IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 25, Issue 9, Series 6 (September. 2020) 31-45
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Globalization and Contradictions of Development in African States

DR. PETER DICKSON AKPAN
Political Science (Political Economy & Development Studies)

Abstract :
This study, ‘globalization and contradiction of development in African states’, is conducted to examine whether globalization has provided for the development of African states or is rather contradicting it, especially, in the face of continuous widening of inequality gap between the rich and the poor countries of the world; the watering down of the position of nation states vis-à-vis globalization processes or the erosion of the nation-state boundaries and the independent policy-making capacity of states in matters of development and the escalating incidents of terrorist activities in African countries, using the same celebrated tools of globalization, and thereby frustrating the development efforts of African states. To clearly demonstrate the central issue involved, hypothesis was formulated in the null form, thus: “the globalization process does not provide for, but contradicts, the development of African states”. To generate necessary data on the subject matter, the study adopted the secondary method of data collection and analysis from relevant literature in the field over a period of time. The data generated were subjected to qualitative analysis within the purview of dependency and liberal theories approach of international trade which are counterpoint. The dependency theory believes the capitalist world system is denoted by exchange of goods in the form of world market, and the international relations that develop there from enhance inequality among the countries of the world. On the other hand, the liberal theorists emphasize that free trade is beneficial to all. They posit that the prevalent international market system is the best structure that could engender development in the developing countries. Findings from the study show that the hypothesis is true. Therefore, the study concludes that globalization and its processes contradict the development of African states. Globalization can neither stop inequality among countries, nor promote development in African countries.

Key Word: Globalization, Development, Inequality, African States, Transnational processes, Global trading system, Terrorism

---

Date of Submission: 04-09-2020 Date of Acceptance: 19-09-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study:

The concept of globalization is believed to represent diverse perspectives of “interdependence”. It denotes, firstly, the fact that resources as well as technological endowment are not evenly distributed among countries. This underscores the reason why nations become economically dependent on each other, without any being totally self-reliant. The differences in resource endowments across the globe provide the basis for interactions and exchange by way of trade and investment, information and technology within the global system. Globalization is the process that deepens these interactions and exchange across the globe, thus, making possible a wide range of cross-border activities such as trade in goods and services, movement of people, investment, information and global financial and monetary exchanges.

Secondly, it represents the conception that nation-state is not necessarily the most important in the conduct of international relations (Keohane and Uye, 1977). The interdependence theorists argue that the practice where government of the nation-states traditionally took responsibility for the overall economic welfare of their countries and citizenry, engaged in different forms of international (economic) relations with other countries and contrive different international trade policies to protect their national economic interests were no longer tenable.

In their words, "the growth in the volume and breadth of international exchange has created very complicated patterns of interdependence that make the definition of national interest more difficult” and that, according to them, “there are many ways in which government are linked with a correspondent multiplicity of interests which sometime fall outside the states’ apparatus”, they cited as example the multinational corporations, which they argue sometimes have assets and incomes that exceed those of some nation-states (Keohane and Uye, 1977).. The watering down of the importance of the nation-states in affairs of international relations or the continuous erosion of the sovereignty of nation-states is among the key issues in the globalization process, and the perspective from which globalization was conceptualized.

Thirdly, Hettne (1995), in what could be tagged 'the biosphere explanation of interdependence' cited the UN (1972) conference on environment, which stressed that the human race is generally and ultimately dependent on the biosphere, and that the ecological systems are not necessarily conterminous with national boundaries, meaning that in the event of a disturbance of the ecological balance in one country, the effects will be felt by other countries. This implies the interdependence of nations in the protection of the ecological system, and also implies that since nations share in their dependence of the biosphere, an harmful occurrence on the ecological system in one part of the world has the likelihood of penetrating the whole world. Moreover, the idea of penetration is one of the hallmarks of globalization - any happening in one part of the world has a way of penetrating every part of the globe. Giddens (1990), in his theory, calls it "time-space distanciation" which he defines as "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away", even the cultural patterns of people in remote communities of the world are shaped by what happens in very distant localities.

The concept of globalization means different things to different people and the process has winners and losers. To the losers, globalization is another phase of capitalist expansionism, or a new phase of expanded "worldwide inequalities, new mode of domination, displacement, the perpetuation of capital crisis and marginalization" (Robinson, 2007). Samir Amin (2011) sees globalization as a new form of economistic capitalist utopia, an imposition doomed to failure, as it only reduces economic policies to the status of crisis management policies (Samir Amin, 20011, p108).This means globalization is a gloss over capitalist exploits in the developing countries. However, to the winners, the concept of globalization is a process with distinct development strategies, the process with the "magic wand" that would ensure global development. They argue that globalization means openness, a phenomenon that has opened up the entire world for increased economic, social and cultural interactions, and ties across geographical boundaries; increased communications which have turned the world to a global village; and increased opportunities in terms of connectivity, thus, creating new-found prosperity, freedom, emancipation and democracy. This is basically the view of the liberal scholars in the developed world. However whether or not these normative issues are grounded, they will loom large in any survey of theories of globalization.

Suffice it to say, notwithstanding the prevalent disagreement among theorists on the meaning and utility of globalization, one cannot deny the rapid social change and transformation that have occurred in the last decades of twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries; and relative increased connectivity among peoples and countries, worldwide. Furthermore, it is undeniably true that the effects of globalization are seen everywhere in the economic, social, political and cultural processes to which the term actually refers. However, it is also a truism that these effects bring with them negative consequences to some and positive and beneficial consequences to others.

1.2 Statement of the problem:

Globalization is a development strategy. A development strategy is nothing but a strategy for promoting the process of development. The developing countries have been searching for a development strategy that could ensure the development of their individual countries. In the 1950s and 60s, they opted for "import substitution" development strategy which was in vogue at that time. They protected local industries by imposing high tariffs and encouraged production for local consumption rather than exports. Governments were directly responsible for the economic development of their countries and actively involved in harnessing resources to the manufacturing sector which, in some cases, were government-owned. Nevertheless, they equally encouraged direct foreign investment in the manufacturing sector as well. This was to foster domestic productive capacity. Unfortunately, this development strategy was abandoned, especially in the African states, because at this time Africa was grappling with the stress of decolonization coupled with the belief that an end to colonialism and exploitation that goes with it would bring about economic development.

