

GLOBALISM, GLOCALIZATION AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA: GAUGING THE GULF BETWEEN SLOGANEERING, APPEARANCES AND STARK REALITIES OF DETERRITORIZATION AND DEMOCRATIZATION

P. OKECHUKWU EKE
Department of Sociology
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria, Nigeria

opeke@abu.edu.ng; okeypeke@gmail.com
+2347032364449

ABSTRACT

*In the present age, it is possible that the term ‘globalization’ is the most frequently occurring lexical item in any economic, political or social discourse. While its virtues are extolled by many including those with very limited (and even impaired) understanding of its various denotative and connotative significations, dimensions and dynamics, attention has been repeatedly drawn by a critical segment of the intelligentsia to the obvious injuries as well as the potential dangers of the trend especially to the economies, policies, and politics of underdeveloped regions of the world predominantly found in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Though economic globalization has been on for centuries in the course of Western capitalist expansion of empires, the present wave was accentuated by radical advancements in electronic technologies of information and communication and the development of supersonic modes of transportation which have all led to the virtual annihilation of physical space. A second factor is the liberalization of trade and investment policies adopted by many modern states. The process of globalization equally created other semantic companies such as **globalism**, **glocalization** and **grobalization**, and these affiliated concepts are in essence estuaries of the same phenomenon. The implications of the liaisons between these global trends and the pursuit of democracy and development in Africa will be closely scrutinized in this article. It is hoped that the numerous discrepancies between the political and economic posturings on the one hand and the stark realities of the African situation on the other will be better apprehended in the end, with the ultimate aim of identifying how best the continent can be reclaimed from the numerous clutches that have historically hindered her stability and prosperity.*

Initial Musings: The Presence of the Past and the Immiscibility of the Three Worlds

Already, we are familiar with the delineation, for descriptive convenience, of the world into three – ‘The First World’ (referring to the Northern hemisphere comprising of the technologically and economically advanced democracies of Europe and America), ‘The Second World’ (found mostly in the Southern hemisphere and constituting the newly developed and developing nations of Asia and parts of North Africa), and lastly, ‘The Third World’; (sadly situated also within the Southern hemisphere but lurking distantly at the back of the rear of the previous two worlds and harbouring predominantly the countries of sub-Saharan Africa). Historically, the realities of these three worlds in terms of social, scientific, economic and political, (r)evolutions and transformations have never been identical nor have the relations on all fronts amongst them ever been equal or mutually beneficial. Also, the nature and direction of change in the economy society and politics of these three worlds have not been the same, with Africa always perching precariously on the extremely odd side of it all. We will therefore in the first two segments of this preliminary part attempt to historicize what has now become the African dilemma.

From the age of slavery and colonialism to the present post-neocolonial era, the bulk of Africa has not been associated with any remarkable positive change and the vast population of autochthons on the continent has continued to don the hood of poverty, squalor, disease and ignorance. The ‘national’ economies of a majority of African states are critically ailing with scant prospects of being turned around

soon, and most governments are contending with serious crises of legitimacy as well as the repercussions of corrupt and inept leadership manifesting in various forms of deadly social and criminal violence. Yet, globalization and democratization is constantly on the tip of every tongue in Africa where sham elections that merely serve to re-cycle the indigenous power elites and their acolytes are celebrated as monumental accomplishments. The expectation of economic stability, income redistribution and a better life for the masses to accrue from the grant of political autonomy to former African colonies have completely evaporated largely because nothing has really changed in the relations between the centre and the periphery of the global capitalist network despite the intensive and extensive nature of international exchanges in virtually every field, given especially the supremacy of the role of capital in the prevailing world economic order.

The picture of Africa is pathetically grim: basic infrastructural facilities are grossly inadequate for an ever surging population and the few operational ones provided mainly during the colonial period are derelict. National budgets are predicated on foreign aids, and unconscionable indebtedness to the Bretton Woods institutions is no longer news-worthy. In consequence, all the vital indicators of economic regression and the failure of development are ubiquitous across contemporary Africa. But even with such an awfully bleak and prostrate posture of an overwhelming majority of African states, the song of globalization and liberal democracy in getting merrily deafening. Kwame Nkrumah's (1957:164) prophecy of 'Seek ye first the political kingdom, and all things shall be added unto you' has become shamefully disproved by unfolding realities in post-colonial Africa and Ali Mazrui, in mournful contemplation of the present fate of the continent mused thus:

When he said that, Kwame Nkrumah was convinced that political independence was the key to all other improvements in the African condition. Underlying the statement was a philosophy about the primacy of politics in human affairs – of radically different philosophy from economic determinism. Had Nkrumah been a thorough-going Marxist he would have been tempted to proclaim 'Seek ye first the economic kingdom – and all else will be added unto it'. And yet, in a colonial situation, Kwame Nkrumah's political primacy was at least partly right. Colonial Africa did initially have to seek political sovereignty before anything else could be added unto it. What Nkrumah overlooked was a simple distinction of logic – the distinction between what was a sufficient condition and what was a necessary condition. Political sovereignty (or 'political kingdom') was indeed a necessary condition before Africa could fulfill or realize any of her other fundamental aspirations. But by itself, political sovereignty was not enough – it was not a sufficient condition. It was simply, not true that 'all else would be added unto it' (Mazrui, 1999:105).

Despite the non-materialization of Nkrumah's prognosis, he still cannot in fairness be imagined to have been totally oblivious of either the principles of logic or the beacon of the Marxist thesis (i.e. the economy as the ultimate infrastructure from which issueth all that is manifest in other realms of society). After-all, did Nkrumah in his *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1966) not declare that there is no separation of the 'economic' from the 'political', and that if economic stability is far from realization, then, political stability cannot by any means be nearer? The case rather is not one of analytical error on Nkrumah's part but simply a matter of the past being ever present in the African situation. Trans-Atlantic slavery was a prelude to colonialism and these were stages in the crystallization and expansion of capitalism, and colonialism itself was the primary vehicle of capitalist penetration of Africa. From Claude Ake's (1981) scintillating analysis of the political economy of Africa, it is easy to see how the disarticulation in the colonial economy, market imperfections and monopolistic tendencies, complexities and discontinuities in the social relations of production, and the series of contradictions between colonial capital on the one hand and the African petit-bourgeoisie, labour and the peasantry on the other hand have continued to haunt the course of developments in the post-colonial economy, politics and society of Africa.

To be sure, slavery and colonialism are not a peculiarly African experience and it is also true that many countries in other continents with similar exposure to same phenomena have been able to rise to vertiginous heights of accomplishments in science, technology, economic prosperity and sophisticated political organization that memories of a past of foreign subjugation, exploitation and domination seem almost completely obliterated. In the African case however, it was the uniquely odious form of slavery – massive, indescribably cruel and protracted – and its natural corollary – colonialism, which was attended by an exceptional dose of racist hostility and violence that made the difference. The burden of ‘civilization’ and the ‘charitable’ task of ‘development’ in African colonies were convenient ideologies intended merely to disguise, conceal and justify the paradoxical logic of European imperial capitalist venture. It is sufficiently clear from the evolution of the capitalist system under the primary inspirations of Calvinism and the industrial revolution in the First World that such an economic order was inherently incompatible with equality at the levels of participation and consequent benefits. Capitalism has no moral conscience and exploitation is at the heart of that enterprise which is guided solely by the motive of profit maximization and ceaseless accumulation.

At every stage in the development of capital, the meaning and implication have remained different for Europe and America – the inhabitants of the First World occupying the centre, as well as for those co-opted nearer the centre, i.e. the Second World of the newly industrialized and developing locations while the Third World generally and Africa in particular have continued to be ‘integrated’ into the global capitalist economy in a manner akin to the Biblical Jonah and the big fish. This is neither unity nor does the appearance in any way convey a situation of comfortable incorporation. The three worlds, at least for now, are immiscible and the experience of the metropolitan centre and those closer to the centre – the First and Second Worlds respectively of the relative advantages of the international division of labour markedly vary in an unfair, unjust and lopsided manner, from the experience in the subservient capitalist peripheries of sub-Saharan Africa.

Though it has become more fashionable now to talk in terms of the global North and the South, the truth is that sub-Saharan Africa remains the worst hit, the most exploited, impoverished and devastated by the operation of capital than the rest within the ranks of the Third World in Asia and Latin America. The vulgar opulence of the Western core of the international capitalist grid spells and spreads misery across the periphery. As Samir Amin quips:

Accumulation, which is synonymous with pauperization ... expresses itself mainly in the growing contrast between the affluence of the societies in the centre (of the world system) who benefit from the imperialist rent and the misery of the societies at the dominated peripheries. Historically “real existing” capitalism is associated with successive forms of accumulation by dispossession, not only at the beginning (“primitive accumulation”) but also at each stage in the unfolding of the capitalist system. Once properly constituted, this “Atlantic” capitalism sought to conquer the world and remake it on the basis of permanent dispossession of the conquered regions, which in this process become the dominated peripheries of the system (Amin, 2011:1, 2).

The critical questions now are: How did Africa acquire such an unenviable slot in the present scheme of the capitalist order? Can Africa be said to be innocent of her fate or is she wittingly and unwittingly culpable in her own destruction? Who has been gaining and who are the losers and whose society is being destroyed in all these? It is to these issues that attention will now be directed in the second part of our preliminary considerations here.

Re-reading the African Situation: A Matter of Destiny, Coerced Cooperation or Volitional Participation in Own Destruction?

Perhaps, it may be better to start by re-visiting the old argument of the negro’s inability of scientific and technological achievements based on race since it was the revolution in the world of natural sciences leading to radical innovations in industrial and military hardware and particularly, the development of sea

transportation that greatly enhanced trans-Atlantic slavery and colonial conquests of Europe over Africa. Our task in this respect has been graciously eased by Arnold Toynbee's summation in his *Survey of Civilizations*:

... The temporary Western domination of Africa during the 'colonial' period has led Westerners to underestimate the African achievement. The values of the aggressive Western society of the 19th century were largely determined by the recently adopted Western objective of technological innovation and alien societies that did not come up to this arbitrarily imposed technological standard were classified in Western minds as barbaric, primitive and savage. Today, however, the perpetuation of these views convicts those who hold them of obstinate prejudice. An unbiased observer will credit Africa with achievements comparable to those in other societies – and such societies have been the normal types so far – in which an obsessive concern with technology has not allowed to overshadow everything else. It will be recognized that Africa has made a special – perhaps not yet adequately recognized contribution to mankind's cultural achievements in the spheres of social relations and of man's relation with non-human nature (Toynbee, 1995:71, 72).

Aside of the advantages conferred on Europe by the industrial revolution that paved the way for the emergence of superior technology and military prowess, the development of the art of printing and massive sea-going ships, there were equally changes in the forces and social relations of production in Western societies during the early stages of capitalism under the spirit of Calvinism as well as the eventual crystallization of the dominant and subordinate classes and all these historical processes did not occur in Africa. The series of connected transformations in the society of Europe from the pre-industrial and crude agrarian economy to the industrial and post-industrial stages of capitalist mode of production and social organization were not experienced in Africa and it was only through the coastal Atlantic contacts in the course of legitimate and illegitimate transactions between Europeans and Africans that rudimentary aspects of the capitalist system began to make its entry into an incongruent socio-historical society of Africa.

