this enquiry with caution, even as it tries to understand, assimilate and proffer suggestions for addressing the problematic aspects of phenomenon. This paper tries to explore the historical trajectory and philosophical moorings of globalization as well as its practical manifestations, as this relates to the inequality between the advanced industrialized nations and the countries of the South. The central argument in this paper is that globalization creates a dichotomy between ‘We’ and ‘Them’, or the “poor” and the “rich”, or the “North” and “South”; a dichotomy that could feed the embers of marginalization, distrust and insecurity in the world if not urgently addressed.

Corresponding Author:

Osita AGBU, PhD, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos State, Nigeria.

Implicit in the arguments in this paper, is that globalization is not necessarily powered by the invisible hand of the market, but rather, by forces behind the scene, by political calculations and expediencies and by interests that do not hesitate to use political instruments and institutions to attain their goals. It is no secret that globalization is today impacting on almost all areas of human activity. Apart from the issue of poverty and its discontents, as we, globalization is also directly and indirectly destroying many civilizations as cultural and social formations disintegrate under the onslaught of finance capital and one-sided external information dissemination architecture. The objective of this enquiry therefore, is to enable us better understand the phenomenon, the dynamics of the dichotomy or asymmetry that is created and replicated, and probable ways of checkmating the undesirable aspects of globalization on disadvantaged societies.

The plethora of literature about globalization that has been churned out tends to confuse, rather than explicate the different dimensions of this phenomenon. The discussion about globalization has, in fact, mystified the concept to a degree that is unhealthy. However, the fact also remains that whether we do understand globalization or not, it definitely impacts on quality of life, the peace and stability of the environment, and one's relevance in the 21st century (Utomi, 2000).

In the main, without necessarily rehashing the literature, the globalization debate has raged between those who see in it opportunities for economic growth and more efficient markets, and those who see a disadvantage for the late starters mainly of the developing world. Many also see economic and corporate globalization as eroding state powers with serious implications for weak developing states (Utomi, 2000). It suffices to state that globalization is a major site of contestation with supporters (Ohmae, 1995; Scholte, 1996; Axtmann, 1998), and opposers (South Centre, 1996; Khor, 2001; Stiglitz, 2003).

From the literature, globalization is assumed to have played a very important role in increasing economic growth and reducing absolute poverty in developing countries of the South. To this end, proponents of globalization argue that it has led to better products, lower costs, job opportunities, increased productivity and improvement in global equity of life and welfare. Indeed, some believe that globalization has enriched the world scientifically and culturally, and has benefited a greater part of the people economically. However, Beberoglu (1997) was of the view that globalization actually accentuates class, regional, national and local inequalities and that it increases disparities in wealth, resources and power. That globalization reflects the increasing contradictions between capital and labour, and the logic of accumulation between the local and the international cannot be overemphasized.

Historical Trajectory in the Growth of Globalization

Globalization is neither a new concept nor a new phenomenon. It is simply a particular (but important moment) in the expansion of capitalization. It could be argued that globalization is a logical stage that could be traced to the slave trade, through to colonialism and imperialism, and to the present stage in the expansion of capitalism, especially finance capital propelled by new technologies. Ordinarily, this should not be a problem; however, for capitalism to grow there must be some exploitation of either human or material resources. And this is what has happened.

In fact, Tandon (2000:56) equates globalization in its broadest sense with the movement of history. The larger movement of history he also considers as the movement of civilization itself, which comes with both positive and negative effects.

The roots of Globalization date back to the time of European exploration and eventual colonization of other parts of the world. It is believed that the first great expansion of European capitalism took place in the 16th century following the first circumnavigation of the earth between 1519 and 1521, and at the early phases of the slave trade (Institute of Ethics and Developmental Studies, 2002). The salient features were characterized by the search for markets, raw materials and cheap labour. There was an extensive market in Africa where slave trade was the first sign of globalization. Africa, it appears was integrated into

globalization quite early. It could be said that the second phase of Africa's integration into the global system was that of the colonial period. In both instances, Africa was at a disadvantage for several reasons.

However, the process became more global in the 19th century as capital moved from Europe to America and Australia, to open up the areas with the building of rail road systems and agriculture that would be central to the expansion of capital (Akindele et.al, 2002). The arrival of joint-stock companies and developments in the acts of banking, industrial capital and technology enabled the scramble for and partitioning of Africa in 1884. Though, interrupted by the cold war, led by the United States, globalization was to re-assert itself with the effective end of the cold war in 1990. With this, there was no need this time around for the West to compromise its ideology of globalized trade and culture on the account of communism. Capitalism had triumphed.