In the 1980s, developing countries shifted their focus to export-oriented development strategies, which would rely on expansion of overseas markets for their exports and removal of trade barriers, based, however on a new trade agreement, expectedly from the Uruguay round (1988 – 1993).. But the industrialized countries at that time became divided about agricultural subsidies. While the U. S. government proposed the "phasing out of all direct farm subsidies and farm trade protection for a decade" (Spero & Hart, 2010), Japan objected to it The E.U preferred reduction in subsidies. Even within the E. U., there were internal divisions. France and Germany which had their farmers benefitting from subsidies were aligning against countries like United Kingdom which had not much to do with agriculture in their economy. The proposals by the U. S. that would have given developing countries an advantage by way of buoying the prices of their export products (which were predominantly agricultural) up and expanding the markets failed. Agricultural subsidies remained, and high farm trade protection continued - the developed countries continued to impose barriers to trade in agricultural products which were of immense concern to the developing countries, in the process scuttle the expectations of developing countries of entering into a new regime of trade relations with the developed countries. This was worrisome, especially when the Round was expected to lay the foundation for the globalization of world trade and a negotiating table where the developed countries were to decide "new rules and institutions for managing the new global trading system" (Spero & Hart, 2010).

Another unfavourable dimension to the exports-oriented strategy against the developing countries in the global trade system is the application of "implied" reserved positions and rights of the developed countries to act unilaterally on matters that are global in scope. For example, the very few developing countries that were able to achieve success from the strategy were restricted from exporting their goods, the developed countries rolled out different national policies that restricted importation of products from developing countries. One good example was the U. S. restriction of importation of canned tuna from Mexico. This incident accentuated the age-long suspicion that, any trade regime from the developed countries would not take the interests of the developing countries into account.

Under globalization the "system of nation-states and national economies … are becoming transcended by transnational social forces and institutions" (Robinson, 2011). Some emerging relationships between the states, classes, institutions, etc. have become possible outside the territorial, geographical and statist confines, those concepts that were considered from the nation-state perspective are now "reconceived in social rather than geographic terms, as social location in a global society is increasingly stratified less along national and territorial lines than across transnational lines" (Robinson, 2011). This means, globalization has weakened or dismantled, the foundation of statism. Before globalization the key actors in development strategies were nation-states operating in competition with others under the process of internationalization to move up the ladder of development. Under the internationalization process, extension of economic activities and other social relations across national boundaries were subsumed under inter-state relations, and development in any country was predicated on the nation-state centric approach. The nation-states were the drivers of development. Even the development of the developed nations of the world stemmed from the framework of the nation states' development approach. According to Bjorn Hettne (1995), "the starting point for analyzing the European development experience is the emergence of nation states and the international system they made up." The practice of policies and effective strategy are the national responsibilities of the state and national society (Amin, 2011).

In the case of financial market integration and liberalization occasioned by globalization to broaden the geographic reach of international financial market, the lack of symmetry between the strength of market forces or bargaining power from one country to another constitute a problem. For example, when a poor country seeks financial aid, loan, or investment, that country is in a weak bargaining position, and the institutional framework that regulates the process tends to tilt in favour of the rich. In most cases, the markets do not properly differentiate between groups of borrowers, that is, borrowers with different shapes of casts are dump together in the same mould, or kind of applying the same drugs to all manner of diseases, meting out the same terms of conditions to all borrowers in the financial market during both booms and busts. Also, the practice where financial globalization co-exist with macroeconomics policies of (developed) nations, formulated based on domestic interests and contexts, would definitely, creates considerable tension for developing countries, which are prone to uncertainties caused by the developed countries' macroeconomic policies. And thirdly, the threats associated with the globalization of financial volatility and its adverse effects on economic growth and social equity of poor countries cannot be ignored.

On the whole, the problematic of this study is: (1) In reality, the history of the world has been the history of asymmetrical relationship, the rich - poor, the metropolitan - satellite, the core – periphery, the North – South, the developed – underdeveloped, and the industrialized – Third World contrasts. The points mentioned in the statement of the problems above are realities of these contrasts. How can one say, of a certainty, that these realities will cease to be part of the globalization process? Development under globalization is said to be a global thing. This, to me means every development step taken has the development of the whole world in focus. How possible that could be is the task of advocates of globalization to explain. Even if that could be possible, one would still have to worry about the fact that some countries are already developed, and African states are not. Therefore, the concern of this study is, can globalization provide the solution to the problem of inequality, or help to bridge or widen the gap already existing between the rich and poor?

(2) All development theories, except globalization, clearly show national bias. This means, the very notion of development has always been linked with the nation-state, or "development strategy is essentially an empirical concept, immediately related to state behavior or, more precisely, what the state does to promote development" (Hettne, 1995). Now, the fact of globalization has made it so difficult, if not impossible, to talk of development from the perspective of a smaller unit other than the world as a whole. What are the implications of these for African states that are yet to experience development in its true sense, or the less developed? If it is true that development was a process that required control and needed to be steered by actors, usually the state, is

it wrong to say that the globalization of development casts doubt on, or disrupt the viability of focusing on national development by African states? This is because “a crisis of the nation-state also implies a crisis for development strategy” (Hettne, 1995). At the last count, only a handful of states from the developing countries designated, the “newly industrialized countries” (NICs) become relatively strong in term of development, with African states having only one entrant in that group. But the overwhelming majority of the developing countries continue to sink deeper in poverty, remain vulnerable, more especially in the context of rising global corporate power.

The globalization process itself contains its own contradictions (Hettne, 1995) and challenges. The point is, can African states, poor and fragile as they are, have the capacity to confront these challenges and contradictions in the face of global inequality and unevenness in levels of development, or what appear as the forces of exclusion of the continent of Africa at the global level. Perhaps, African continent may not have truly been participating in setting the agenda of the globalization process. They might have only been goaded into the process. And it is common knowledge that “in the North – South system there is virtually less or ‘no’ perception of common interest” (Spero and Hart, 2011).

A number of studies have been conducted on “globalization”, some on the impact“, or its effects, some are concerned with “the theoretical relevance”, but none has studied *“Globalization and the contradictions of development in African states”.* This study is set out to examine the link between globalization and, in particular, the development of African states, or whether it rather contradicts it. It is against this background that the attempt to undertake the study becomes expectedly worthwhile and it is hoped the study will provide the answer to the research question stated below.

1.3 Research question:

Does the globalization process provide for, or contradict, the development of African states?

1.4 Objective of study

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the relationship between globalization and the development of African states, in specific term, whether the globalization process provides for, or contradicts the development of African states.

1.5 Hypothesis:

To ease the investigation of the research question and the achievement of the stated objective, the following hypothesis will be tested theoretically, and the hypothesis is stated in null form

(1) The globalization process does not provide for, but contradicts, the development of African states.

1.6 Significance of the study

African states have been making efforts towards the development of their individual countries. They adopted several development strategies in their quest for development. These attempts at acquiring development, more often than not, always ended up in failures. These have been attributed to a number of factors, which include the supposed insincere attitude of the developed countries in supporting the development aspirations of African states, the continuous perpetuation of disparity between the developed and developing countries and the inadequacy of some of the development strategies. The globalization process will be evaluated against the backdrop of these issues and more to prove or disprove the hypothesis.