For instance, the process of emergence of the owners of the means of production, the ruling classes, who with their enormous economic power controlled the state, determined the politics and influenced virtually all that concerned the rest of the masses that typically lived by the sale of their labour at the incipient stages of capitalism and the evolution of the modern state in Europe could not be replicated in Africa. These processes were guided by the natural laws of history and therefore could not be artificially ignited or reproduced. Till date, certain deep-rooted abnormalities in the development of the structures of power in most African states as colonially fabricated, chiefly the lack of solid economic base of the indigenous ruling classes have continued to be at the heart of the problems of political violence, official corruption and "prebendal politics" as Richard Joseph (1991) aptly described the phenomenon in Nigeria and elsewhere on the continent. The abnormalities issue from the fact that the African petty bourgeoisie as an imitative and shallow class have not been able to achieve the hegemony wielded by their "real" counterparts in Europe. Again, in the case of Africa, economic power is sought through the political given the extremely statist nature of "national" economies so designed from colonial times, while the reverse obtains in the West.

It must be noted in passing that there is in reality very little that is "national" about the economies of African states because of their domination by the activities of multi-national corporations and international financial institutions, the entanglement with the debt trap as well as their heavy orientation towards the dynamics of the core international capitalist system, with Africa's clear limitation of involvement only at the primary extractive sector and finally, due to the role of the continent as ordinary markets for mostly European (and recently Asian) products and services. A third may be added which is Africa's role as a theatre for the geo-political displays of the "super-powers". The continued domination of African economies by the Western forces of capitalism, particularly the multi-national corporations and the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) have rendered the so-called "independence" from colonial rule

largely ineffectual. The conditions and strategies for the perpetual dependence and interminable tutelage of former African colonies were firmly and tactfully crafted by the imperial powers before the grant of political autonomy.

Before delving into the discussion of globalization, globalism, glocalization, and liberal (Western) democracy (together with other such-like concepts that constitute the current fads in the repertoire of the capitalist order) as they affect Africa, let us quickly re-examine the role of Africa in what now seems like the continent's destiny – the destiny of poverty, endemic conflicts and violence, underdevelopment and regression while the centre and those nearer the centre of the capitalist mainstream continue to progress in every vital respect. In defiance of Willy Brandt's (1980:25) admonitions that "focusing on questions of historical guilt will not provide answers" and that "self-righteousness will neither create jobs nor feed hungry mouths" – (in the Third World and especially in sub-Saharan Africa), a brief analysis of the respective parts played by the European and African parties during slavery and the phase of colonial subjugation and plundering of human and material resources of Africa will be undertaken which will hopefully lead to a better illumination of the present trends in the operation of the New International Economic Order (NIEO) and the covert politics and intrigues beneath it that has continued to demonstrate that the past is still being vigorously re-enacted.

Admittedly, the pre-occupation with the largely unhelpful search for the party to blame or congratulate for the consequences of the historical intercourse between Europe and Africa as Brandt hinted has dominated the discourse on the North and South for too long and such exercises end with further blurring of vision, complication of the mutual misunderstanding already there and enlarging the gulf between the worlds in intellectual, economic, political, diplomatic and strategic terms. Our sole aim therefore is merely to situate issues in their proper perspectives for as the *Igbo* saying goes: "He who did not see the snake climbing the tree may simply conclude that it was delivered to the top by human hands". The present circumstances of the three worlds are simply beyond the claim that 'heaven helps only those who help themselves' for the severity of certain kinds of yoke could render the victims incapable of self-assistance, making intercession the only possible source of rescue.

Pre-Colonial Euro-Africa Contacts and the Slavery Argument

From Basil Davidson's (1992), *The Black Man's Burden: Africa and the Curse of the Nation-State*, glimpses of an African past that shockingly contradict the prejudiced views of a European visiting the "black" continent for the first time are offered and Walter Rodney's (1972) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* presented with exceptional lucidity the varying degrees of evolving sophistication of the African world before the devastating interceptions, distortions and reversals of the "natural" course of historical transformations which began with trans-Atlantic slavery. Now, a tome of materials abound that engage this subject of trans-Atlantic slavery from multifarious dimensions – the cruel dimensions of African population and the huge unjustifiable drainage of the vital productive forces, the huge contributions of slave labour to the plantations, industries and infrastructural developments in Europe and America without any form of remuneration, the immorality of the institution of slavery and its incompatibility with the Bible message professed by the Christian slavers of the West, the extreme inhumanity and indescribable indignities meted to slaves in the course of their transportation and in the practical engagement of those "lucky" to get to their destinations in the West, the ascription to the negro of an inferior racial status deriving from the experience of slavery and the continued association of anything "black" with everything bad. The institution of slavery was a common and "normal" feature of nearly every known society at a time in history – in feudal Europe and in traditional pre-colonial societies of Africa. There was also the trans-Saharan slavery. But the cruel intensity, duration and toll of the trans-Atlantic by far supersede all other forms of slavery. No kind of enslavement is benign and manumission where possible is easier in intra-racial slavery than in inter-racial which just like the trans-Atlantic under reference proceeded with unparalleled cruelty to the extent that black slaves were imagined in the Western minds to be barely a little above animals.

Despite the unmitigated evil of trans-Atlantic slavery, Ade Ajayi notes that:

Some writers even tried to justify the Atlantic trade with the argument that it took black slaves from heathen lands into Christendom, thus opening up the possibility of converting them and saving their souls ... (Ajayi, 2002:7).

This kind of rationalization is not deserving of any re-joinder and attention will rather be directed to the question of collaboration. For Ade Ajayi, all were victims, not beneficiaries and he further advanced the following illustration:

Inter-ethnic relations in Africa will for long continue to be affected by perceptions as to who collaborated with the slavers and who suffered most. This is largely a futile argument because in the end, all Africans and peoples of African descent were victims, not beneficiaries of slave trade. The technology, capital and competition that characterized the European participation in the Atlantic trade meant that no African peoples could afford to stay aloof from it ... The chiefs who participated in the trade were victims at least of unequal exchange. They exported man and woman productive and reproductive power in return for ammunition, cheap gin, textiles, mirrors and others which the late Dr. Dike called 'meretricious' goods. No black African could escape from the racist burden of being black ... (Ajayi, 2002:10).

If the African slave-raiders acquisition of the taste for the spurious foreign products could be excused to have been out of curiosity and out of the desire to appear better or greater than his neighbour who has no guns, gin, mirror, or imported textile, the fact that he sources his human commodity not from his family or close relatives but from distant strangers is indicative of a mind fully aware of the mortal horror of such business. Both the African supplier of the human ware and the European purchaser were beneficiaries in material terms, though the European's "gain" by far exceeds that of the African. But on a deeper, philosophical level of analysis, setting aside the angle of economic and psychological motivations behind behaviour, the African supplier of the human cargo was a double-loser. The trifles are long gone and Diaspora communities that so emerged have become eternally torn from their roots. As in most cases of historical evil, the generation that sows is not always the one that reaps. This should be enough for the age of slavery and we shall now turn to the era of colonialism which it gave birth to.

Issues of the Colonial Era

Just as in the case of trans-Atlantic slavery, there is a corpus of literature that have explored and continued to explore the various aspects of colonialism. An understanding of the logical chains of transmission from slavery to colonialism and then to neo-colonialism and the present post-neocolonial order propelled by the seismic tide of globalization, deterritorization and democratization in tune with the market forces of capitalism as encapsulated in the philosophy of liberalism cannot be avoided if the African situation is to be effectively grappled with. Granted, as earlier hinted, that the West had the original advantage of the proceeds of scientific inventions and innovations and equally imbued with economically exploitative and ideologically manipulative tendencies, the question of destiny or predestination cannot be successfully killed for an account of how Africa in particular appears to be outside the orbit of progress up until now has to be made. With respect to the ever-central idea of progress in human life and society, the reasoned opinions of Jose Maria Sbert cannot be safely omitted:

With the rise of the modern world, a distinctly modern faith - faith in progress – arose to make sense of, and give ultimate meaning to the new notions and institutions that are now dominant. Our deep reverence for science and technology was inextricably linked up with the faith in progress. The universal enforcement of the nation-state was carried out under the banner of progress. And increasing conformity with the rule of economics, and intensified belief in its laws, are still shadows of this enlightened faith ... there were only two kinds of people – those few screwed up through having achieved progress themselves and the many screwed up by the progress of others ... (Sbet, 1999:192, 193).

Both in the Comtean and Marxian theorizations about the stages of progress in human society, it will be noticed that what lies at the next bend remain unknown until they begin to unfold, usually after the

exhaustion of the contents of the preceding epoch, and secondly, that each passing stage is preparatory for the subsequent ones. Our position here is that the thesis of destiny, predestination or providence in the explanation of the African situation is untenable for if it is conceded that the initial advantage of the West was a matter of accident, natural or historical, how does one explain subsequent developments in Euro-Africa relations? It seems that Africa was “screwed up by the progress of others”, to take a cue from Sbert, more out of choice than coercion for H. Browne captured an instructive scene in Asia during the early part of European expansion of trade and empire:

The European desire to extend trade had reached China, but as yet without success. China relied solely on her own divine dynasty, the Manchu, and remained confident of her own civilization when faced by the West. The West had nothing which the Chinese needed except opium. To the West, China offered the possibility of new markets for their own products, and imports of tea and porcelain. Japan remained even more impenetrable than China. She had been closed to all foreigners for two hundred years and no Japanese was allowed to travel abroad. Until the middle of the nineteenth century Europe had no contacts with Japan at all (Browne, 1974:3).

Today, Japan is in the First World and China has practically dominated the African market. The rapid industrialization and transformations of the economy of the old and new Asian Tigers are not “miracles” but the product of the paths chosen by their forefathers and early generation of leaders who refused to be ensnared by the baits of the West, who, with a combination of foresight, selfless patriotism, self-reliance, selective adaptation of foreign technologies and economic models have continued to engineer their societies to ever greater heights. On the colonial passage to the present epoch, a few elucidative remarks will be made regarding the origins of that enterprise as well on the native Africans’ reactions, particularly the educated elite who become the first crop of indigenous leaders, to the colonial rule.

It all began with the scramble resolved with the Berlin Conference of 1884-5 in which not a single black was present and that was understandably so because the issues discussed at that gathering mainly bordered on the balkanization and plundering of black societies and resources. The second “moral” gathering still on the same topic was the Brussels Conference of 1889-90 which is less frequently mentioned and whose practical outcome was in comparison with the earlier one in Berlin by far less obvious because its motive stood in sharp contrast with the first – peace, development and civilization of the African colonies. Zoe Marsh and G.W. Kingsnorth expressed the following views on the Brussels conference:

Of the meetings which were held between the countries concerned in the colonization of Africa, one at least shows that the interests of the African peoples were not ignored. The Brussels Conference (1889-90) had three aims, all of which were humanitarian: first, to destroy the African slave trade completely and finally; second, to protect the African population, and third, to ensure for Africa ‘the benefits of peace and civilization’ (Marsh and Kingsnorth, 1965:93).

The extent of success of these humanitarian proposals is evident in Rodney’s (1982) observation that ‘the greatest achievement of colonialism is the fact that the African went into it with a hoe and came out with a hoe’ but we are now most concerned with how Africans are underdeveloping Africa. Now, regarding the formal commencement of colonial rule on African soil, native chiefs entered into treaties with the colonial authorities and these monarchs have been maligned and portrayed as the hands that ‘betrayed’ and ‘sold’ their people.