Capitalism, with its dogmas of promoting private initiatives regulated mainly by the market forces, free trade, and limited governmental intervention in public policy formulation and implementation, and also of individual or multinational accumulation of surplus, and its supportive procedural democracy, has become the most important institution around which social progress or social change has been articulated in contemporary times (Lumumba-Kasongo, 2001:3). Marx had espoused the nature of capitalism in his three volumes of *Das Kapital* amidst other writings, noting the importance of the profit motive in the expansion of capital and in its undoing. From Marx's writings, no region of the world was too remote for the penetration of capital, even the end of bi-polarism (itself a product of globalization), could be the mine dimitis of capitalism as it creates neo-bipolarism (between the haves and haves-not, and therefore between the north and south in novel ways (Olurode, 2003).

It was observed for instance that significant in the new imperialism was the emergence of several empires in competition and the predominance of finance capital over mercantile capital (Hobson, 1938; Magdoff, 1978). Jinadu (2007:3) also observes that the accelerated and more aggressive push of the scramble between 1880 and 1900 was partly and strategically impelled by the imperative cardinal foreign policy objectives of the European countries in order to maintain a balance of power in Europe. Many therefore, view contemporary globalization as the continuation of the historical and structural process of capitalist and imperialist domination on a world scale, and of the global diffusion or replication of its economic substructures and cultural and political superstructures. According to Jinadu (2007:5), globalization has not only led to the marginalization of Africa for example, but also denied it the possibility of auto-centred development, by regarding African countries as follower-societies in the image of the globalizing and hegemonizing West.

The point therefore, is that there is nothing new about globalization. The forces had been at work from the onset of the Industrial Revolution (Economides and Wilson, 2001:9). The Industrial Revolution and the spread of industrialization led to the production and manufacture of goods, a process that required a variety of raw materials from a variety of sources; while the production of goods in large quantities required markets at home and abroad. Just like the old imperialism. Jinadu (2007:6), reiterates that the new one is anchored and reinforced by a number of universalizing cultural, legal, political and social factors, which constitute its ideology.

Theoretical and Conceptual Issues

The perspective through which this enquiry examines globalization in modern times is through the prism of the Marxist tradition, which invariably entails the dependency explanation of the nature of globalization and its impact on disadvantaged societies of the world. The Marxist tradition over the years has given birth to other strands that try to explain social change in different societies. Some of these include the dependency theory, world systems theory, Marxist political economy and Neo-Marxism. Though Marx did not have a theory of imperialism per se, which is fundamental to understanding globalization, he did have a theory of history in which capitalism plays a big role. This is sometimes called historical materialism and its basic assumption is that history is a product of social forces of

production and the contradictions generated by these forces. Virtually all theories of imperialism, are attempts to explain international political occurrences; mainly from the economic angle. For Marxists, globalization is viewed as a new age of imperialism where national, regional and global asymmetries characterized by social injustice and unequal exchange are much more pronounced and pernicious than was the case before (Institute of Ethics and Developmental Studies, 2002). In fact, Marxists view imperialism not simply in terms of bilateral relationships between two countries, but as a condition of the entire global system.

From this perspective, the internal contradictions of feudalism led to its downfall and the establishment of capitalism (MacRae, 1969). Each stage was a necessary precursor to the next. The conditions for capitalism were established by feudalism and the conditions for socialism were established by capitalism. The historical role of capitalism was particularly important to Marx. Unlike other modes of production it succeeded, because of its dynamic force. It expanded to every corner of the globe through its own internal logic and dynamics. In doing so, backward, pre-capitalist modes of production and their attendant customs and habits, myths and superstitions were dismantled, and the world united, for the first time, under a single socio-economic system. Subsequently, capitalism would give rise to the formation of a world-wide urban proletariat, revolutionary class consciousness, and the conditions for realization of socialism. According to Economides and Wilson (2001:55), capitalism is thus a disturbing, dislocating, destructive force, but also a progressive one with the vital historical task to shepherd the destruction of backward social forms. This paradox that capitalism is at the same time destructive and progressive – also central to Marx's thesis - is one that later Marxists have found difficult to assimilate. It was Lenin however, who dramatically illustrated the internal political implications of Marx's analysis of capitalism. Lenin famously defined imperialism not as the possession of overseas territories, but as a stage in the evolution of capitalism, in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Lenin, 1917). Half a century later, social theorist, Johan Galtung stretched the concept even further, by equating it with any form of international inequality in his *A Structural Theory of Imperialism* (Galtung, 1971).