The study becomes significant in that it will attempt to prove or disprove whether globalization can provide a solution to the age-long yearnings of African states for development. More importantly, the study is significant both from the theoretical and practical perspectives.

(i) From the theoretical perspective, the study will be helpful to scholars who would want to further researches in this area of study.

(ii) From the practical perspective, the study will help in establishing the correlations between globalization and the development of African states, and highlights the relationship between the provisions of the globalization process and the development of African states. This will as well help policy makers in related areas to make policies that would in turn help development in African states.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature review:

The concept of globalization became prominent from the late twentieth century. This caught the attention of scholars all over the world. Hence a whole lot of literature began to emerge on different aspect of the subject matter – its impact, the changes in technology, communication and transport, the universal character of culture, and so on. In this work our main focus is on globalization and the contradictions of development in African states. However, I shall attempt a brief review of one or two literature.

Spero and Hart (2011) in their book, "Politics of International Economic Relations", discuss much on globalization. They pay attention to the transformation of the international economic system under globalization, the dramatic shift in global economy; a surge in international economic interaction due to innovative improvement in technology and communication; a new system of global production, trading system and finance, foreign direct investment in the era of globalization, as well as integration of developing countries into the world trade organization. They started by identifying three economic systems under which the world economy was regulated since the end of the second world war in 1945, namely, the Bretton Woods system, the interdependence and globalization and moved to the globalization of financial markets or the broadening of the geographic reach of international financial markets, shifting from the government controlled and protection to free-market principles, with emphasis on liberalization.

Spero and Hart (2011), in their discussion on globalization did mention that by following the strategy of embracing globalization, some developing countries (very few) were successful. As examples, they mention four Asian Tigers, which are, Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Similarly, they named China and India as other examples of developing countries that benefit from liberalizing their interactions with the global economy, and, nevertheless, admit that "there are still more than a billion people on the planet who are not benefiting from globalization".

Spero and Hart (2011) main area of concentration is the changes that occur in the world economic system as a result globalization. As stated earlier their focus, principally, is the world and the globalization of the economic system, nothing was said about the development of African states, which is the main thrust of this article. Even in their mention of inequality, their explanation was that there was inequality within countries, among the developed countries or among the developed and the developing countries. This is a statement of fact, but does not even answer our question of whether the gap between the rich countries and poor countries in terms of development is bridged or widen under globalization.

Eddy and Marco (2006), in their book titled: "the social impact of globalization in the developing countries" concentrate mainly on three sub-headings: (1) globalization and employment, (2) globalization and within-countries income inequality, and (3) globalization and poverty alleviation. In their findings, it was concluded that "the optimistic predictions do not apply to the current wave of globalization. Neither employment creation nor the decrease in within-country inequality is automatically assured by increasing trade and FDI" (Eddy and Marco, 2006). On poverty alleviation, their findings concluded as follows: although increasing trade appears to foster growth and absolute poverty alleviation, some important counter-examples emerge, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, showing thus: "while FDIs seem to be neutral in term of their impact on income distribution and poverty, financial liberalization seems to have adverse effects on relative poverty" (Eddy and Marco, 2006).

It is noteworthy, however, to state that the relationship between the findings of this study and the development of African states is very remote, and has no connection with "globalization and the contradiction of development in African states". But, howbeit, the conclusions of the findings can, in this case, add to the generalizations about the negative impact of globalization to the development of African states.

2.2 Theoretical framework:

In this study, the dependency theory versus liberal theory approach of international trade shall be used. The dependency theory believes that in the last centuries, the capitalist world system that consists of a growing number of countries has been established. And the relations among the constituent units of the system are marked by the exchange of goods, in the form of world market, and the international relations that develop within the context of the system, enhance inequality among the countries of the world (Wil Hout, 1993). But liberalism is an expression of the classical and neo-classical economics of the nineteen and twentieth centuries. It is a theory of free trade and one of the most important theoretical traditions of the West. The liberals were the pioneer writers whose works were elaborated upon by many liberal economists and had tremendous influence on contemporary economic (liberal) theories of international trade (Ricardo, 1971).

The difference between the theory of free trade by the liberals and the dependency theory is very outstanding. The liberal theorists emphasize that free trade is beneficial to all trading partners. They posit that the prevalent international market system is the best structure, and following its market-oriented economic reforms could engender development in the developing countries. On their part, the dependency theorists stress that trade is detrimental, particularly for the developing countries. According to Wil Hout (1993), 'The dependency theory does not believe in genuine free trade within the capitalist world system. The laws that govern the capitalist world system make trade 'unfree', even when the epithet free is attached to trade, this in the view of the dependency theorists, serves as camouflage for unequal exchange between the core and the periphery. It continues to make the periphery worse and the core better off. Unequal trade relations, they say, perpetuate underdevelopment in the periphery, and development in the core.

The liberalists argue that, trade would be beneficial and interesting for all countries if they adopt the principle of comparative advantages, meaning that, countries should only specialize in producing those commodities requiring the least amount of labour. But to the dependency theorists, the lack of development in the developing countries is because there is no free trade except in theory, and the result of opening up the developing countries to foreign capital would always be negative as long as they are still part of the capitalist world system. Taking a close look at what the issues really are, it becomes obvious that evaluation of the concept of development among the two ideological groups are divergent: while the liberal theorists only concentrated on the cases where free trade seems to have succeeded, the dependency theorists are looking for where free trade fails.

Nevertheless, the relevance of the dependency theory versus liberal theory approach to the study lies on the fact that the two approaches are counterpoint on the development strategy that could lift African states out of the woods. More importantly, the globalization processes encapsulate the principles of the liberal theory of development, and the dependency approach is perhaps very illustrative of its explanation of the abnormalities in the liberal theory, for example, it is a fact that increase in world trade is not in any way beneficial to the vast majority of developing countries, more so, "the fact that Third World countries possessing evident comparative advantages (a cheap and abundant labour force, extensive sources of raw materials) have not been able to achieve a significantly higher level of wealth than others" (Wil Hout, 1993). In view of this, the research question set out in chapter 1.3 remains as relevant as ever.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter we shall be focusing on the methods of conducting the research, that is, the research design, method of collecting data and the method of data analysis.

3.1 Research design

In this study, we shall only use the trend research design. A trend research design is well suited to a study of dynamic processes, in other words if the problem being studied is likely to change or the attitude of the people about the phenomenon is likely to change over time – the focus is change over time.