Such an analytical attitude is extremely unfair given the context of the conduct of these diplomatic affairs. The diplomacies between traditional African rulers and the representatives of colonial powers display all the credentials of ‘gun-boat diplomacy’ which Obasi Igwe described as involving military intimidation of one of the actors, sometimes including an actual unilateral application of force. Also, the term ‘secret diplomacy’ equally reflects the reality of those international relations, because, a large part of

it involves malevolent and hidden intentions (2005:119) against the African party in this case. The point is that most African monarchs entered into these treaties innocently unaware of the nocturnal aspects and did so even eagerly in anticipation of great benefits to be attracted to their kingdoms. With their very limited education (for those who had at all) and inexperience in such matters, the possibility of consciously entering into injurious pacts is a very unlikely one and a grand-daughter of King Dosunmu who signed the *Treaty of Cession* in 1861 on the basis of which formal colonial administration of Nigeria commenced lamented in her speech the continued misinterpretation of the deed apparently done in good faith delivered at the 56th Annual Congress of the Historical Society of Nigeria held at Oshogbo, Osun State from 31st October to 1st November, 2011, which I had the fortune of participation. In a nutshell, to “negotiate” or engage in “diplomatic talks or agreements” from a position of weakness of any sort, properly understood, is to be dictated to in a gamble sure to be eventually lost by the weaker party. Those still committed to the task of guilt attribution should endeavour to recall that even the resistance of some African kings to European colonial entry bids did not change much, if at all anything, for they still had their way – by treaty, threat or force.

Concerning the perception and reactions of Africans to colonialism, our focus will be on the educated elites who became the vanguard of the so-called nationalist struggle and who ultimately emerged as the indigenous power elites. They were all the same in character and motive, and the trends were equally similar throughout Africa with few exceptions such as Mwalimu Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana who really had the interest of their respective countries at heart. The greater lot were primarily pre-occupied with the pecuniary and political benefits expected to yield from the occupation of the positions previously monopolized by foreign colonial officials and the “liberation” war got to a crescendo amongst the “nationalists” rather than against the colonial oppressors before the superficial independence was granted. Aside of the ‘divide and rule’ policy of colonial administration in British West Africa which sowed the seed of internal cohesion challenges of most African nations, it was especially during this era of nationalism that the problems of ethnic politics, conflicts and the crises of citizenship ossified and all these have continued to make the dreams of social order, democracy and development more elusive. Some of the works that did extensive and thorough examination of these issues include: Okwudiba Nnoli (1980;1989); James Coleman (1986); Crawford Young (1979); Oga Abah (2005); Ogho Alubo (2006); Naila Kabere (2005) etc.

E.A. Ayandele in his consideration of the Nigerian educated elites as collaborators notes that by the first decade of the 20th century, practically all the members of this class, including the James Johnsons and Mojola Agbebis had accepted the establishment of British colonial rule as an event in the nature of things. This event, felt by the unlettered masses as humiliation meant for the educated elite personal liberation and opportunity. There was no question of their organizing protests against the Union Jack; they became confirmed loyalists of the British Empire. They were never tired of eulogies about the *Pax Britannica* and their gratitude to the British invaders and conquerors. For instance, Sapara Williams, one of the first Nigerian lawyers in 1910 declared that: “Loyalty to the British Crown is too deeply rooted in the breast of this Nigerian people” and three years later, Herbert Macaulay, in spite of his grievances against the British establishment in Lagos followed with another statement in the same spirit: “We are to a man, proud today, Sir, that we are subjects of the British Crown, for the British Government administers Justice without fear or favour” (Ayandele, 1974:58)

Even those trained in the United States, and whom students of the Nigerian scene are prone to consider as fiery leaders – Nnamdi Azikiwe, K.O. Mbadiwe, Mazi Mbonu Ojike and Nwafor Orizu – never regretted the establishment of British rule in Nigeria. In 1942, K.O. Mbadiwe expressed his views in this manner: “For its beneficent Government, despite the factors of human frailties, there is no power on earth to shake the confidence of West Africans in Great Britain. The British empire is not only an improvement on the past empires but with it rose ethics in imperialism and we love and cherish the British Empire, but we must be assured of a life for all human beings”. Indeed, as lately as 1960, R.O.A. Akinjide declared thus: “Britain, I should say, has no reason to regret her stay in Nigeria and we too have no reason to be ashamed of Britain being in this country.” All these were said in protection of class interest and the interest of the educated elite was hardly identical with or complementary to those the unlettered masses (Ibid:58, 59).

Even with all the aping of the white man in speech and life-style, often accompanied by self-indignity and ingratiating by the educated class, the scorn, detest and derision of the white man, in church and state for this class never abated. As Ayandele (ibid:21) remarked in this regard, the West sincerely believed that the African was simply ineducable, biologically inferior to the white, incapable of understanding, how much apply in his life, the tenets of the Christian faith. Using data provided by negrophobe R.F. Burton, T.J. Hutchinson and Winwood Reade, Dr. Hunt, the first President of the Anthropological Society of London declared in a paper on the 17th of November, 1863, entitled: “*On the Negro’s place in History*”:

The assertion that the negro only requires an opportunity for becoming civilized is disproved by history ... Not only has the Negro Race never civilized itself, but it has never accepted civilization ... With the Negro, as with other races of man, it has been found that the children are precocious: but that no advance in education can be made after they arrive at maturity; they still continue mentally children. It is apparently of little consequence what amount of education they receive, the same result nearly always follows; the reflective faculties hardly appear to be at all developed ... From the most remote antiquity, the Negro Race seems to have been what it is now. We may be pretty sure that the Negro has been without a progressive history, and that Negroes have been for thousands of years the uncivilized race which they are at the moment (Hunt, 1965; Reade, 1863; and Hutchinson, 1861 cited in Ayandele, 1974).

In spite of all these, “independence” was still “won”, on a platter of diamond as it was described and the celebration of “victory” was quite elaborate and equally on a delirious pitch.

What manner of independence called for such celebration? What is the viability of the architecture of the emergent state as colonially designed in Africa? From every indication, post-colonial African states seem to be originally programmed to fail and as Ajayi (2002:13) pinpointed, there was no possibility or intention to restore independence to the pre-colonial states which explains why it was only during the decade 1950s – 1960s that the rudiments of state institutions in terms of the executive, legislative and judicial patterned after the metropolitan institutions and suitably adapted began to be hurriedly put in place so that the outgoing colonial rulers could have new political elites to whom to hand over power. Thus, far from trying to decolonize, colonial powers deliberately created colonial states which were soon conferred with political autonomy. It is little wonder then that Chinweizu (1978) identified African “independence” accurately as “a fake product of the grand fraud of decolonization”. In the summary of Claude Ake, the gaining of independence was not a matter of the nationalists’ marshaling forces to defeat colonial regimes. It was simply a matter of the colonizers’ accepting the inevitable and orchestrating a handover of government to their chosen African successors, successors who could be trusted to share their values and be attentive to their interests (Ake, 2001:30. From independence till date, these chosen African successors have continued to keep the faith of their erstwhile colonial masters and the society in consequence has remained the way it is.

The preceding segments of the first part of this discourse have been preoccupied with the examination of the case history of the African malaise for without an appropriate diagnosis of the etiology of any disease, either a wrong course of treatment is chosen or the care-giver concentrates on the management of the clinical signs, and in both situations the outcome could be anything but healing for the roots of the disease have neither been identified nor dealt with. This fact holds for the biological organism as it does for the human society. Of course, both are “living” things and the organismic conceptualization of the society is a common thread that runs through the entire theoretical fabric of structuralism, whether of the consensus or conflict hue. We will at this juncture render a précis of our socio-historical analysis of the roots and sequence of the African situation before delving into the next part.

Firstly, it was found that the African problem was neither a historical accident nor a matter of pre-destination. It was rather the ineluctable repercussion of the nature of Euro-Africa relations from the trans-Atlantic dealings in human cargo to the colonial era and at each of these stages of imperial capitalist

expansion, excluding the factor of initial advantage conferred on Europe by the industrial revolution, Africa is heavily implicated in her own destruction given the role she has been playing in all these more out of choice than coercion or ignorance. Coercion and ignorance, no doubt were strong factors but myopia, greed and selfishness are believed here to have been the more compelling reasons for the nature of African participation in own retardation. Secondly, it was identified that the African situation progressively worsens with the passing of every stage because the proceeds in economic, technological, social, psychological, strategic and ideological terms that accrued from the previous exploitative relations between the West and Africa are put into more vicious and sophisticated use in subsequent patterns of exchange as dictated by the forces of transmutation of international capitalism. For instance, the experience of trans-Atlantic slavery, aside of its contributions to the development of European society equally gave rise to the association of the colour 'black' with servitude and racial inferiority which Africans were eventually socialized into accepting.

Aspects of this socialization of Africans into the negative stereotypic Eurocentric perceptions of the black race were hinted in one of Chinua Achebe's most recent works, *The Education of a British Protected Child*, (2009), and it constituted the kernel of Claude Ake's *Social Science as Imperialism* (1979). Now that we are contending with the grand-offspring of slavery in the name of globalizing post-neocolonialism, the mis-education of the African elite has continued with more disastrous effects as the West is still wielding the torch (by way of prescriptions) which has been issuing darkness, not light, in Africa's search for *development* and *democracy* – the slogans that replaced the nationalist chant of self-rule. Thus, the "catching-up" frenzy and the "technological transfer" illusions, dominant in the 1980s were products of psychological inferiority and unhelpful comparisons of Western and African societies.

This complex, generated by the past experience of slavery and colonialism and the frequent and inappropriate comparisons between Western and African societies based on the level of technological accomplishments and "civilization" as perceived through Euro-centric lenses have made permanent pupils of post-colonial African ruling circles who continue to receive catechisms and tutorials on economics and politics that proceed in the form of unreflective, rebarbative and regurgitative rote learning dished from the exalted knowledge centres such as Harvard and Cambridge. And the enforcement of the practice of what has been so taught is of course the primary mandate of the Bretton Woods institutions in Africa, particularly, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The stage is now set for our next business which is the critical examination of the actual content of the present popular catch-words like 'globalization', 'deterritorialization', and 'democratization' which, as demonstrated by the concrete realities so far, have been leading Africa down the slope of poverty, economic regression and political confusion – a black continent groping in the dark under the sun.

Globalization, Deterritorialization and Democratization: Disentangling the Myths and Simulations from the Realities of Manifestation

The subterfuge exit of the colonial regime in Africa was attended by the domination of the economies of the new independent African nations with the activities of multinational corporations that merely use the continent as a source of raw materials and a market for finished products and this is precisely why we have serious difficulties here referring to the economies of Africa states as "national". This fact was succinctly expressed in the following manner by Daniel Offiong:

... The resulting international division of labour following the early stage of economic globalization never led to parallel development through Ricardo's notion of comparative advantage. Although the anti-colonial struggles attending colonization culminated in the disappearance of overt colonial imperialism, political independence has not meant economic autonomy. African countries still maintain economic relationships with rich and powerful nations of the West that perpetuate the colonial pattern of economic domination. This neocolonialism, as this new relationship is called, is fueled by a capitalist world economy, with the multinationals as its principal instrument (Offiong, 2001:vii).