Not all theories of imperialism are Marxist in Orientation. There is the "realist" theory of imperialism that gave primacy to the struggle for power (Morgenthau, 1973:48-76). Also in 1902, the English liberal economist and social theorist, J.A. Hobson, published, *Imperialism: A Study*. The work opined that fundamental contradictions in the structure of advanced capitalist economies in Europe, led to the need to export capital overseas, and hence the rise of imperialism.

Globalization is thus a historical process of change that has been with humanity for long. It is a system that generates domination and disempowerment, and impacts differently and often detrimentally on individuals, social groups and political entities, especially of the South. The present character of imperialism denotes less explicit control, influence, domination and even covert colonization. It can take the character of unequal bargaining power, enabling an economically powerful state to determine the economic policies of another, much weaker state.

Often analyzed at the level of the global economy as the unit of analysis (Biersteker, Madunagu, 1999), globalization is empowered by an international division of labour broadly characterized by dichotomy between high and low skill intensity of production between the advanced and developing countries respectively. This has implications for developing countries that serve as sources of raw materials for the advanced industrialized countries; and eventually, as dumping grounds for products manufactured from the same raw materials. This is possible as a result of liberalization a critical component of globalization (Akindele et.al, 2002). So the history of production and reproduction is important in the ability of a society to change and in determining its strengths and weaknesses (Lumumba-Kasongo, 2001:5).

FACE OF GLOBALIZATION

Positive Expectations

1 .Market driven Negative Realities

1. Tariff walls on products from developing countries
2. World without borders 2. Borderless only for capital and technology
3. Increased interdependence 3. Competition has killed businesses in the South
4. Opportunities for economic growth 4. Growth hampered by low technology evolution and lack of capital in developing countries
5. Reduces inefficiency 5. Creates unemployment, local businesses and traditional societies threatened with extinction
6. Provides technology 6. Has facilitated moral decline
7. Enhances concerted global responses 7. Increased capacity of external actors to intervene in local governance.

Source: Adapted from Iman Ill-Haque, *The Human Development Report*, 1999.

There is little doubt, that the economic factor is important in the process of change. And globalization is a process of economic change with implications for social, cultural and political relations. Perhaps, we could conceive of globalization as the Marxists have done, as a dialectical process of thesis and anti-thesis that may then produce a synthesis (Olurode, 2003). Find above, the two faces of globalization, which characterizes its nature. These are by no means exhaustive.

It is therefore reasonable to opine that globalization generates contradictions, which further generate other contradictions with implications for those that are disadvantaged. The reconciliation of these contradictions has fundamental implications for capitalism and global governance, and these implications are played out at the various sites of contestation and within structures at the global level.

Sites of Contestation

Globalization has many sites of contestation that are not bereft of politics and other overt and covert mechanisms and strategies for protecting the interests of the advantaged over the disadvantaged. Some of these sites could be found in the realm of trade and investment, Information Communication Technologies (ICT), finance Capital, Immigration, national policy formulation, poverty reduction, Knowledge and technology, culture and region, democratization and reforms and global governance. These sites are by no means exhaustive, but embody issues of critical analysis in this enquiry. For instance, matters of international trade have become the high politics of the 21st century (Economides and Wilson, 2001:84). Questions are being asked about how fair international trade architecture is? Competition and market accessibility does not seem to favour the developing countries. Take coffee for instance, the price of raw coffee beans is on a free fall, while the price of processed coffee continues to rise. Failures of developing countries to gain from the World Trade Organization (WTO), lack of market access and protectionism all point to deteriorating and not improving international trade for the developing world. In Africa, local enterprises are daily being destroyed as a result of globalization, thereby halting creativity and innovation. While this destructive process is going on, the preeminence of transnational corporations (TNC) continue to grow. Chishti (2002) counted 63,000 parent firms and around 690,000 foreign affiliates, and a plethora of inter-firm arrangements that span virtually all countries. Whereas over 60 countries in the world have a GNP of less than US \$10 billion, 135 TNC-only have sales in excess of US \$10 billion (Economides and Wilson, 2001:189)

In the past two decades or so, rather than earnestly seek ways of addressing the problems encountered by the developing countries in their trade relations with the richer countries, various measures like the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) were doled out as the panacea for the economic problems of

the developing world. SAP was characterized by constraining economic measures and conditionalities that further pauperized the masses of Africa (Gibbon and Olukoshi, 1996:57-58).