3.2 Methods of data collection

The data collection method used in this study is the qualitative method or secondary source of data collection. This includes both official and unofficial documents, such as government publications and records, journals, articles, textbooks, Newspapers, magazines, internet and others.

3.3 Methods of data analysis

Equally, the qualitative method of analysis is used in this study. Qualitative data collection and analysis are complementary to each other, because it produces a higher synthesis than the one analysed. In this study we shall use review and appraisal methods of analysis in analyzing the data derived mainly from relevant document in answering the research question stated in section 1.3

IV. GLOBALIZATION: MEANING, SELECTED COMPONENTS, GOVERNANCE AND THE TRANSNATIONAL PROCESSES

The main points of discussion in this chapter include meaning of globalization, selected components of globalization – trade, investment and finance, the governance and the transnational processes.

4.1 Meaning

Globalization is a complex phenomenon. It means different things to different people. Wallerstein (1974) defines globalization as "the ideology of the dominant groups in reference to the neo-liberal political ideology of global free trade and capital accumulation unrestrained by states". The World Bank sees globalization from the standpoint of citizens of one country being able to freely carry out business transactions with residents across national boundaries without the involvement of the state. To the IMF, globalization is "the growing economic interdependence of countries worldwide through increasing volume and variety of cross-border transactions in goods and services, freer international capital flows, and more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology." World Health Organization (WHO) defines globalization as the increase in interconnectiveness and interdependence of people and countries, understood to mean the opening of international borders to increasingly fast flows of goods, services, finance, people and ideas; and changes in institutions and policies to facilitate and promote such flows.

The few definitions of globalization above appear to generally describe globalization from two angles - the economic dimension, which include, trade, finance, investment and the cross-border activities outside the purview of nation-states. However, the concept of globalization might weigh more heavily on the economic aspect, but the causal determination and theories of globalization are wide-ranging and multidimensional. Globalization can also be discussed from the dimension of politics, culture, time-space, etc.

4.2 Selected components of globalization:

In this section, few selected components of globalization will be discussed. The components include trade, investment and finance (including loans and aids).

4.2.1 Trade:

One of the major components of globalization is trade in goods and services. World trade is not, however, new to the developing countries. From the pre-independence era, Africans had been engaging in trade at the international level. African countries exported agricultural products and raw materials, and in turn were buying finished goods from the developed countries. It could be said the terms of trade were unfavourable to African products which were agricultural with low prices against the high prices of manufactured goods from developed countries. The industrialized countries imposed high tariffs and non-tariff barriers against goods from Africa. Nevertheless, the economies of African states depend largely on trade with the developed countries. Export earnings are not only the main source of income to the developing countries, but they constitute the bulk of their GNP and crucial to their development.

To the liberal theorists, trade is considered the engine of growth and development. Under globalization trade liberalization became a key factor. The neo-Keynesian theorists' logic of globalization as cited in Hettne (1995), in the quote from Angelopoulos (1983) below explains it all:

… the great problem today for the industrial countries is to generate a 'creative demand'… It is therefore necessary to find sufficient purchasing power for absorbing additional goods produced. If such purchasing power cannot be secured within the national borders of a country, it must be sought elsewhere. The developing countries, which have a great need for equipment and services for accelerating their economic and social progress, have some levels of aggregate demand but lack of the requisite purchasing power. Here is the key of the problem. And it is here that the reapplication of the Keynesian theory on a world scale can bring a solution to the present economic crisis by generating sufficient levels of global creative demand … (p.111)

The aforementioned quote confirms the fact that the fulcrum of globalization is trade, and reveals that globalization is only fashioned to confine the developing countries to the position of buyers of finished products from the developed countries. No wonder, the Uruguay rounds (1988 – 1993) that provided the platform for the development of new global trading systems and regimes; and the extension of the "world trade regime to agriculture" (Spero & Hart, 2010, p.106), ended without fulfilling the expectations of the developing countries– that of creating a new regime of trade relations between the developing and developed countries, and removing trade barriers such as tariffs and agricultural subsidies. Even when they did not stop mounting pressure on developing countries to liberalize importations, efforts to get the developed countries to liberalize agricultural products imports failed (Hout, 1993, p. 183).

Scholars have commented on the negative effects of trade restrictions on the exports of developing countries. Wolf (2004), an ardent defender of globalization, admitted in his treatise that the imposition of trade barriers on the exports of the developing countries has harmful effects on the poor nations. Strange and Bayley (2011) observe that even when the developed countries provide aid to improve the African countries' agricultural trade, if they continue to maintain "trade barriers or measures that keep the developing countries' goods out", such aid is inefficient and cannot promote growth. The removal of barriers to trade is believed to be more effective in promoting the development of African States than any other form of assistance. The World Bank's World Development Report (1991) stated that "the cost of trade protection to the developing countries in term of forgone exports in 1990 was $55 billion, an amount almost equal to that year's total official development assistance" (World Bank, 1991, p. 105). This means the developing countries lost $55 billion to trade barriers on their exports to the developed countries in 1990, and received assistance worth the same amount. Assistance is a decoy that gives the giver-nations the advantage to unduly influence the domestic policies of the receiver-nations. But revenue from exports gives joy and fulfillment to the exporting country.

4.2.2 Investment and finance (loans and aids):

Investment, loans and aids are important aspect of financial flows to developing countries. They are instruments of development. The need for infrastructure, industrial and overall economic development of African states remains the main reason why they turn to the industrialized countries for private funds in the form of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and bank loans. Multinational corporations are the main vehicle of FDI. In the period of globalization, the primary classes of investment are the FDI, foreign portfolio investment, that is, investment without direct control of overseas assets and other private sources such as mutual funds and sovereign wealth funds. But, like it was during the time of Reagan and Thatcher when the world of finance was based on what they called "disintermediation", "decommissioning" and "deregulation", which implies elimination of mediators in finance regulations and dismantling of any form of barriers between financial centres so that, according to the policy (which took leverage from neo-liberal policies), the process of exchange of capitals between the world financial actors could be made easier. The globalization of finance as the

"Reaganist" and "Thatcherist" 3Ds policy implied, has given rise to a new system of globalized financial market, whereby (even) aids to developing countries were based on "return to free-market principles". Under globalization, any African states in need of foreign direct investment or international private funds must be able to implement liberalization to the fullest. Similarly, the IMF conditionalities for new loans are based mainly on a "structural adjustment programme" which emphasizes government reforms such as reduction in public spending which always result in a dramatic cut in demand and a halt in growth, and devaluation which weakens the local currency against the international currencies, thus, making external debt servicing worse and aggravating the fiscal problem of the government. The private capital flows of financial and direct investment have been in the decline in recent years. Except in few of the developing countries classified as emerging markets and said to have fully liberalized their economies and financial markets – Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, China, India and Indonesia, other developing countries share very negligible growth rate of capital flow. Wolf (2004) says the requirements for FDI are good governance and attractive economic environment. But bad governance is not peculiar to African States. It is everywhere. To hinge foreign investments on bad government is assumptive, and bad governance is relative.