In the past 30 years or so, the concept of globalization which has multifarious dimensions such as cultural, political, ideological and economic with the last (economic) being the prime mover gained exceptional prominence in public and private discourse as it has more than any other wave of change throughout the course of history tremendously and almost instantaneously been affecting individual, national and international lives, in several ways. Though economic globalization has been on for over five centuries through the increasing extension of outreach of trade and production activities by firms in the economically advanced countries (Khor, 2001:1), its present surge in significance was accentuated by radical advancements in electronic technologies of information and communication as well as the development of supersonic modes of transportation which have all served to annihilate physical space. A second factor is the liberalization of trade and investment policies adopted by many modern states.

Just as slavery was defended as offering the miserable, heathen negro's soul a special opportunity of Christian redemption and salvation (for which he ought to be very grateful) and colonialism also presented as the charitable labour of civilizing and developing the barbaric native peoples of Africa, globalization has equally been serving some curious and dubious functions both at the propaganda and practical levels in virtually all facets of existence in all societies particularly in Africa (and the rest of the Third World). The phenomenon of globalization is enthused by Western scholarship and a good number of ill-informed African enthusiasts as holding the marvelous promise of wiping out poverty, of wielding the magic wand that will invigorate through unbridled liberalization of trade in finance and foreign direct investment the global economy and politics, and ultimately lead to a good life for all free from the encumbrances of state restrictions on the conduct of international business and social liberties.

Embedded in this seemingly innocuous, overly favourable and optimistic picture of globalization are the ideas of deterritorialization and democratization. The former implies on one arm the virtual dissolution of national boundaries resulting from the removal of barriers to state economies: the international spread of trade, financial and production activities and the growing power of transnational corporations and international financial institutions in these processes and on the other arm, the "globalization" of national policies and policy-making mechanisms in practically all realms of society: economic, social, political, cultural, technological, etc., which have combined to seriously erode the sovereignty of weaker states found mostly in the Third World and also limit the ability of such governments to make choices from domestic options (Khor, 2001:1, 4). The later, i.e. democratization draws its primary inspiration from the former which simply implies that it is still the capitalist market forces of the West that dictates the tone and texture of this fetish of *Liberal Democracy* vigorously proselytized across Africa in particular and the rest of the Third World by America. The point is that appearances could be quite misleading and what is being claimed could be a far cry from what is actually being done. In order not to start *in media res*, we will properly begin with the question of meaning of globalization as well as the semantic constellation which it has created in its progress such as *globalism*, *glocalization* and *grobalization*.

Globalization in the African Context

No concept has ever had any meaning on its own, aloof and in a contextual vacuum. The denotative and connotative signification of any word is therefore determined by the context of its usage, of its situational occurrence. It is for this reason that concepts are said not to have any meaning at all until they are practically engaged in a discourse, and the meanings of concepts are not fixed but continually displaying a sort of malleability for a given word performs the particular service it is called upon to do by the circumstance of its application and this is precisely why the same word or concept may convey a different and even a conflicting message because of the variations in the 'setting' of actual communication. But in this critical re-examination of the phenomenon of globalization, we will go beyond the mere clarification of a popular concept which nearly every literate person the world over seems to have an idea about. We will for this reason proceed with the investigation of the meaning and roles of this concept of globalization and its other associated terminologies and trends within the context of Africa in the spirit of the first Cartesian principle of human knowledge which decrees thus:

That in order to seek truth, it is necessary once in the course of our life to doubt, as far as possible, of all things. As we were at one time children, and as we formed various judgments regarding the objects presented to our senses, when as yet we had not the entire use of our reason, numerous prejudices stand in the way of our arriving at the knowledge

of truths; and of these it seems impossible for us to rid ourselves, unless we undertake, once in our life time, to doubt of all these things in which we may discover even the smallest suspicion of uncertainty (Rene Descartes, 1912:165).

Ordinarily, globalization refers to the global process of homogenization of different cultures and economic models in an interconnected manner under the influence of multinational corporations and international financial institutions accelerated by radical advancements in digital electronic technologies of information and communication as well as the development of supersonic modes of transportation as earlier noted. Another factor that greatly enhanced the rapid pace of economic globalization is the liberalization of trade and investment policies embraced by nearly every modern state. Let us examine the dangerous role performed by this deceptively harmless and universally attractive concept of globalization with specific reference to the African continent. We will commence with a content analysis of a sermon on the economics of globalization delivered by a high profile IMF official a decade and half ago.

In an address by Alassane D. Quattara, the Deputy Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, IMF, on the 21st May, 1997 at the South Africa Economic Summit sponsored by the World Economic Forum held at Harare, Zimbabwe, it was argued that the extent of the trend (of globalization) toward integration is clearly reflected in *the rising importance of world trade and capital flows in the world economy; that an increasingly large share of world GDP is generated in activities linked directly or indirectly to international trade; and there has been a phenomenal growth in cross-border financial flows, particularly in the forms of private equity and portfolio investment*, compared with the past. In addition, the revolution in communication and transportation technology and the much improved availability of information have allowed individuals and firms to base their economic choices more on the quality of the economic environment in different countries. As a result, Alassane Quattara maintained, *economic success in today's world* is less a question of relative resource endowment or geographical location than it used to be in the past, and that it is now a question of the market perception of the orientation and predictability of economic policy. Continuing, Quattara remarked that (i) globalization is first and foremost a result of the expansion, diversification and deepening of trade and financial links between countries, especially over the last ten years; (ii) that this reflects, above all, the success of multilateral tariff reduction and trade liberalization efforts; and thirdly that economic thought itself has evolved over time toward the general acceptance of the fact that outward-oriented and open economies are more successful than closed, inward-looking ones!

Consequently, Alassane Quattara insists that more than at any time previously, individual countries in all parts of the world are liberalizing their exchange and trade regimes in the conviction that this is indeed the best approach for growth and development, and that with the increasing liberalization of financial markets, and their growing sophistication, capital markets have become integrated, and capital flows are now largely driven primarily by considerations of risk and return. The benefits of these developments, from the position of IMF as advanced by Quattara are easily recognizable in the following terms: (i) increasing trade has given consumers and producers a wider choice of low-cost goods, often incorporating more advanced technologies, and facilitated a more efficient use of global resources; (ii) greater access to world markets has allowed countries to exploit their comparative advantages more intensively, while opening their economies to the benefits of increased international competition; (iii) the rapid increase in capital and private investment flows has raised the resources available to countries able to attract them, and accelerated the pace of their development beyond what they could otherwise have achieved, and also, the greater openness and participation in competitive international trade have increased employment, primarily of skilled labour, in tradable goods sectors (Quattara, 1997:1,2).

Certainly, these are glib answers well-articulated by Alassane D. Quattara to the *Challenges of Globalization for Africa* as the address was entitled and coming from the Deputy Managing Director of IMF, one of the two principal organs of the Bretton Woods, the other being the world Bank, whose motives and modus in Africa are no larger secret, nothing less could have been expected. In Quattara's litany of the wonders wrought by globalization, there are too many doubts and suspicions that the speciously excellent rendition still could not conceal and the questions studiously avoided in the fatal seduction of the trend is

where these benefits are occurring, (in the North or South) and why Africa in particular has remained the way it is, especially as a consequence of the activities of IMF and the World Bank.

The parts of Quattara's speech highlighted by the use of italics contain more than mere suspicion of uncertainty in meaning, to couch our doubts in the Cartesian tradition. For instance, *the rising importance of world trade and capital flows in the world economy* and the claim that *an increasingly large share of world GDP is generated in activities linked directly or indirectly to international trade* are deserving of closer scrutiny. This rising importance of world trade, for whose products and for whose markets? These capital and financial flows, which directions do they profitably take? And the surplus profits from these investments, where do they end? Now, this large share of world GDP generated in activities linked directly or indirectly to international trade, where does it occur – in societies of the North or those of the South? The economic success in today's world, is the Third World and Africa in particular part of the story through globalization? In this multilateral tariff reduction and trade liberalization, does it imply the death of protectionism in the West and does it translate to a possibility of the Third World gaining any reasonable access to Western markets?

There are still more disturbing questions excited by Quattara's claims. The "economic thought" that has finally emerged that gave birth to the "general" acceptance of the "fact" that "outward-oriented and open economies" are "more successful than closed, inward-looking ones" – whence cometh this economic thought and upon which fact is the so-claimed general acceptance of this logic of external and porous economies anchored? This liberalization of exchange and trade regimes by individual countries in all parts of the world, is it a matter of "conviction" or that of naivety, mis-education, cajoling and subtle coercion through conditionalities? Is it "indeed" the best approach for "growth and development" as defined by who? Nearly every aspect of Quattara's beatitudes of globalization is trailed by numerous doubts and suspicion regarding exactly how the phenomenon affects Africa and the Third World in general and we will at this juncture focus on the meaning and manifestations of the trend on the continent of Africa.

The opinion of Daniel Offiong on the meaning of globalization as the "consummation of the internationalization of capitalism and its associated institutions and the subjugation of the peoples of the globe (especially in Africa and the rest of Third World countries of Asia and Latin America), which began several centuries ago" is perfectly in sync with our position in this paper. In a competitive global market, different countries will specialize in the products they can make best, as postulated by Ricardo's law of comparative advantage but in Africa, it translates to the law of comparative disadvantage partly because specialization in the production and export of raw materials was not voluntary and it is not altogether profitable. It is further assumed that specialization will result in improved efficiency and thus to lower prices. Supporters argue further that the adjustment to new economic roles (that is specialization) will be difficult initially but that the difficulty will be compensated with benefits in the long run. This is yet to materialize with respect to Africa and it may never! (Offiong, 2001:1, 2, 3).

Calhoun, Light and Keller (1997:492, cited in Offiong, 2001) have raised some interesting critical questions about the phenomenon of globalization. The first question is: "Global Village or Global Pillage?" The second question asks, "Is globalization an opportunity or a threat? Are we becoming a global village or witnessing the pillage of the planet and its people?" To them, globalization has knit the world more closely together in some respects, but it has also divided the population of many countries into winners and losers (ibid). Not only has it divided the population of many countries into winners and losers, but it has also divided regions of the world into winners and sad losers. Certainly, Africa is a loser region. Globalization is hurting instead of helping certain countries and regions. Following this view, multinationals "increase profits not through greater efficiency but by pitting countries and peoples against one another in a race to the bottom (ibid). Under-developed countries attract investors by offering them the cheapest labour, the lowest taxes, and the least regulations; their "national" economies may show signs of expansion but at the great cost of falling or low standards of living. In the poor and weak countries of Africa, the multinationals dictate the conditions and terms under which they want to invest. If the host country insists on too many limits on what business the multinationals can do (including exporting/repatriation of profits), they can quite easily take their investment elsewhere. Capital is the wealth supporting business and does flow rather rapidly across national borders. This appears to be the experience that African countries witnessed in the 1970s and 1980s and particularly in the early 1990s following events in the former Soviet Union and the supposed Asian economic miracle (ibid:3).

Practically every economic forecast about Africa in recent years has been very gloomy as Daniel Offiong rightly observes. One of the forecasts has it that Africa's share of the world's poor will double from 16 to 32 percent, even though Africa accounts for only 11.1 percent of the world's population. This dismal economic picture, changes in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, and more profitable business in Asia (at least until the Asian financial crisis of 1997) have combined to make a neocolonial Africa unimportant to world business leaders and their multinationals. The result has been the marginalization of Africa by the captains of business. Thus, Africa has been handed over to the international financial institutions – the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, IMF, - to handle as they will. The results have been the iron-fisted economic reforms associated with structural adjustment programmes, SAPs, engineered and executed by the World Bank and IMF (Ibid:vii).