It suffices to state that politics of fair or unfair trade is being played out within the ambit of the WTO and the EU-ACP arrangements. While countries of the developing world strive for capacity and access to markets of the richer countries, the rich countries devise all sorts of standards and conditionalities to frustrate the efforts of the developing countries, and protect their interests. On finance capital, the speed with which capital flows can take place today constitutes both an advantage and a disadvantage. The movement of finance capital, which is a key messenger of capitalism, is almost uncontrollable today. While many countries in the south compete amongst each other for access to Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), the investments that come do not necessarily go to areas relevant to the needs of the local peoples, but to those areas of interest to the investors. In Nigeria, for example, while investments are needed in the agricultural sector and infrastructure development, they rather go to the oil and gas industry. These are resources that constitute the engine of capitalist production and its survival. Indeed, if we remember the Marshall plan to rehabilitate Europe after the Second World War, we will realize that it is in the interest of the West to empower development in the South, through fair investment and trade practices.

On information communication technology, we know that this sector today is one of the major forces that propel the globalization process. The convergence of three streams of technology computing, telecommunications and broadcasting ensured that the once far-fetched, almost science fiction, 'global village' became a reality (Utomi, 2000:64). Information technology has made it easier for the entire world to be within the reach of global investors. Easy information flow and cheap transportation now enable companies to locate where production is most efficiently carried out. With trade barriers down, ensured by the Uruguay Round of GATT and WTO. the economies of less efficient countries have suffered, resulting in de-industrialization. The reports from the Cable News Network, BBC and other networks are often heavily tilted in favour of their home governments and business interests, and to the detriment of those countries without the capacity to counter or influence such penetration of information.

The increasing incidence of poverty around the world, and efforts at reducing or curbing it, is another major site of contestation as a result of globalization. While one-half of income worldwide is generated by trade among nations, 1.3 billion people live on less than one dollar a day and 3 billion people, or half the population of the world, live on less than one dollar a day (Utomi, 2000). A situation in which the assets of the top three billionaires in the West is more than the GNP of all least developed countries and their 600 million people is most alarming and unacceptable, in spite of whatever positive impact globalization has had. This situation is scandalous, as experience suggests that it is possible to provide and eradicate poverty through correct policy choices, without taking anything away from anybody.

In addition, the globalization of policy making has resulted in the national policies of individual countries being compromised with implications for poverty reduction. According to Khor (2001:11), national policies, including the economic, social, cultural and technological that until recently were under the jurisdiction of states and peoples have increasingly come under the influence of international agencies and processes or of big private corporations and economic/financial players. While globalization creates a revolution of rising expectations, it at the same time, reduce; state capacity with respect to economic and social policy options.

Clearly visible in the march of globalization in the 21st century are the contradictions generated by this phenomenon. While it requires qualified, but cheap labour from countries of the south: it at the same time imposes strict immigration measures to check the movement of labour, which from time immemorial has been a key feature of capitalism. Still, it is estimate that each year, between two and three million people immigrate to the developed countries. The beginning of the 21st century saw more than 130 million people living outside their native countries and the number continued to rise by about 2 percent per annum (World Bank, 2000).

There is no-gain saying that globalization has therefore enhanced brain drain from Africa as example. Prospects for retaining highly skilled individuals are daunting, as the richer countries of the world snatch up these individuals with better offers. Again, even if FDIs and related technologies are eventually obtained in Africa, will the relevant manpower be available since most are sojourning in strange lands. Even at this, restrictions on labour mobility as evidence in tougher immigration laws in the United States and Europe continue unabated. The import of this is that economic globalization is really about capital, rather than labour: and focused on global accumulation, rather than income re-distribution.

Globalization through commission or omission also has a cultural and civilizational dimension as a site of contestation. That globalization is impacting fundamentally on the organization of traditional societies is not in doubt. The worrisome dimension is that whereas the advanced industrialized societies have almost already attained the post-industrial era, globalization is threatening to erode the last vestiges of traditional culture and traditional political organization existing in many developing countries. Must the societies of the developing world follow the tangent passed through by the European and American societies? The answer is no, because some of the values associated with capitalism and globalization are definitely not the best to emulate. Agreed that human societies must go through the process of social change through cultural diffusion, and that the imported material and immaterial aspects are substantial; this does not however, imply that there should be no resistance or options as to what changes are desirable and those that are not. Increasingly countries like Japan and China are showing that there is a choice in determining the rate and type of cultural diffusion. The developing countries should learn from this. Though culture is the way of life of a people, and there is no culture that is closed to influence, however, one should have the capability and choice of determining the speed and character of the changes that are occurring. History indicates that borrowing of ideas and material culture through diffusion is inevitable, and this has been largely facilitated through migration over long distances, a process that is now abridged in time because of transportation and the revolution in communication technology (Olurode, 2003). Therefore, special effort should be made to monitor and control the speed and spread of undesirable cultural influence.