The World Development Report of 1990, stressed that more investment in the human capital of the poor (countries) contribute to faster long term growth. Wolf (2004), agrees with the above argument when he says: "FDI stimulates exports, another major creator of jobs" (Wolf, 2004, p. 18). These statements attest to the fact that foreign direct investment in the developing countries remains one of the most viable options in the development of African States. If the US with all its riches and development, as observed by Wolf (2004), could still be receiving as much FDI as it provides, with no net FDI, one could imagine what happens to the African countries where FDI becomes a near-impossibility.

In the case of aid, despite the growing arguments about the ineffectiveness of aids in the areas of growth and development, many still believe that aid has been a contributive agent of growth, for if not for aid interventions to the developing countries in the areas of health, education, poverty alleviations, etc., the quality of life would have been worse. As observed by Spero and Hart (2010, p. 246), "… aid contributed in important ways to growth in countries such as South Korea and Taiwan, which received massive aid inflows during the Cold War". In the period of globalization, aids to African States have been on the decline. This can be attributed to efforts by the governments of the US and the UK to discourage foreign aids as true means of economic development, and their support for a return to the free-market. Political and strategic factors, other than economic, have become the main determinants of aid donations. For instance, the European countries tend to give aids to their former colonies; the United States give preference to the Middle East, particularly, Egypt and Israel; and Japan concentrate on Asia. Most developed countries place conditions before giving aids. They use aids to influence investment, fiscal and monetary policies of the recipient countries. Aids can be used as sanctions against unpopular regimes or policies. Spero and Hart (2010) cited the United States as withholding aid from Haiti in 1987, Panama in 1988 and Nigeria in 1994. It can as well be used to promote "new foreign investment by providing information, sharing the costs of survey, and guaranteeing such investment against risk" (Spero & Hart, 2010, p. 247). Basically, the common denominator in the giver-receiver engagements – whether aid, investment, or trade - is the perceived interest of the giver, which, invariably tends to affirm the fears, by many, that globalization is a smokescreen against the true motives of the developed countries as regards the development needs of the Third World countries.

4.3.1 Governance process:

One of the outstanding features of globalization is what Sklair (2000, 2002) in the theory of global capitalism describes as 'transnational practices' (TNPs), used to stress the different categories of activities and models involved in the globalization processes. The TNPs are those practices that do not originate from the logic of the nation, that is to say, they are practices that neither are state-driven nor state-directed. They are activities of non-state actors which transcend national boundaries, a departure from the interstate system. This is an unfolding transnational process under globalization, a new global production and financial systems that become practically transnational rather than international in nature. Sklair (2000, 2002) alludes the governance structure of globalization to these TNPs and the institutions under which they operate, excluding the nation-states. Robinson (2003 & 2004) speaks in the same line with Sklair on the three levels governance structure, namely, "transnational production, transnational capitalists and a transnational state", which, according to him, indicate a movement from a world economy to a global economy.

However, Robinson becomes more explicit in his analysis of the governance roles of the three different levels, accordingly, he postulates that "a transnational capitalist class is the class group that manages these globalized circuits" (Robinson, 2007, p. 131). In another aspect, Robinson deviates from Sklair's analysis of the states as having no role to play in the global system, and identifies an emergent 'transnational state' apparatus, which he describes as "a loose network comprised of supranational political and economic institutions together with national state apparatuses that have been penetrated and transformed by transnational forces". He further specifies "national states as components of a larger TNS structure" that "tend to serve the interests of global over national accumulation processes" (Robinson, 2007, p. 131).

Both Sklair (2000, 2002) and Robinson (2003 & 2004) identify the 'transnational practices' as the operational categories for the analysis of transnational phenomena, or institutions and structure in which globalization processes revolves. Each of these practices is primarily identified with a major institution. For example, the transnational corporations are the most important institution for economic transnational practices. Locating the practices in the field of transnational global system, Sklair then explains the dynamics of capitalist globalization from without the logic of the nation-state system.

However, Hardt and Negri (2000) disagree with the argument that there is an identifiable agent that controls globalization as expounded by Skair and Robinson and ascribe governance of globalization to "an amorphous empire" that "seems to be a ubiquitous but faceless power structure that is everywhere yet centred nowhere in particular, a new universal order that accepts no boundaries or limits, not only in the geographic, economic and political sense, but in terms of its penetration into the most remote recesses of social and cultural life…" However, there are yet many globalization theorists, who believe that the development of some supranational political organizations as the 'Trilateral Commission, the 'World Economic Forum', the World Trade Organization and the 'Group of Seven' (G7), etc. signals an "incipient transnational or global governance structure".

4.3.2 Transnational process:

In the pre-globalization periods, the tasks of developing and managing national economies of states, which connects individual state economy to that of other countries through national economic policies such as trade and finance in an "integrated international market" was strictly the purview of the sovereign nation-states. But under globalization, the nation-state approach to development has been distorted. As Robinson (2007, p. 130) puts it, "the new transnational stage of world capitalism involves the globalization of the production process itself, which breaks down and functionally integrates what were previously national circuits into new global circuits of production and accumulation", and consequently dismantles national economies and development in its wake.

Although it is the view of many that globalization is incontrovertible, yet, there are those who argue that it is not convincing enough to think that economic forces have the capacity to replace public policy and the state. As Polanyi (1957) put it …"if the market seeks to take precedence over society, it will end up destroying its own foundation".

V. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The main focus of this chapter is to provide answer to the research question stated in section 1.3 using the document review, appraisal or analytical approach. Relevant documents as well as conclusions from past studies and theoretical backgrounds shall be employed in analyzing the related variables that could contribute to, or otherwise contradict the development of African states, which are: Globalization and inequality; globalization: transnational practices and development of African states and Globalization: Terrorism and development in African states

5.1 Globalization and inequality

Inequality has remained the central theme of debate among development theorists. While some attributes development or its absence to some factors, such as following prescribed course or pattern, or that inequality is a consequence of some people putting in the required efforts, while others do not. Others believe that there are certain factors or processes at the international level which have the capacity to engender or perpetuate inequalities. In their view, "true equality of opportunity does not exist in the real world", and that the "market mechanisms tend to reproduce, and sometimes exacerbate existing inequalities" (ECLAC, 2000a). This is also true of globalization, a new phase of exogenous distortions by the economic and political structures of the developed countries intended to impoverish African countries, which results in unequal gains in the process of production and distribution of wealth, and explains the predicament of developing countries such as Africa, where efforts at turning their income fortunes around always meet with failure and cyclical poverty.