Sovereign nations (especially of the Third World) have been de-sovereignized and the financial institutions are managing their economies. In fact, in the particular case of some sub-Saharan Africa countries, the two financial institutions have been acting as if they were receivers. Although all the blames associated with the negative impacts of SAPs have been heaped upon the two international financial institutions, they are actually the agents, messengers of the Group of Seven (G-7), which became the Summit of Eight on June 20, 1997 with the admission of Russia into the club at Denver, US summit. The SAP as a policy was orchestrated by the G-7 in consultation with other key industrialized Western nations. SAP is a strategy designed by the G-7 and their allies to reverse rational and truly nationalistic policies in the Third World by providing loans in exchange for significant and fundamental changes in their political economy, changes that further tie these countries inextricably to the industrialized nations. The SAPs enforced by the international financial institutions have consummated a dependency that even formal colonialism never achieved, and this phenomenon is what Offiong prefers to call "post neo-dependency" (under the inspiration of globalizing capitalism) (ibid: vii, viii).

Structural Adjustment Programmes have accentuated poverty in Africa because their institution is not meant to help African countries, or Third World countries for that matter to overcome their financial predicaments and perennial poverty and hunger. Instead, they are, among other things, designed to impose strict conditionalities to any new credits or rescheduling of old debts, and force African and other Third World countries to adjust to the whims and imperatives of the inequitable global market by opening up their markets to the US and other industrialized countries. This is happening even at a time when the wealthy and powerful industrialized nations are themselves practicing protectionism, despite their pious and sanctimonious pronouncements to the contrary. The orchestrated global economic interconnectedness or economic globalization is hurting Africa badly and this spells unconscionable poverty for the continent; the future remains bleak (ibid).

The authenticity of this prognosis is further supported by Boutros Boutros-Ghali's revelation following his analysis of the dialectic nature of global trends that the planet earth is in the grip of two immense "opposing forces" globalization and fragmentation and so the ideas of economic marginalization and political fragmentation got introduced into the picture of the phenomenon. Globalization was viewed by Ghali as the creation of a world that is increasingly interconnected, in which national boundaries are less important, and it is generating both possibilities and problems. Boutros-Ghali sees globalization as largely economic, that is, a phenomenon characterized by ever increasing integration of national economies into expanding international markets and this phenomenon is failing to reach all peoples in a positive way. Too many people in the Third World are excluded, unable to obtain access to the prosperity that globalization offers. Simultaneously, "the market economy that is the engine of this moment is, by its logic, driving large numbers of people – in developing, transitional and developed countries alike – into deeper poverty and despair (Boutros-Ghali, 1996:2, 3; quoted in Offiong, ibid).

If a former United Nations Secretary-General could admit the social and economic injuries inherent in the phenomenon of globalization across the three worlds with specific reference to deepening poverty, the peculiar disadvantages suffered by the Third World given their structural and institutional weaknesses in the face of the sweeping wave of trade liberalization, capital flows (and flights), and investments dominated by alliances of transnational production, marketing and servicing conglomerates added to the activities of IFIs especially in Africa, one wonders the factual bases of the Swedish economist Johan Norberg's (2008) *In Defense of Global Capitalism*. A critical confrontation with Norberg's narrative of the "virtues" of globalization reveals a fatal victim of reductionism and selective, peripheral analysis that

canonizes through obfuscating obscurantism the current transmogrification of capitalism for its role in expanding the frontiers of choices, especially of nonlocal options in goods and services as well as the realms of liberty. For him:

Globalization consists of our everyday actions. We eat bananas from Ecuador, drink wine from France, watch American movies, order books from Britain, work for export companies selling to Germany and Russia, vacation in Thailand, and save money for retirement in funds, investing in South America and Asia ... When globalization knocks at the door of Bhagant, an elderly agricultural worker and “untouchable” in the Indian village of Saijani, it leads to houses built of brick instead of mud, to people getting shoes on their feet and clean clothes – not rags – on their backs. Outdoors, the streets now have drains, and the fragrance of tilled earth has replaced the stench of refuse. Thirty years ago, Bhagant didn’t know he was living in India. Today he watches world news on television ... (Norberg, 2008:x, xi, xii).

Surely, the full import of globalization by far is deeper and more extensive than this picture of Norberg, though, as he honestly stated, “the availability of non-local options may seem like a luxury to those of us in the affluent world” (ibid:x).

Of course, looking down from the dizzying heights of his affluent society, Norberg could not have missed the sight that the existence from which globalization delivers people in the Third World is intolerable, that for the poor (in the Third World), existence means abject poverty, filth, ignorance, and powerlessness; that it means wondering where the next meal is coming from; and that it means walking many miles to collect water that may not be fit to drink (ibid:xi). Norberg could be right in his observations of desperate poverty in the Third World but certainly wrong in his attribution of deliverance from such a state to globalization, for if in truth he understands the roots, dynamics and the real motivating forces associated with the triumphs of global capitalism, he would be talking of “empowerment through disempowerment” as the actual consequence of this new reign or religion of globalization. Again, Johan Norberg’s (ibid:x) suggestion that EU, IMF, UN, WTO, UNCTAD, and OECD have nothing to do with globalization which in his words “takes place from beneath” indicates either ignorance of the historical course of development of global capitalism or a deliberate attempt to conceal the vital distinctions between the differential effects of the juggernaut phenomenon in the global North and South, and Africa in particular.

Samir Amin’s *Spectres of Capitalism* (1997:12-39) is sufficiently revealing of the intimate and dangerous liaisons and strategic roles of the IMF, the World Bank and GATT-WTO in securing the hegemony of capital as well as in the crystallization of the NIEO with several decidedly negative implications for the political economy of the Third World curiously glossed over by Norberg. An understanding of the African morass can only be complete if all historical currents are given due cognizance without any unnecessary evasion or diminution of the huge significance of certain internal and external historical forces, institutions and processes that are heavily implicated in the perennial economic, social and political crises of the continent and the Third World in general.

Perhaps, the main reason for Norberg’s glamorous trivialization of the real impact of globalization especially in the Third World is his very strange and uniquely personal conceptualization of “capitalism”.

When I say that I mean to defend capitalism, what I have in mind is the capitalistic freedom to proceed by trial and error, without having to ask rulers and border officials for permission first. That is the liberty that I once thought anarchy would bring, but under the control of laws ensuring that one person’s freedom will not encroach on other people’s. If the critics of capitalism feel that we already have a superabundance of that liberty today, I would like to have still –a super-duper abundance if possible – especially for the poor of the world’s population, who as things now stand have little say regarding their work and consumption.

*That is why I don't hesitate to call the work **In Defence of Global Capitalism**, even though the "capitalism" I celebrate is really a possible future than a currently existing system. By capitalism I do not specifically mean an economic system of capital ownership and investment opportunities ... What I mean is the liberal market economy, with free competition based on the right to use one's property and freedom to negotiate, to conclude agreements, and to start up business activities. Capitalists are dangerous when, instead of seeking profit through competition, they join forces with the government ... (Norberg, *Ibid*: xiii, xiv).*

From the foregoing, it would appear that Johan Norberg has an eccentric understanding of "capitalism" which is incongruous with all the established historical facts about that mode of production and social organization both from the North and the South irrespective of the ideological persuasions of the holders of such knowledge. Beginning with Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* which occurred in three volumes to the host of other works that dealt with aspects of the historical emergence and dialectics of the capitalist system such as Beamish Rob (2007); Bakker Hans (2007); Agger Ben (1978); Louis Althusser (1969); Ellen Meiksins and John Foster (1997); Frederick Bender (1970); Cohen (1978); Dob Maurice (1964); Martin-Jay (1973); etc., in addition to an array of other materials that critically explored particularly the nature and effects of the relations of the capitalist West and Africa which include Walter Rodney (1972); Daniel Offiong (1980:2001); Chinweizu (1978); Samir Amin (1975; 1996; 1971); and Claude Ake (1981), there is nowhere any hint that either classical or contemporary capitalism has ever been associated with the dispensation of charitable liberties or the exercise of moral conscience. There can only be one authentic version of capitalism which we all know is driven solely by the desire of ceaseless profit maximization achieved through the intensification of exploitation, alienation, commoditization of the human input and the objectification of the human essence.

So, the tokens of liberty mentioned by Norberg popularly expressed in terms of human rights guaranteed by state laws are inevitable concessions for if the entire exploitative enterprise is to proceed with the peace and protection of both the oppressor and the oppressed, a legal system must of necessity be put in place to maintain the *status quo*. It was not therefore globalization that originated or have been expanding the spheres of individual freedom but a historical part of the placebo dispensed by the growth of capital to avoid disruptions in its operation and the criminalization of certain behaviours such as offences against property, vagrancy, and laws against revolt are all aspects of state control as determined by the dominant classes who wield enormous economic powers with which they maintain a grip on the instruments of government. Indications are quite clear that Norberg did not reckon that in the liberal market economy of his imagination with free competition based on the right to use one's property and freedom to negotiate to conclude agreements, and to start up business activities, that a critical segment of the population are systematically denied legitimate access to education, employment, capital and trade or investment opportunities and capabilities given the nature of social stratification in capitalist societies. The kind of freedom, equality and good life for all that Norberg envisages cannot come from a capitalist social structure and the tide of globalization which is the latest transmutation of Western capitalism is simply incapable of bearing fruits which is not in the nature of its progenitor.

Finally, Norberg's assertion that *capitalists are dangerous when, instead of seeking profit through competition, they join forces with the government* is very baffling for he could not possibly have lost sight of the common-place fact that in all capitalist societies, whether in the Western metropolises or in satellite peripheries of the Third World, the connection between the capitalists and governments, nationally and internationally have historically been strong and obvious. In fact, the two are inseparable and Charles Wright-Mills, had long identified the triangular unity of the power elites in political, military, and economic institutions whose decisions have consequences that affect billions of people worldwide (Mills, 1963:27). Thus, the fluidity of the boundary between the captains of capitalism and captains of the state as a fact was totally lost by Johan Norberg and the difference in his personally conceived future 'capitalism' and the 'currently existing system' is just as effective as the difference between six and half a dozen. Norberg's positions which were amplified by June Arunga from every indication appears to have been seriously

afflicted by analytical superficiality and misattribution of “success” or “benefits” of globalization in the Third World, using the reductionist indexes of trade growth, the circulation of market artifacts (expressed as increased choices in non-local products) and freedom of economic and social pursuits, and all these occurring at the micro level of society without considering the deeper and long-term effects of the trend at the macro levels of political economy of Low Income Countries (LICs), that are also the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs) found predominantly in sub-Saharan Africa.

Even Jagdish Bhagwati in his similar title, *In Defence of Globalization* painted the phenomenon just as Norberg by arguing that ‘globalization has delivered a better standard of living in less developed countries’, that ‘globalization has benefited the poor since trade enhances economic growth, and growth reduces poverty’, and that ‘the growth spurred by globalization has not only expanded the pie but has done so in a way that is “socially benign” and possesses “a human face” (Bhagwati, 2004). John Feffer therefore asks:

Is there, a ‘good’ globalization and a ‘bad’ globalization? Do we need more than one word to describe this phenomenon? Is globalization in all its forms inevitable or merely a passing fad? Are we bending towards one world ready or not with no turning back, no detours, no forks or even speed bumps on the road? (Feffer, 2002:1, 2).