The situation today is that young people in developing countries are undergoing uncontrolled acculturation, and are under the tremendous influence of western culture in music, dress style, food and behaviour. This situation breeds confusion and disorientation in the youth, making them difficult to shape into law-abiding adults. The point being made is that when we consider the centrality of culture to human development, globalization in its present form is undoubtedly undermining the future of young people in Africa and the developing world in general. There is consciously or unconsciously media imperialism perpetrated by the networks of the advanced or rich countries of the world. For example, reportage on Africa is biased and unbalanced. It is either nature programmes, implying that Africa is still at the level of food gathering, or it is conflict, wars and starvation. This indeed, is imperialism of a particular kind. Footages of the beautiful infrastructure at Abuja, Nigeria or the clean environment of Accra and civility of Ghanaians are never shown. Included also, is the poor attention on Africans and peoples of the developing world that have made giant strides in science and technology, and in the arts. I believe my point is made. The increase in uncensored consumption of information detrimental to the morals and values of traditional societies such as pornography and unsavory TV shows, require to be countered. It should be a site of contestation between negative change and positive change.

The sphere of culture and popular education are also under pressure from globalization, and has implications for local consumption patterns and production relations. The way African languages are being eroded is worrisome. There is a need to respect cultural differences and share a commonsense of commitment about the world. The developing world need in the present era to be selective as a matter of urgency and necessity. They can think globally, but must act locally.

Let us at this juncture, examine the issue of religion and civilizational differences in this age of globalization. Globalization took on a different interpretation after the September 11 attacks in

Washington DC. Severally condemned as inhuman and unacceptable, the attacks appeared to be a statement that the ideological differences between the West and Arab civilization have crossed the Rubicon. The West led by the United States became alarmed and in the process unleashed defensive, but unhealthy offensives against individuals, forces and nations perceived (not proven) as bearers of international terrorism and enemies of the West. Iraq. Afghanistan, Pakistan. Palestinian Territory became theatres of conflict. Many innocent lives were lost, limbs and property were also lost, in this amorphous war that appears to have no code of conduct or rules of engagement. The crisis in the Middle East therefore, took on a new dimension, and Arab fundamentalism and the Muslim Vanguard clashed with this amorphous offensive. It was Huntington, who had previously written that in the immediate post cold war global political order, the dominating source of conflict will be "cultural", and that principal conflict of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilization (Codesria, 2004). Perhaps, this prompted the Mahmood Mamdani, into writing the book *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*, as a way of show-casing the current trend of contradictions between the West and other parts of the world. Here, there is definitely a focus on religion as the carrier of evil, and by implication a site for the clash of civilizational differences.

It appears to be the case that Islam has disapproved of the capitalist economic systems as exploitative and evil, as it is predicated on the exploitation of man by man, creating social imbalances. From Islamic lenses, capitalism is viewed as extremely materialistic, fanatically secular, immoral and anti-God (Al-Islam, 1995). This view is shared by many Arab Muslims. It is therefore not surprising that it is from the Middle East that the greatest opposition to capital in its modern form, and western civilization is coming; this could indeed be the beginning of a clash of civilization (Codesria, 2004). The fact remains that Islam with its elaborate belief system on the provision of welfare, finds itself in opposition to economic globalization.

Contestation is also being played out in the field of knowledge and technology. While traditional societies are desirous of protecting their indigenous knowledge, globalization is making this difficult. Meanwhile, the technological gap between the developed and developing countries continue to worsen. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries with 19 percent of the global population has 91 percent of internet users for example. In addition, tighter Intellectual Property Rights have raised the price of technology transfer, blocking developing countries from the dynamic knowledge sector. This exclusivity is creating parallel worlds of "haves" and "have nots" in the field of science and technology. Developing countries therefore have little option, but to either steal, borrow to purchase or embark on a long-term programme of producing scientists and technologists in order to bridge a gap that is increasingly widening.

The political dimension to the current globalization comes in the form of the export of democracy as of capital. So, democratization and reforms targeted at liberalization and decentralization presently constitute aspects of globalization. States under one party system were required to open up the political space to admit competition and political liberalism with a view to making the state more stable and to minimize political contestations from ethnic and religious groups (Olurode, 2003). This in itself is nothing bad, but what is worrisome is the fact that liberalization of the political space, also, empowered hitherto amorphous groups and suppressed forces (Agbu, 2004) to challenge the sovereignty of states built on shaky foundations of European partition and scramble. Democratization comes with expectations, which in many cases: African states have been unable to meet resulting in social and political crises. In recent times, we now hear of "choiceless democracies" in countries like Benin. Zambia, Malawi and Ghana as the case may be.