Previous capitalist, imperialist and colonialist invasions had created uneven relationships that polarized and contrasted the world into the core and the periphery: the rich and the poor; the developed and underdeveloped, which Frank (1984) thinks, is an aftermath of "the prolongation of the trade-dominated exploitative mechanisms". And it would be fallacious to think the situation could change under the current phase of globalization. Martin Knor (2001, 2003) says globalization is a very uneven process. As he put it, "globalization, polarization, wealth concentration and marginalization are linked through the same process; and in this very process investment resources, growth and modern technology are focused in a few countries of the West. A majority of developing countries are excluded from the process through what some scholars refer to as "exclusionism" which has prevented the entire continent of Africa from catching up with the globalization process.

Strange & Bayley (2008), in their conclusions, state that despite the increasing rate of ties across geographical boundaries, or perhaps the transformation of the world, and the increase in connectivity occasioned by globalization, the world obviously do not share the same circumstances, lifestyles or opportunities. "… the 'haves' and the 'have nots" still exist "side by side… It is hard not to be aware of the glaring disparities in living standards in different parts of the world, even as we all participate in the same global economy". They further state that "despite progress, huge challenges remain. Gross inequality is still prevalent in the world … "(Tracy & Anne, p.42 & 43)

The UNDP, Human Development Report 1992 estimated that 20 percent of the world's population in the developed countries receives 82.7 percent of total world income, while 20 percent of people in the poorest countries receive only 1.4 percent (UNDP, 1992). In 1989, the average income of the 20 percent of people living in the richest countries was 60 times higher than that of the 20 percent living in the poorest countries. The ratio had doubled from 30 times in 1950. The Human Development Report 1996 showed that over the past three decades; only 15 countries have enjoyed high growth, while 89 countries were worse off economically than they were 10 or more years earlier. This means "wider inequalities among countries … which are closely associated with globalization processes" (UNCTAD, 1997). It shows that since the early 1980s, the world economy has been characterized by rising inequality, and North-South income gaps have continued to widen (UNCTAD, 1997: Chaps IV – VI).

Spero & Hart (2010) explain that more than a billion people on the planet, from the sub-Saharan African and South Asian are not benefitting from globalization. These countries have both low averages per capita income and low growth rates. According to them, three of every four people in developing countries, in 2007, lived in rural areas, and 2.1 billion living on less than $2 a day, 880 million on less than $1 a day are found in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia (Spero & Hart, 2010).

Nayyar (1997) examined this phenomenon of "uneven development", showing how globalization mainly benefits the developed world. According to him, there were only 11 developing countries which were integral part of globalization in the late 20th century. They accounted for 66 percent of total exports from developing countries in 1992 (up from 30 percent in the period 1970 – 1980); 66 percent of annual FDI inflows to developing countries in 1981 – 1991; and most of the portfolio investment flows to the developing world. Some of these 11 countries have since been badly affected by financial crises, debt and economic slowdown, thus diluting further the rate of success of the Third World Integration in the global economy. Moreover, major economists like Joseph Stiglitz (2002), as well as anti-corporate globalization protesters and critics, argued that the developing countries were not developing under current corporate globalization policies and that division between the rich and poor nations was growing.

Cha (2000) stated that "globalization, in forms, which include Westernization, secularization, democratization, consumerism, and the growth of market capitalism, represents an onslaught to less privileged people in conservative cultures; repelled by the fundamental changes that these forces are bringing, or angered by the distortions and uneven distributions of benefits that result" (Cha, 2000). This is especially true of African states. From all the facts and conclusions gathered, globalization has not produced the much acclaimed sustainable development of the liberal theorists, or the touted cornucopia of benefits it would bring to developing countries. And the most pronounced of it all is that inequality is becoming more glaring than had ever been. Beyond this is the failure by the developed nations to end the poverty trap forced upon African countries. Seers (1971), in his treatise writes: "a plan that conveys no targets for reducing poverty, unemployment and inequality can hardly be considered a development plan". This includes globalization, touted as a development strategy. As Nnonyelu Nkemdili (2009) observes, "The supposed gains of globalization are not only dubious, but devious". In fact, the travails occasioned by globalization and its contradictions in African countries are many. The benefits are still far flung.

5.2 Globalization: Transnational practices and development of African states

Globalization has altered the building block of the international system – the sovereign nation-state. Globalization undermines the ability of governments of African states to manage their economies through national economic policies such as interest and exchange rates. Governments of the industrialized nations are consciously applying the concept of globalization in governing the world, using such multilateral agencies as the WTO, the World Economic Forum, IMF, World Bank, the OECD, and the G7. These institutions have become major makers of an increasingly wide range of policies that were traditionally under the jurisdiction of national governments. Governments of African nation-states now have to implement policies that are in line with the decisions and rules of these international institutions.

The consequence of this is that nation-states are losing the sovereignty of their peoples to the dictates of transnational capitalist class. This plays out as globalization continues to infringe on the rights and freedom of African states to make their own decisions and the right of self-determination expressed in the sovereignty of the states or the narrowing down of the ability of governments and people to make their choices from options in economic, social and cultural policies. Most developing countries, after the erosion of their independent policy-making capacity, have to depend on policies made by other entities, which may be detrimental to their countries. For instance, African governments are urged to open up their economies so as to attract foreign investment. The form and content of these investments are not considered; even now a country like Nigeria has become a dumping ground for all manner of imaginable low quality, disused commodities.

When thinking of development, the inseparability of the nation-state is a fact, there is a very close relationship between development and the nation-state. Hettne (1995), observes that development strategy is an empirical concept, immediately related to state behaviour or what the state does to promote development. He views development strategy as an integral part of nation-building (Hettne, 1995, p.122). The major roles nation-states play in the process of development are the ability to influence the behaviours of citizens, galvanize and coordinate their efforts towards development. These roles go beyond mere identification of objectives or the establishment of measures to ensure implementation, it covers all aspects of the economy, society and the availability or non-availability of physical resources for which development actually depends. "No model, however robust, no foresight, however penetrating" (Strange & Bayley, 2008, p.132), can take the place of the nation-states in the development of their countries.