Globalism, Glocalization and Liberal Democracy in Africa: Re-Reading the Trends

Globalism, as Obasi Igwe aptly remarks, is the doctrinal foundation of globalization, itself being both a process and movement of bringing everything, beginning with the economy, into the “world” standards, which actually means the Western system, and the subsequent cultivation of a common but unequal economic, trade, social, military-strategic, and political culture. Globalism refers to any policy of “one world, one destiny”, or the process of taking mankind along a uniform path whether coercively or voluntarily, a phenomenon which today seems gradually ascending the status of the new world order ideology, questioning the fundamental assumptions of the state-centric system – independence, sovereignty, equality of states, non-interference in internal affairs, polycentrism, ideological and cultural pluralism, and so on – by the demands which it makes of, and the attendant consequences upon all nations, above all, the less developed and weaker states of the Third World (Igwe, 2005: 175, 176).

This is possibly the ultimate stage in the long evolution of capitalism (after mercantilism, the industrial revolution, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonization) at some point of which it may, going by current unequal trends, likely to suffer a reversal to earlier forms, with possibilities for either a more humane reconstruction or the emergence of alternative models. Democracy, capitalism or free enterprise, uniformity of standards, whether in morals, trade, health or whatever, universality of openness and the principle of the penetrated state, liberalism, fundamental human rights, unhindered travels, the information revolution, together with the creeping emergence of a world culture, language and citizen – some of them good for everybody, others of doubtful merit but all as initiated, defined and guided by the West in general and the United States in particular – seem to be the major elements of the new globalism (Ibid).

However, it must be noted that globalism and globalization are not exactly the same thing. Globalism, as viewed by two Wikipedia sources, can have a minimum of two different and even opposing meanings. One meaning of globalism is the attitude or policy of placing the interests of the entire world above those of individual nations. Another is viewing the entire world as a proper sphere for one nation to project political influence. American political scientist Joseph Nye, co-founder of the *International Relations Theory of Neoliberalism*, argues that globalism refers to any description and explanation of a world which is characterized by networks of connections that span multi-continental distances while globalization refers to the increase or decline in the degree of globalism. On his own part, John Saul in his *The Collapse of Globalism and the Reinvention of the World (2005)* is of the opinion that far from being an inevitable force, globalization is already breaking up into contradictory pieces and that citizens are reasserting their national interests in both positive and destructive ways. There are also other dimensions that tend to equate globalism with the theory of a “global economy” which will entail the dissolution of national boundaries, the abandonment of national economic accomplishments, pursuits, and values, to be replaced by an integrated “world system” (a most improbable and utopic expectation).

Lastly, globalism has equally been construed as a kind of “anti-globalization” or “anti-Americanization” movement. But the interpretation of globalism preferred in this article is that supplied by Ulrich Beck (2000) which presents the concept as ‘the view that the world is dominated by economics and that we are witnessing the emergence of the hegemony of the capitalist world market and the neoliberal ideology that underpins it. Globalization in its aggressive progress has been quite successful in creating certain enhancing conceptual estuaries in the form of *glocalization* and *globalization*. The matter of the distinction between globalization and globalism will not be needlessly belaboured here. The two concepts are not mutually exclusive though they are not identical and furthermore, it has been shown that most aspects of the latter issue from the former and we will now be focusing on the other associated concepts and processes of the mother-theme of globalization.

It is the observation of Scott and Marshall (2005:249) that contemporary globalization comprises two entirely contradictory processes of homogenization and differentiation; that there is a complex interaction between *localism* and *globalism*, and that there are powerful movements emerging in resistance to the globalization processes. This complex interaction between the *local* and the *global* has been expressed in the term ‘glocalization’. For Giddens (2010:1121), this mix of globalizing processes and local contexts often leads to a strengthening rather than diminishing of local and regional cultures. Giddens position is a debatable one, for the reverse is the African case. *Glocalization* as perceived by George Ritzer is the interpenetration of the global and the local resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas. The idea of *glocalization* (which is a companion of the notion of glocalization) is the imperialistic ambition of nations, corporations, organizations, and the like to impose themselves on various geographic areas. Their main interest is in seeing their power, influence, and profits *grow* (hence the term *glocalization*) throughout the world. Globalization involves a variety of sub-processes – capitalism, Americanization, and McDonaldization – and these three are the central driving forces in globalization and are also of great significance in the worldwide spread of nothingness (Ritzer, 2008:586, 587; Ryan, 2007).

Details of what is meant by *nothingness* abound in Ritzer’s (2004) *The Globalization of Nothing* and it would be enough here just to hint that by *nothing*, Ritzer means empty forms, forms largely devoid of distinctive content. *Something* would be defined as (largely) full forms, forms rich in distinctive content. It is easier, Ritzer argues, to export empty forms (nothing) throughout the globe than to export forms that are loaded with content (something). *McDonaldization* (i.e. the process by which the principles of the fast food restaurants are coming to dominate more and more sectors of the American society as well as the rest of the world) and globalization of nothing may be taking place but these are largely superficial changes (Ritzer, *ibid*).

It is these superficial changes egregiously typified by the McDonald’s corporation that the protagonists of globalization celebrate as the blessings of the era and June Arunga in her introduction to Johan Norberg’s (2008) book excitedly declared that: “Globalization is happening! And I think we should welcome it”. She pointed to the “Great surge of trade in Africa, among Africans, after a long period of isolation from each other, due to protectionism, nationalism, and misunderstanding”, and all these to the credit of the all-mighty globalization. As Arunga further remarks, globalization “created transfers of skills, access to technology from around the world, and much more, and she also talks of the opportunities given the poor in Africa to engage in trade, employment at factories, cell phones, and modern modes of transportation which have all made life a lot better (*Ibid*:viii). Certainly, there is no controversy that trade enhances economic growth and that this growth in turn reduces poverty. It is equally true that paid jobs and cell phones and new means of movement such as cars, bikes, airplanes and trains make living smoother. The internet, radio, television and other media of information and communication are all there in Africa, through globalization, which as earlier noted has multifarious aspects with the economic dimension being the arch among others such as the political, cultural, military, environmental, etc. Our argument is that the same way slavery and colonialism (which were the precursors of neo-colonialism) were acclaimed as the ultimate marks of salvation, civilization and development to the savage heathen negro of Africa, the propagation of the benevolent marvels of globalization (which is the present apogee of neo-colonial capitalism) has been pursued in exactly the same spirit.

With respect to Arunga’s claim that globalization has “created transfers of skills”, one wonders the kind of skills, where and how these skills are being transferred, and ultimately, in whose overall interest. Of course, the African’s ability to operate factory machines (which he did not make) is still a testimony of

skill acquisition and maybe, access to technology too. But the African does not (because he cannot) own the factory owing to the macro implications of the capitalist political economy and the nature of centre-periphery relations. Again, the African machine operator receives a lower pay than his expatriate counterpart doing the same job in the same place. Another level of “transfer of skills” could be seen in the practice of multinational corporations coming into a Third World country to install, run and maintain a system with their home-drawn crew, just like the Chinese that came to revitalize the Nigerian rail system did a few years ago. The deliberate refusal to transfer “real” skills and the apartheid mode of employment and treatment of staff as exemplified in the Ajaokuta Steel Complex case in the 1980s in Nigeria simply show that those asking others to open up are hugging a lot of secrets. In the bustling and buzzing of the economies of Ghana and South-Africa for instance, how many of the nationals of these countries are really in charge? Are most not found as cashiers, receptionists, attendants, salesmen, operators and the like? All have been to “their” gain, not the Africans’.

Apparently, because of the kaleidoscopic manifestation of the trend of globalization, the numerous inherent contradictions and paradoxes in its effects especially on sub-Saharan Africa are shielded from many. And just as many at the vanguard of the nationalist struggles in Africa expressed vain glorifications of the benevolence of colonial rule to curry their masters’ favour, a substantial proportion of academics from both the North and the South have been echoing the bounties of goodness being dispensed by this terrible tide of globalization. It is in response to all these that Samir Amin in his *Specters of Capitalism* loudly wondered whether all these deification of capitalist globalization border on the so-called ‘pure economics’ or whether it is the contemporary world’s witchcraft in operation.

... The comparison with magic and witchcraft is inescapable. A wizard, likewise, dresses up his assertions in a seemingly “scientific” phraseology. He gains conviction by including some sensible and plausible things in his discourse, but only to bolster conclusions which follow from them in no way whatever... The foremost wizard was always intelligent enough to know what the king expected of him, and he delivered the goods. Pure economics performs similar functions in our economically alienated society; moreover, it performs them through similar methods, notably by an esoteric terminology (using mathematical terms to throw dust in the eyes of non-mathematicians (Amin, 1998:141).

As in exchanges during the previous ages between Europe and Africa, inequality has remained a constant feature of globalization and in both material and non-material terms, the successive chain of exploitative relations effectively secures for Africa a situation of seeming perpetual development inertia, economic regression, political uncertainty, dependency and interminable pupilage. The so-called gains of the present era are as spurious and ephemeral as those conceded to the African middle-man in the pre-colonial and colonial times. Unfortunately, the sort of economics (which informs the nature and quality of politics) often delivered by revered Western schools in the form of strict religious dogmas tend to conceal the roots of the African dilemma, project trade, finance and investment liberalization as the way to attain heights of development and prosperity in the model of Europe and America, and point at the structural aberrations in Africa and the rest of the Third world that are in need of adjustments for these places to “catch-up”. Thus, the Structural Adjustment policies to which African governments must comply with as part of the inescapable conditionalities for the so-called development loans offered by IMF and World Bank have been analyzed in the following manner by Patrick Wilmot:

Specific IMF conditions include wage freezes or even decreases, cutbacks on subsidies on essential food items, reduced expenditure for social welfare and education. These measures were evolved to correct structural problems of advanced capitalist countries in the 1950s and

60s. Applied unaltered to poor and ailing economies, they have the effect of killing the patient by giving an overdose of the wrong medicine (Wilmot, 1985:117).

From the foregoing, it is understandable why Ali Mohammed and Muhammad Ahsan after their deep reflections on the debt burden, debt servicing, the ever widening gap between the rich North and the poor South, international aid (as it is called), human deprivation and human development and in particular, the place of the Muslim world in the face of Western fundamentalism and global politics among numerous other disturbing issues in the contemporary reign of the capitalist order wondered if we should be talking of *Globalization* or *Recolonization* which actually is the title of their 2002 book. The point is that the African travails have been occurring along a continuum and that is precisely the reason for the length of time and energies expended in the ‘initial tillage’ without which the vital connections in the series of historical currents that culminated in the emergence of the three worlds as presently constituted could be quite easily missed.

We earlier noted in the preliminary segments of our discussions here that there is no separation of the economic from the political and also recalled Kwame Nkrumah’s belief in the political kingdom being the key to everything else with specific reference to colonial Africa, a projection that has been betrayed by unfolding events in post-colonial situations on the continent. The failure of materialization of Nkrumah’s prophecy was identified to be directly linked with the fraudulent game of decolonization, the bequeathed structures that have guaranteed even a more vicious and total control from “outside” of the so-called “independent” African states, as well as the manner in which the indigenous state managers have continued to faithfully act the scripts of the former imperial over-lords to the utter detriment of own societies. Our focus in this concluding segment will be on the re-assertion of the centrality of the economy – the infrastructure as it is most appropriately described in strict Marxist tradition – and its deterministic role in all that is made manifest in the superstructure, with specific emphasis on the political ideology of *Liberal Democracy in Africa* which is presently the most advertised ware in the stock of capitalism marketed through every possible media using the primary instrumentality of globalization.