Globalization should also be contested at the level of global Governance. This is because global governance is increasingly becoming an important issue in the 21st century. Since politics is imbued in all human activity including governance structures, it is only logical that it can also be found at the level of global governance. Politics here entails who takes the ultimate decisions and in whose interest. The

north has increasingly arrogated to itself the right to interfere at will in all structures of global governance in complete disregard to the interests of others and the basic premises of the UN Charter. It is therefore, not surprising that development no longer features as central or a priority in the list of topical issues on the global agenda. While there is the real need for new and improved global rules and regulatory arrangements to provide for public goods, protect the global environment, manage global financial risks, and discourage anti-competitive processes, global rules have tended to reflect the interests of the rich rather than give voice or votes to poorer countries and people (Center for Global Development, 2007). As expected, the South has risen up in opposition to the composition and workings of global governance institutions like the UN, WTO and World Bank with view to having better representation and therefore their interests protected.

Responses from the South

A lot has been written about the magnitude and nature of the responses of South countries to globalization (Ake, 1995, Khor, 2001, Aina, 1997, South Centre, 2003). It suffices to note that it is not as if globalization has had a free run. As observed by the call for proposal of the "Joint International Conference on Globalization: Migration, Citizenship and Identity" in 2007 by Kennesaw State University, Georgia, globalization by its character has attracted opposition: and everywhere, mobility, identity and citizenship are generating mounting tensions.

Indeed, beginning from the 1970s, as inequalities between North and South increased, developing states called for a radical overhaul of the international economic system, involving the regulation and reorganization of the market, and the introduction of radical redistributive mechanisms. This gave rise to North-South debate, and the New International Economic Order (NIEO) became one of the most important issues on the International agenda (Economides and Wilson, 2001:10). By 2001, Starr (2001) was able to identify at least 200 organizations that have anti-corporate, anti-capitalist and anti-globalization political programmes and agendas. The resistance centered on contestation and reforms with respect to SAP, grassroots resistance to the impact of globalization; and delinking, relocalization and saving localities from the ravages of globalization.

In recent times, there has been better coordinated opposition to globalization through protests from South countries. Anti-globalization protests have greeted meetings of the World Bank, IMF, WTO and the Group of Eight industrialized countries (G8), and other institutions that serve as support bases for globalization. The protests during the WTO meetings in Doha, Seattle and in Cancun in 2003 indicated that there was something wrong in the way globalization was evolving. In Davos, there were protests against the Trilateral Commission, the World Economic Forum, while in Washington; it was against the World Bank and IMF. These were surprising!}' not anticipated at all (Chachage, 2004:330).

Re-Negotiating Participation in the Process

That globalization has positive elements is not in doubt, however, because its negative impact is deeply destructive, it behoves states, individually and collectively to respond to globalization, first, by re-negotiating participation in the process. This has to be done because sharp contrasts exist between the economic gains of globalization and the social and political problems it has generated (Utomi, 2000). Abraham (2006) had noted that the international system is driven by unequal power structure, which has created an imbalance that is destroying the economies of developing countries. It is our belief that the ways in which the consequences of globalization are negotiated, will induce a modification in the process.

Though globalization has been likened to a runaway train that the developing countries must keep pace with, with little alternative, there is a sense in which this train could be blocked or diverted. To begin with, each developing and disadvantaged country must define its own destination, or do so in concert with the other developing countries to determine the route of diversion, so as to attain their goals. On the other hand, countries of the developing world should also learn how to live with capitalism, and engage

with it constructively (Chachage, 2004). This approach is necessary as globalization's ideology of free-market liberalism and political, economic and cultural imperialism are made possible through the exploitation of weaker partners the developing countries (Tandon, 1998). Underlying the domination and exploitation is the inequality inherent in the distribution of power at the global level. In other words, globalization has been largely driven by the interests and needs of the developed world (Grieco and Holmes, 1999). Though, supposedly market-driven, it is not actually driven by the invisible hand of the market, rather benefits and losses are managed by undemocratic, opaque and supremacist forces which defy rational dialogue on most items in the various agreements of WTO for instance.