As stated by Sen (1999), "democracy is the best means of setting a development agenda" and, as a corollary, "good governance is characterized by a focus on improving the design, management and evaluation of public policy, understood as the analytical and operational unit of government" (Lahera, 1999). Undoubtedly, the pressure to win the support of the populace by government in power and political leaders holds the excitement of democracy. In this wise, it can be stated, in the words of Albert (1991), that "the promotion of democracy as a universal value is meaningless if national processes to provide for representation and participation are not allowed to influence the definition of economic and social development strategies or to mediate the tensions inherent in the globalization process". Strange & Bayley (2008, p.121), in recognition that national governments have some roles to perform to promote sustainable development enumerated as follows: (1) government gives direction and leadership in moving society in a given direction; (2) They ensure that individual interests of citizens do not detract from the common good; and (3) National government also "intervene to deal with what economists call 'market failures', situation in which market forces alone do not produce the most efficient outcome" Samir Amin (2011) argues that the dynamics of globalization by its champions that states' policies must be adjusted to the strategies of private firms and submit to their interests, which transgress national boundaries or the sense that economic objectivity imposes itself on the autonomy of politics and society can lead to societal sclerosis or … self-destruction (Amin, 2011, p.69).

In their discussion on 'global monetary governance in the twenty-first century', Spero & Hart (2010) write:

Governance also will be complicated by conflict between globalization and national sovereignty. Managing globalization requires the coordination of national economic policies and the imposition of international discipline over policies that traditionally have been the prerogative of national governments…. Numerous ideas for achieving coordination and stability have been proposed…. Ultimately, these ideas all depend on the ability of countries to pursue sound economic policies at home and to achieve international coordination when needed (p. 62 & 63).

All these conclusions attest to the fact that development remains elusive unless the national governments are involved. In the Third World countries, even when governance was controlled by the so-called "Westernized elites, some levels of development, though minute, were recorded. Equally, when the apparatus of state was taken over by military juntas, without legitimacy, minimal level of development took place. This means, the state holds the spanner of development in any circumstance. Under globalization, the state is in full retreat and "the state-as-planner structure is being dismantled (Hettne, 1993, p.9). How could development be possible?

Globalization: Terrorism and development of African states:

Globalization has been used to refer to many things - free trade, open borders, information technology, and a hundred other things. One of the major elements of globalization is the erosion of national boundaries. Tomlinson (1999) asserts that globalization is "a process that enhances the destruction of barriers that previously existed among states of the world, thus integrating the world into a single entity where barriers such as culture, communication, governance and geography are extinct". This consequently leads to the growth of cross border activities of any kind. Globalization has enabled terrorist organizations to reach across international borders in the same way and channels that trade and other businesses are linked, therefore, giving terrorists and their financial resources fluidity of movement, including easier and growing informal connections (Krieger, 2006).

Equally, terrorism owes much to globalization. Terrorists use the Internet to transmit messages; credit cards and modern banking to move money; and use cell phones and laptops to plot attacks. Globalization makes available to terrorist groups, not only the conventional weapons, the chemical, biological, nuclear and radiological weapons are made increasingly available to them as well, and information needed to build these weapons has become ubiquitous, especially through the internet. Cha (2000) states that fundamentalism, terrorism, and other criminality thrive through the globalization of technology and information" .

The September 11 attack on the World Trade Center is a clear indication that globalization has given expressive violence, greater symbolic force than ever (Coker, 2002). Some scholars call it "the ambiguity of contradiction of globalization". Firstly, the tools of globalization can be used to fight globalization. Secondly, the vulnerability of even the world superpower and "protagonist" of globalization, the U.S. to terrorism was exposed to the whole world through the same tools of globalization - the internet, media and other technologies. Since then it has become almost a fact that globalization begets terrorism. As Cronin (2003) noted, "the current wave of international terrorism, characterized by unpredictable and unprecedented threats from non-state actors, is not only a reaction to globalization but is facilitated by it". Terrorism gains more supports from many who suffer marginalization, a product of globalization. (Cronin, 2003). Similarly, Rourke (2005) stated that "the gap between the rich and poor has expanded over the last 20 years owing to the effects of globalization, and thereby fuels animosities and violence among the poor and the marginalized". Globalization gives pep to terrorism. Widening disparity between the poor and the rich and the incidents of dashed expectations combined with the burgeoning of information and connectivity, all occasioned by globalization, lead to widespread sprouting of terrorist cells and the catastrophic wave of terrorism that rage across the world and with a very devastating effect on African countries' economy.

Terrorism is the heaviest burden of globalization the Third World countries are carrying in recent times. The already poor and fragile economy occasioned by poor infrastructural and industrial facilities is being decimated or ravaged on a daily basis by terrorist activities. Recently, terrorism is taking a different dimension, particularly in Africa. They operate a total warfare using very sophisticated weaponry, seize and declare territories and hoist flags. In almost all situations, however, the elementary tactics used by the terrorists are the suicide bombings. In north-east Nigeria and some countries within the Lake Chad region of West and Central Africa it is "Boko Haram". In Somalia and some other countries around the eastern flank of the continent of Africa, it is "Alshabab". There are also many less popular terrorist groups operating in almost every country in Africa. It is in this sense that Cronin (2003) says that "globalization connotes the inculcation of backward countries of Africa, Asia, Middle-East and Latin American into a 'global terror' groups".

Using Nigeria as a case study, the socio-economic implication of Boko Haram scourge on the country's economy is enormously devastating. Apart from being a distraction on the part of African countries from concentrating their efforts on economic development and nation building, terrorism has really impeded the development effort of its victims in so many ways. For example, the Nigerian economy has been in comatose since Boko Haram struck. According to Okafor (2011), in 2009, over 837 factories have closed. About half of the remaining operating firms have been classified as "ailing". The Maiduguri Monday Market said to be the biggest market in the city is reported to have been seriously affected as hundreds of shop owners, especially Southerners are said to have closed their businesses and left the troubled city. About half of the 10, 000 shops and stalls in the market were said to have been abandoned by traders who have fled the city (Okafor, 2011).

In terms of finance and investment, all efforts by government to woo investors into the country have yielded no result. The issue of investment is also about the issue of security. With the current security challenge in Nigeria, no investor would risk investing. Insecurity drives away investment, whether FDI or local investment, and without investment, there is no economic development. A World Investment Report of UNCTAD, as cited by Okereocha (2012), estimated that the domestic economy lost a whopping N1.33 trillion FDI, owing to the activities of Boko Haram. And according to the UNCTAD report, FDI flows to Nigeria fell to \$6.1 billion (N933.3billion) in 2010, a decline of about 29 per cent from the \$8.65 billion (N1.33 trillion) realized in 2009 fiscal year. Also, statistics obtained from the 2010 annual report by the CBN showed that the total foreign capital inflow into the Nigerian economy in 2010 was \$5.99 billion. The record showed that FDI represented about 78.1 per cent drop of \$3.31 billion in 2009.