Within the context of globalization, George Ritzer remarks, a particularly important example of political theory is the *Liberal Theory* (derived from the classical work of John Locke, Adam Smith, and others) (MacPherson, 1962), especially in the form of neoliberal thinking (Campbell and Pederson, 2001; Harvey, 2005) often called the “Washington consensus” (Williamson, 1990; 1997). Liberal theory comes in various forms, but all are undergirded by a belief in the importance of the free market and the need to allow it to operate free of any impediments, especially those imposed by the nation-state and other political entities. The belief is that the free operation of the market, in particular the capitalist market, will in “the long run” advantage just about everyone. This is a popular theory in international relations, political science, and business. It is embraced by many politicians (especially in the United States, hence the label “Washington consensus” following the world leaders WTO meeting in 1999 in Seattle, which also drew protesters upon the streets of Seattle), and this informed the writing of influential journalists such as Thomas Friedman (Anthonio, 2007). Another political theory involves a “realist” view, popular in most of the same venues, that sees globalization as the outcome of the power relations among nation-states (Scholte, 2005; Spegle, 1996). That is, states are seen as aggressively pursuing their own interests on the global stage (as well as within their own borders) and using their power to advance those interests. As the most powerful nation in the world today (the sole remaining superpower), the United States, is seen as the world’s major user (and abuser) of its power on the global stage. Thus, for example, the war in Iraq (begun in 2003) is seen as an exercise of global U.S. power, especially military power. The United States exercised that power to advance its own interests, which could be interpreted positively as defending its own well-being against the threat of weapons of mass destruction (never found), or negatively as a ruse to protect and advance its own interests, especially its economic interests in protecting vital oil supplies in the Middle East (Ritzer, 2008:594, 595).

But for Justine Rosenberg (2005), the transnational focus of most globalization theories is misguided and there should rather be a renewed focus on nation-states and their inter-relationships, specifically from Marxian perspective as well as a retention of focal concern with capitalism. Rosenberg, is making this case from the point of view of international relations and is seeking the renaissance of a field

that has tended to be eclipsed by globalization theories that see the nation-state as eroding or even disappearing (in the course of the so-called deterritorialization). This approach is by no means representative of all political theories of globalization and James Rosenau's (2003) *Distant Proximities*, that is the idea that the globe is increasingly characterized by the feeling that what seems remote is also close at hand (a notion somewhat akin to Giddens' (1984) concept of *time-space distanciation*) offers new illuminations on the multiple paradoxes of the phenomenon of globalization. This concept of distant proximities is linked to another key process (and concept) in Rosenau's work-*fragmentation*, which is the idea that the world is both fragmenting and integrating at the same time under the primary influence of capitalist globalization. Most generally, the world is localizing, decentralizing, and fragmenting while it is simultaneously globalizing, centralizing, and integrating (Ritzer, 2008:595). How have these contradictory and scalar movements especially of political globalization been affecting the emergence of genuine popular democracy, in Africa? This question has become a very crucial one since the political liberalization just like economic liberalization accomplished with varying degrees of success (and abysmal failure too) in the societies of the North and South through globalization have not been associated with identical implications in terms of really empowering the people, that is the masses, who count most in any authentic democracy.

In principle, *Liberal Democracy* is a form of government in which representative democracy operates under the principle of liberalism. It is characterized by fair, free, and competitive elections between multiple distinct political parties, a separation of powers into different branches of government, the rule of law in everyday life as part of an open society, and the protection of human rights and civil liberties for all persons. Ideally, liberal democracies should draw upon a constitution, either formally written or uncodified, to delineate the powers of government and enshrine the social contract. Liberal Democracy has become the predominant political system on earth after a period of sustained (capitalist) expansion primarily aided by the forces of globalization throughout the 20th century, into the 21st, and still going. Normally, a liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms: it may be a constitutional republic as found in France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, or the United States, or a constitutional monarchy such as Japan, Spain, or the United Kingdom. It may equally have a presidential system (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, the United States), a semi-presidential system (France and Taiwan), or a parliamentary system (Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, Poland, the United Kingdom) (Wikipedia B).

But there is always a gulf between the "ideal" and the "real" and the very catchy slogan of democracy irrespective of the variant – whether liberal (i.e. Western capitalist type) or the Socialist version have been stirring into a kind of political frenzy in Africa which upon closer examination reveals nothing in the direction of honest democratic changes. It is therefore little wonder that no African country could be seriously considered as typifying any version of democracy. Of all the traditional features of democracy just highlighted, none can be held to be truly manifesting in the political theatricals of African States nor are there prospects of such in the foreseeable future unless a complete, full-circle, reversal of trends occurs.

As hinted earlier, the obstacles in the way of democracy in Africa are huge, complex, enervating and issuing from several sources – historical and contemporary, external and internal, institutional and informal, structural and procedural – with the latest complication to the complexity supplied by the train of globalization in the kitty of 'market forces' democracy. Regarding the implications of globalization for Africa (aspects of which have been dealt with in the proceeding parts), the conclusions of Akindele, Gidado, and Olaopo on that topic are very relevant for our present purposes:

... globalization is the final conquest of capital over the rest of the world and its "antecedents" and "uneven thesis" are explainable within the one-arm banditry and ethos of capitalism ... this will continue to be so, irrespective of its transcendental homogenization of political and socio-economic theory across the globe and its purported benefits to mankind ... the asymmetry of power and interests of the member states of the global village, as well as the lopsidedness in the rules of the game there-in, cannot benefit Africa and her people. This is so and would continue to be so because globalization is a new order of marginalization and re-colonization in a "neo-neo-colonial fashion" of the African continent (Akindele, Gidado, and Olaopo, 2002).

The critical point to note from the above passage is that contrary to the claim that “the free operation of the capitalist market” as well as the liberalization of the political processes of nation-states will “in the long run” benefit just about everyone (including the rural African global villager and the beleaguered African states), there is practically no evidence upon which to anchor the expectation that the present expansionism and hegemony of capital will suddenly turn benign and equitable and begin to favour everybody, everywhere, and in every way simply with the ordinary passage of time. All the signs are rather to the opposite direction and the probability of perpetuation of the prevailing order is extremely high, just to avoid the suggestion of immodesty the declaration of its certainty may arouse.

Now, the fetishist seduction of liberal democracy, which sails in tandem with the free market forces of capitalism as presently propelled by globalization has acquired a thick cloud of doubt around it that border on its propriety, wholesomeness, practicability, and utility in creating a just, egalitarian, equitable, peaceful and progressive society in Africa. In the reasoned argument of Shola Omotola, liberal democracy represents a major disservice to democratization in Africa:

... liberal democracy has not only become subjective but also theoretically ambivalent and analytically vacuous. Its dispositions as a “celebrity” in its own right tend to propel undemocratic forces to pretend as democrats to avoid courting international resentment. For this reason, the concept of liberal democracy can be indicted of complicity in the level of participation of autocrats in civilian garbs across the globe particularly in Africa. In its present form and character, the concept of democracy does very little or nothing to illuminate our understanding of politics particularly in the African context. Its main attraction seems (to be) the advancement of Western interest especially the USA in the consolidation of its Cold War victory, and that of opportunistic African leaders in their quest for power and accumulation of private capital ... (Omotola, 2009:6).

Beneath, the posturing of African democratization are to be found layers of frustrating misery, alienation and despair of the globalized villager on the continent whose condition has forced into the affective enclaves of ethnicity, indigeneity, and religion.

Commenting further on the inherent contradictions of political liberalization which have produced both good and bad repercussions on the African society, Okwudiba Nnoli, using the Nigerian experience that largely reflects the contemporary continental situation remarks that from 1999, with the reversion to civilian administration, the political space has been opened up beyond what the military permitted, and expanded the liberties inherited from the past struggles of the people for democracy. Across Africa, Nnoli argues, notable political liberalization has occurred in the last decade, as reflected in the significant decline of human rights abuses, the rise of independent media, civic, functional and interest organizations and the emergence of multiparty politics. In his reasoned view, political liberalization has not led, and does not necessarily lead to popular empowerment. The prospect of popular power is subverted by the fake, lame and irrelevant democracy which is on offer as a substitute in Africa. But real democracy that ensures popular empowerment will hopefully triumph and find unique institutional forms in accordance with the historical conditions of the peoples of Africa (Nnoli, 2006:149,150)

Epilogue: Towards the Reclamation and Revivification of Africa

Indeed, the African situation is a curious paradox of sorts. The first incontrovertible pieces of evidence of the precursors of the human species was found on the continent just as the ancient civilizations in arts and sciences immensely benefited from the original contributions of this part of the globe. Natural endowments such as fossil fuel – the most strategic commodity in an energy-crazy world as well as the sole object of deadly national and international intrigues and violence – and many other mineral deposits and raw materials essential for a broad spectrum of industrial activities abound in large quantities across Africa. The scenic beauty, stable cycles of seasons for most parts, a generous supply of sun-light, minimal

threats of ecological disasters, and an ever-increasing human population are some of the features of Africa that could justify the description of her condition as a mixture of numerous natural blessings with numerous human curses, of affluence and affliction occurring at the same time in the same place.

In the age of slavery, the continent of Africa was a double loser, a total loser. Human beings were exchanged for trifles – both the people and the trifles have long vanished – forever. In the age of colonialism, trifles were also gotten. In the post-colonial age, the indigenous African ruling classes, who originally were drawn from the “special” breed of the educated elites have continued, out of a deliberate refusal to learn from past experiences, which is the most important distinguishing capability that separates man from the lower animals (as we prefer to imagine other non-human living creatures), have continued to earn even larger doses of trifles. The pattern and effects of Euro-Africa relations have remained the same through history. During the ideological warfare between the Communist and Capitalist forces that lasted for about 50 years, Africa and Africans were actively involved, wittingly and unwittingly, as physical mercenaries, as strategic aids, as a vital source of oil and other necessary resources, and as a theatre of contests for candidates (states) to be converted to either side using the supply of military hardware manufactured by the two principal parties and the so-called development finance aids as baits. The victory of capital has meant tragedy for the rest outside the First World and the only change in the dynamics of Western capitalist order especially with respect to Africa is the sophistication and subtlety of its operation in its dual delivery of “development” and “destruction”.

Since the grant of political autonomy (which has remained largely effectual given that the economy of states in post-colonial Africa has continued to be tied in a most unhealthy manner to that of Europe and America), the nationalist song of “independence” has become replaced by the new hymns of “development” and “democracy” which for the indigenous leaders serve as a convenient propaganda to sustain themselves in a *status quo* that must be at all costs protected the way the white-man fabricated it. For the former colonial powers, the twin concepts of development and democracy serve as unsuspecting tools with which to continue to consolidate the proceeds of the deft manouvre of the grand fraud of decolonization, while for the masses, an undying hope in the materialization of the two serve to support an existence that is in reality devoid of any meaning, concrete form or definite direction.