In subsequent negotiations, developing countries should begin to attack and strive to alter the conditions that have given undue advantages to the rich countries. Where do these advantages lie? They lie in the possession of economic, military and political leverages, off-shoots of power. According to E.H. Carr, three main elements constitute political power military power, economic power and power over public opinion (Razeen, 1998). The possession of considerable economic power is implicit in the notion of "hegemony" and domination. Therefore, developing countries will do well to begin to accumulate those elements of power relating to military prowess (if not actual, potential), economic power and the necessary information technology to counter media imperialism and acculturation. Nigeria recently launched an observatory Satellite into space (NIGCOMSAT I); is due to launch a communications satellite in 2009 (NIGCOMSAT II): and even another, NIGCOMSAT X. in no distant future. Its national television station (NTA) has gone international helping to tell the story of Nigeria. Nigerian's in diaspora and Africa to the world from an African perspective. This is the type of engagement and re-negotiation that the South requires to counter the negative aspects of globalization. Also, economic power could relate to industrial capacity, size and skill of population, degree of technological advancement and food security. It could also relate to extensive international influence as a result of financial power, production power and market power. These are areas that developing countries need to pay attention to in their contestation with globalization.

Finally, developing countries should also seek to possess "structural" advantages to determine agenda and shape the context and environment in which decisions affecting them are taken. The WTO, World Bank and IMF readily come to mind as institutions that not only set agenda, but seek to perpetuate their ideas. Therefore, being able to have a voice in the decision making process and global governance structures will help reduce the penchant of the richer countries to perpetuate their interests.

Apart from the foregoing, which may be regarded as proactive re-negotiation interventions, the advanced countries should also realize that it is in everybody's interest to accommodate the interests of the south countries. Politics would have served humanity when it is deployed in a human manner that could serve the peoples of the world. What is the essence of a system, or in short capitalism, if at the end, rather than taking humanity to greater civilization is actually instrumental in its destruction.

Conclusion

Having gone through the gamut of the historical, theoretical and conceptual, manifestations and contestations about globalization, and the responses from the developing countries, we are still left with the feeling that enough has not been done about addressing the subject. However, from the standpoint of understanding what is at stake and its manifestations, it is possible to lay claim to some progress. The problem, however, remains the how or ways through which the global economy could be made benign to parts of the world disadvantaged by historical, structural and rule-based institutions of the current globalization architecture. In this study, effort has been made to identify those areas that require attention, and how south countries could attempt to redress their predicament. The developing world should not stand akimbo, but must re-orient and re-negotiate their participation in the global political economy, for them to be able to achieve meaningful and sustainable development. This is because there is gross inequality and inequity in the allocation of the benefits of globalization.

For Africa, in particular, it is important to recognize that a critical component of re-constructing the continent and achieving effective re-negotiation is the development of the necessary capacity to identify and exploit its own resources in a way that adds value to the products before export. The point had earlier been made about the need for all to shift emphasis from the 'globalization of world economy, to globalization of development'. For the West, this should be a more practical philosophy for assisting in addressing underdevelopment in the South. The rich should realize that the scourge of underdevelopment can incense the dialectics of capitalism, and shake the very foundations of the global economy as presently constituted. With the deepening and alienation of vast masses of the world's peoples, 'petty national interests', should give way to 'global developmental needs' for the stability of the international system. The West should also realize that the sociology of economic life in Africa for instance, is not all about the economic rationale, but about community welfare. Indeed, there is a sense in which communalism is a higher civilization than capitalism with its individualistic character. This discussion will be for another day.

In summary, globalization should not mean that there should be no national controls at all; rather, it challenges countries to be more vigilant, proactive and re-adapt their national strategies to survive in a challenging and exploitative global political and economic system. In this quest for survival, Asia and South America must meet Africa and together devise and execute a grand alliance and strategy for confronting unbridled capitalism in the guise of globalization.

Notes

This paper, "Globalization: The Politics of We' and 'Them'" was initially presented at the NAPSS Week of the National Association of Political Science Students, Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka; held at Genevieve Hall, Whiteview Hotel, Awka on 25 May 2013.

References

- Abraham, K (2006), "The Marginalization of Africa and Globalization", Ethiopian Online Newsletter, http://www.dekialula.com/articles/ K_abraham_feb_11_2006.html [Accessed 24 August 2007].
- Agbu, O (2004), *Ethnic Militias and the Threat to Democracy in Post-Transition Nigeria*, Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Agbu, O (2006), "Globalization and Nigeria's Economy", *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.32, No. 1.
- Ake, C (1995), "The New World Order: The View from Africa", Hans-Henrik Holm and George Sorensen (eds.), *Whose World Order: Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*. London: Westview Press.
- Akindele et.al (2002), *Globalization, Its Implications and Consequences for Africa*. http://www.globalization.icanp.org/content/v2.1/0lakindele__etal.html (Accessed 26). March, 2007].
- Aina, A. T. (1997) *Globalization and Social Policy in Africa in Africa*. CODESRIA, Working Report Series 6/96.
- Axtmann, R. (1998), "Globalization, Europe and the State: Introductory Reflection" *Globalization and Europe: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. London: Mansel.
- Beberoglu, B. (1997), "Globalization and Its Impacts on the Third World: A "Comparative Historical Analysis"", *Development and Social Economic Progress*. No.69.
- Biersteker, T.J. (1998), "Globalization and the Models of Operation of Major Institutional Actors", *Oxford Development Studies*, Vol.20, No. 1.
- Center for Global Development (2007), http://www.cgdev.org/doc/commentary/birdsall/WIDERlecture_inequality.pdf. [Accessed 24 August, 2007].
- Chachage, S.L. C. & E. Annan-Yao (2004), "Conclusion Future Agenda: Beyond Globalization", Tade Akin Aina et.al (eds.), *Globalization and Social Policy in Africa*, South Africa, Codesria.
- Chishti. S. (2002), "Globalization, International Economic Relations and the Developing Countries", *International Studies*, Vol.39, No.3, July September. Codesria Bulletin (2004), "Terrorism and Globalism", Numbers 3 and 4, Dakar, CODESRIA.
- Economides. S. and P. Wilson (eds.) (2001). *The Economic Factor in International Relations*, London. I.B. Tauris.
- Eze, O. (2007), "Globalization and the Dynamics of External Interests in Africa", Paper Presented at the Conference on the New Scramble for Africa, Abuja. April 11 -12.
- Galtung. J. (1971) "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 13. No. 2.
- Gibbon, P. and O. Adebayo (1996), *Structural Adjustment and Socio-Economic Change in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Uppsala, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Research Report No. 102.
- Grieco, M. and L. Holmes (1999), "Tele Options for Community Business: An Opportunity for Economic Growth in Africa", *Africa Notes*, October.
- Hobson, J. A. (193 8), *Imperialism: A Study*, London.
- Ohmae, K. (1995), *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, London, Zed Books.

- Ill-Haque, I. (1999), *The Human Development Report, 1999*.
- Institute of Ethics and Development Studies Year II (2002), *Globalization is a Reverse Gear for Africa*, Inter University Seminar <http://www.Fiuc.org/esap/MAKER.MAKER2/General/globalization?Php>[Accessed 4 October, 2007].
- Jinadu, A. (2007), "Conceptual and Theoretical Issues in the Scramble for Africa", Paper Presented at the International Conference on the New Scramble for Africa, Organized by The Presidency and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja, April 11 12.
- Khor, M. (2001), *Rethinking Globalization*. London: Zed Books.
- Lenin, V.I. (1917), *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking, Foreign Language Press, [1963].
- Lumumba-Kasongo, T. (2001), *Globalization, Capitalism, Liberal Democracy and The Search for New Development Paradigms in Africa*, AAPS Occasional Paper Series, Vol.5, No. 1.
- MacRae, D. (1969), "Karl Marx", Timothy Raison (ed.), *The Founding Fathers of Social Science*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Madunagu, E. (1999), "Globalization and Its Victims", *The Guardian (Nigeria)*, July 26
- Magdoff, H. (1978), *Imperialism: From Colonial Age to the Present*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Mamdani, M. (2004), *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*, Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Morgenthau, H. (1973), *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Knopf.
- Olurode, L. (2003), *Gender, Globalization and Marginalization in Africa*, Vol. XXVIII. Nos.3and4.
- Razeen. S. (1998), *Classical Liberation and International Economic Order*, London. Routledge.
- Starr. A. (2001), "Naming the Enemy Anti-Corporate Movements Ccr.fr:T.: Globalization", <http://www.bad.server.org/reviews/2001/2001-10-12-8,48AM>.
- Scholte. J. A. (1996). "Beyond the Buzzword: Toward a Critical Theory of Globalization", E. Kofman and G. Young (eds), *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, London. Routledge.
- South Centre (1996) *Liberalization and Globalization: Drawing conclusions for Development Geneva: Atar*.
- South Centre (2003), "Challenging Hegemonic Globalization: Voices from the South", Issue 39.
- Stiglitz, J. (2003), "Do as the US Says, not as it Does", *South Letter*, Issue 39.
- Tandon, Y. (1998), "Globalization and Africa's Options" (Part One), *AAPS News Letter*, Harare, Vol.3, No. 1, January April.
- Tandon, Y. (2000), "Globalization and Africa's Options", Dani W. Nabudere (ed.), *Globalization and the Post-Colonial African State*, Harare: AAPS.
- Utomi, P. (2000), *Critical Perspectives on Nigerian Political Economy and Management*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books.
- World Bank (2001), *Entering the 21st Century: World Development Report 1999/2000*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Author's Biography

Osita AGBU, PhD, is a Research Professor in the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Lagos. He has published widely in both local and international journals.