A preoccupation with the democratic project throughout the world is informed by the fact that it is for now the name ascribed to the form of government considered to be the best in terms of its ability to enhance the utmost individual and collective realization of the aspirations of a good life, the rights and liberties of a fulfilled existence, as well as the only form of political and social arrangement under which, through effective popular participation in decision-making and the administration of an open society, the potentialities of the society become capable of optimal exploration, leading in turn to unhindered positive social transformation – to development – for all and sundry. But even the liberal democracy whose crusade has been prosecuted by the deterritorizing and deregulating globalization of “empty forms” as Ritzer (2004) aptly described the process is confronted by the problems of corruption, violence, and a fundamentally flawed political culture in Africa. Beneath the posturings of African democratization are to be found layers of political deception in which the indigenous power elites continue to re-circulate themselves through “fixed”, predetermined elections while the masses remain far from the opaque governments that squander within a very tiny circle what is meant for all. The alienation, familiar misery, and despair of the globalized villagers in Africa are the conditions that have forced a recession into the affective caves of ethnicity, religion and regionalism, manifesting periodically in the cathartic explosions of various forms violence presently visible across the continent.

Having reiterated some of the salient points in this discourse, it is our opinion that the reclamation of the African continent can only start with the change of the perception of political power as simply a tool for personal capital accumulation held by the indigenous ruling classes from independence up until now. Unless the present African leaders understand the numinous nature of state power, the sacred duty of protecting the public good, and the absurdity of living off the state to the detriment of the vast majority, the fate of the continent is hopelessly sealed. Also, African leaders must begin to think in local terms, in terms that will positively impact on the domestic economy and society, while at the same time, selecting cautiously and contextualizing whatever capitalist globalization has on offer. It is obvious that the kind of economic prescription offered by the exalted International Financial Institutions and pontifications of renowned Western economists have instead of leading to recovery and growth caused greater complications

and retardation. Unfortunately, it is still this kind of “wisdom” – rote, rebarbative, and regurgitative economics that African graduates of Harvard serving either as representatives of the Bretton Woods Institutions or as advisers and ministers have been offering to their own governments. A mind thoroughly colonized and socialized into the acceptance of an inferior racial status is a mind most unlikely to critically re-assess, in the light of stark home truths, what has been taught by the makers of space crafts and the inventors of “heavens”.

To revivify the continent, the glocalization component of the globalization process must be brought into central focus in Africa while a re-orientation of state economies towards domestic contexts, needs and aspirations is a matter of urgent necessity. Political liberalization in Africa has as its most spectacular achievement the exclusive monopoly of the moneyed-classes and the entire democratization noise mean a little more than electoral gimmickery with the citizens’ participation restricted only to voting which merely serve as artificial legitimation of power often fraudulently acquired. Democratic political participation entails a lot more than this. Since there is no separation of political liberalization from economic liberalization, Martin Khor’s critical observation with respect to balancing opportunities and problem resulting from globalization is worthy of consideration at this juncture. He remarked that among the biggest dilemmas for developing countries is whether they should open up to the globalization process (in the hope of obtaining some of the benefits) or take a more cautious approach to avoid risks (which would attract criticisms from the mainstream institutions that are sure to lecture the countries concerned that they will be left behind). The challenge is whether developing countries can take advantage of the liberalization process, which to a large extent is being pushed on them externally, while at the same time avoiding or minimizing the disruptive consequences on their societies and economies. The ability to manage liberalization and globalization will be a crucial aspect of national policy-making in the years ahead. At this point, the danger is that most developing countries (in particular, sub-Saharan Africa and the Third World in general), under great pressures from agencies such as the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank, will go along with the trend and institute more as well as rapid, liberalization policies, without a clear idea of the conditions needed to address the associated risks successfully. Instead of rapid liberalization, a selective approach to liberalization is more appropriate. The aim of this would be to strike a careful balance between opening the domestic market (to benefit consumers) and protecting it (to take into account the interests of small producers especially) (Khor, 2004:117, 118).

In summary, Africa needs to do more of in-ward looking while participating in the global trends, make intelligent choices from the array of tempting and competing options, and ultimately decide on her own path of redemption and renewal – in politics, economy and society – rather than the present delusive ambition of “catching-up” with the West. The debt shackle, political corruption and violence, ill-informed and mal-conceived policies, inept leadership, food insecurity, and gross inadequacies of basic infrastructure are among the situations in Africa deserving emergency attention. A triage is very likely to identify corruption and the poverty of leadership as candidates for first attention. The entire thing is a matter of choices, a question of decisions, rationally or irrationally made, or not made at all. The wonders in the Asian economy, technology and society are the results of the choices and decisions made by their early generation of leaders, carried on religiously by the contemporary generation of leaders among the Tigers. In the African case, the earlier generation of leaders may have been swindled by sheer ignorance, fear and coercion in the Euro-African treaties giving rise to formal colonialism but the present crop of indigenous leaders, literate and presumably knowledgeable, have been entering into volitional treaties with obvious and deadly devastating effects on own societies. The truth is that the manner of participation in the processes of globalization, liberalization, deterritorialization and democratization is largely a matter of choice for individual nations and if Africa decides to continue groping in the dark under the sun, then that is simply her choice!

REFERENCES

- Abah, O.S. (ed.). (2005). *Geographies of Citizenship in Nigeria*. Zaria: Tamaza Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Achebe, C. (2009). *The Education of a British-Protected Child*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Agger, B. (ed.). (1978). *Western Marxism: An Introduction*. Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyears.
- Ajayi, J.F.A. (2002). *Unfinished Business: Confronting the Legacies of Slavery and Colonialism in Africa*. Calcutta: SEPHIS-CSSSC.

- Ake, C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Ake, C. (1981). *A Political Economy of Africa*. Essex, England: Longman Group Limited.
- Ake, C. (1996). “*The Challenge of Violence in Africa: A Research Proposal*”. Port-Harcourt: ASS Memo.
- Ake, C. (2001). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Akindele, S.T., Gidado, T.O., and Olaopo, O.R. (2002). *Globalization: Its Implications and Consequences for Africa*. <http://globalization.iCaop.org/content/v2.1/01akindele> etal. html.
- Althusser, L. (1969). *For Marx*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin
- Alubo, O. (2006). *Nigeria: Ethnic Conflicts and Citizenship Crises in the Central Region*. Ibadan: PEFS.
- Amin, S. (1975). *Accumulation on a World Scale*. New York: Monthly Review Press. 2 Vols.
- Amin, S. (1996). *Capitalism in the Age of globalization*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Amin, S. (1998). *Specters of Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Press Review.
- Amin, S. (2011). *Long Road to Socialism*. Dar-es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd.
- Ayandele, E.A. (1974). *The Educated Elite in the Nigerian Society*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Baker, H. (2007). “Economic Determinism”. In G. Ritzer (ed.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1293-1294.
- Beamish, R. (2007). “Dialectical Materialism.” In G. Ritzer (ed.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1150-1151.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is Globalization?* Cambridge, Eng.: Polity Press.
- Bender, F. (ed.). (1970). *Karl Marx: The Essential Writings*. New York: Harper.
- Bhagwati, J. (2004). In Defense of Globalization. <http://www.conservapedia.com/globalism>. Retrieved on 2/3/2013.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1996). “Global Leadership after the Cold War”. *Foreign Affairs*. January-march, pp. 3-4.
- Brandt, W. (1980). *North-South: A Programme for Survival – The Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues*.
- Browne, H. (1974). *World History I: 1750-1900*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, J. and Pederson, O.K. (eds.). (2001). *The Rise of Neoliberalism and International Analysis*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Chinweizu (1978). *The West and the Rest of Us*. London: NOK Publishers.
- Cohen G.A. (1978). *Karl Marx: Theory of History: A Defence*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1986). *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism*, Benin City: Katrine Holm.
- Davidson, B. (1992). *The Black Man’s Burden: Africa and the Curse of the Nation-State*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Descartes, R. (1912). *A Discourse on Method: Meditations and Principles*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Dobb, M. (1964). *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Feffer, J. (ed.). (2002). *Living in Hope: People Challenging Globalization*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkely. University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (2010). *Sociology*. New Delhi: Wiley India Pub. Ltd.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Igwe, O. (2005). *Politics and Globe Dictionary*. Aba: Eagle Publishers.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The Dialectical Imagination*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kabeer, N. (ed.) (2005). *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Khor, M. (2001). *Globalization and the South: Some Critical Issues*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Khor, M. (2004). *Rethinking Globalization: Critical Issues and Policy Choices*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- MacPherson, C.B. (1962). *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Marsh, Z.A. and Kingsnorth, G.W. (1965). *An Introduction to the History of East Africa*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazrui, A.A. (1999). “Seek ye First the Political Kingdom”. In A.A. Mazrui and C. Wondji (eds.). *General History of Africa* (Unabridged Edition).. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

- Mills, C.W. (1963). "The Structure of Power in American Society". In I.L. Horowitz (ed.). *Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright. Mills*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mohammad A. and Ahsan, M. (2002). *Globalization or Recolonization?* London: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd.
- Nkrumah, K. (1957) *Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- Nkrumah, K. (1966). *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. London: Panaf Books.
- Nnoli, O. (1980). *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Nnoli, O. (1989). *Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers (Int'l.) Ltd.
- Nnoli, O. (2006). *National Security in Africa: A Radical New Perspective*. Enugu: PACREP.
- Norberg, J. (2008). *In Defense of Global Capitalism*. Lagos: African Liberty.org.
- Nye, J. (ND) "Globalism Versus Globalization." <http://www.theglobalist.com/storyld.aspx?storyld=2392>. Retrieved on 2/3/2013.
- Offiong, D. (1980). *Imperialism and Dependency: Obstacles to African Development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Offiong, D. (2001). *Globalization: Post-Neodependency and Poverty in Africa*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Omotola, J.s. (2008). "Attractions and Limitations of Liberal Democracy in Africa:." *Africana Journal* Vol. 3, No. 1. pp. 5-30. <http://www.africanjournal.org>.
- Quattara, A.D. (1997). "The Challenges of Globalization for Africa". Being an Address Delivered by the Deputy Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund at the Southern Africa Economic Summit held in Harare, May 21st.
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The Globalization of Nothing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer, G. (2008). *Sociological theory* (7th Edtn.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenau, J.N. 92003). *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond globalization*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, J. (2005). "Globalization Theory: A Post Mortem". *International Politics*, 42: 2-74.
- Ryan, J.M. (2007). "Grobalization". In G. Ritzer (ed.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2580-2582.
- Sbet, J.M. (1999). "Progress". In W. Sachs (ed.). *The Development Dictionary*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Scholte, J.A. (2005). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (2nd. Ed.). Basingstoke, Eng: Palmgrove.
- Scott, J. and Marshall, G. (2005). *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spegele, R.D. (1996). *Political Realism in International Theory*. Cambridge, Eng: Cambridge University Press.
- Toynbee, A. (1995). *A Study of History*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wikipedia (B) *Liberal Democracy*. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/liberal democracy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/liberal%20democracy). Retrieved on 2/3/2013.
- Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalism>.
- Williamson, J. (1990). "What Washington Means by Policy Reform". In John Williamson (eds.). *Latin American Adjustment: How Much has Happened?* Washington, D.C: Institute for International Economics.
- Williamson, J. (1997). "The Washington Consensus Reassessed." In L. Emeri (ed.). *Economic and social Development into the XXI Century*. Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank: 48-61.
- Wilmot, P. (1985). *Sociology: A New Introduction*. London: Collins International Textbooks.
- Young, C. (1979). *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.