The cost of terrorism to African countries is colossal and unquantifiable. Terrorism in general terms refers to the destruction of resources. It destroys the economic life of the country, both physical assets and lives of the citizens, which include economic infrastructures, places of worship, Police stations, schools, military bases, banks, hospitals, parks, markets, etc. The costs of this damage are in two ways: (1) the replacement costs of the destroyed assets; and (2) the costs in form of production foregone during the time the normal economic life of a country comes to a standstill. Ibukun & Olukayode (2015) postulated that it would cost more than \$1 billion to rebuild the destroyed infrastructure in Borno State, Nigeria. In another scenario, in the north-east Nigeria, following series of terrorist attacks in schools and the abduction of the Chibok girls, the governments have closed down schools in the affected states. Some banks and shops are equally not operating. Apart from the cost of rebuilding the destroyed facilities, it is difficult to calculate the costs of shutting down all economic activities during the period the war lasted. On fatality, some unofficial records indicate that fatality in the Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria, both military personnel and civilians has reached, some say 40,000; others say, 60,000. Yet, there are those who put the number of deaths at 300,000. Whatever is the actual figure, the truth is that the war has recorded uncountable deaths, and the carnage will continue unless something drastic is done.

Following the Boko Haram war, the defence budget has increased by more than a thousand fold. Military inventories have to dramatically go up. These include logistics, recruitments and training of personnel, securing intelligence and many other undisclosed costs. Nigeria's former Finance Minister, Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, during the analysis of 2013 budget, was quoted to have said that "over N950 billion was allocated for national security purposes." (ThisDay, 2013). Similarly, the 2015 transitional budget of President Buhari administration earmarked N928.9 billion (about 23 percent of the overall budget) for national security. The 2016 budget gave a huge N1.07 trillion (about 25 percent of the total budget of the year) to national security and related purposes. In 2015, Jonathan got Senate's approval for $1billion loan to fight Boko Haram. The federal government of Nigeria Under President Buhari also took a loan of $2.1 billion in 2016 to fight Boko Haram (Abati, 2017); and recently, the "National Economic Council", chaired by the Vice President, Osinbanjo has approved $1 billion to be withdrawn from the "Excess Crude Account" for the fight against Boko Haram (Channel, 2017).

.There are more than two million internally displaced persons (IDPs) scattered all over the northeastern part of Nigeria and in neighbouring Cameroun, Niger and Chad. According to the UNHCR (2017) data, there are 1,770,444 IDPs in Nigeria; 176,555 in Cameroun; 121,391 in Niger; and 90,911 in Chad. About 200 thousands are refugees in neighbouring Niger Republic, Chad and Cameroun. The cost of maintaining these IDP camps for almost a decade now runs in billions of dollar. Goodluck Johnathan's government in July 2014 was said to have raised 60 billion naira "Victim Support Fund" for rehabilitating the internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the northeast Nigeria (Premium Times, 2014); and the UNHCR requires $170.2 million funding to run the IDPs camps as well as the refugees from the crises (UNHCR, 2017). In March 2015, it was reported also that Nigeria was paying Chadian and Nigerien soldiers N146 million monthly to fight Boko Haram (Bella Naija, 2015). The latest was that the base of a multinational military offensive against Boko Haram will cost $30 million over the next one year (THISDAY, 2015).

The point we are trying to establish here is that terrorism in African countries has assumed global and sophisticated dimension made possible through globalization and the costs of executing these terrorist activities is colossal. If the billions of dollar expended on fighting terrorism in Nigeria had been devoted to development purposes, Nigeria would have progressed to another level of development, and this is not only applicable to Nigeria, but to all other African countries facing terrorist war. Here lie the contradictions of development in African states occasioned by globalization.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine globalization and its processes with a view to establishing whether or not globalization is contradicting development in African States. The meaning of globalization by different authors were examined, in addition to the components of globalization, which include trade, investment and finance, such as bank loan and aid, as well as, a critical examination of the processes of globalization, which included the governance and transnational processes of globalization. Document review, appraisal or analytical approach of relevant documents as well as conclusions from past studies and theoretical backgrounds were used in analyzing the related variables such as: Globalization and inequality; globalization: transnational practices and development of African states and globalization: terrorism and development in African states.

6.1 Conclusion:

Despite the accolade that greeted the introduction of globalization, what becomes of globalization to African states is the reverse to their expectations. Globalization must have successfully served the purpose of capitalist expansionism, but has failed in bringing development to African countries. African countries have been participating in every economic system of the West, with the expectation of enhancing their exports, earn more, and perhaps escape poverty, since they believe that an increase in the volume of trade and exports is a necessity for development. Sadly, the responses of the Northern governments to their efforts towards better trade deal could have been anything but credible. International trade, investment and finance under globalization continue to favour the developed countries while the developing countries and their development aspirations continue to suffer severe set-backs. The expectation that globalization would provide the needed connection between trade and development and reduce the current global inequalities turns dashed. In the words of Robert Zoellick, cited by Strange and Bayley (2008, p.47), "addressing the challenges of the globalizing economy means addressing the needs of those people and countries that remain on the fringes..." Speaking in the same context, Rourke (2009, p.24) states that “if the leaders of democratic societies wish to retain the undoubted benefits of open international markets, they will need to take greater notice of the interests of those who are being left behind”. Contrarily, the more African States pursue development through trade, foreign investment and international aid, the more elusive development becomes, because the developed countries do not consider their interest in the globalization processes. Another important point to mention is that cross border activities, information technology, internet services, the global system of communication, floated monetary market, etc are major paraphernalia of globalization that enable terrorist activities to thrive and destroy the development efforts in African countries

6.2 Recommendations:

The situation calls for a new economic, political and cultural restructuring and re-strategizing on the part of African countries on the basis of a renewed commitment to economic integration of African States. Although African states cannot completely run away from globalization, they can rely on the strength of forming a continental economic bloc, in the likes of a continental trade area, where African States trade among themselves to encompass all other regional economic blocs within Africa. This recommendation arises from the fact that, it is inconceivable that globalization can solve African problems. But a continental trade bloc, if properly structured and implemented could enhance the free flow of goods, services and even people within Africa which can invariably expand trade and cooperation, across the different regions of Africa. This, in turn, will strengthen African States as an economic force that can confront the global trade system, speak in one voice and go in one direction. As noted by Spero and Hart (2010, p.434), “some regional organizations like the European Union and Mercosur were formed in part to offset U.S. predominance and enhance the role of their member-states in international economic decision making”. If African States could become economically integrated it will enhance their position and roles as international economic players.

Another area of concern in the globalization process is the governance structure. The argument that the process is incomplete and asymmetrical, apparently suffering from institutional gaps, and majorly lacking in governance cannot in any way be ignored. It is obvious that the globalization process is largely influenced by the fact that participants have an unequal standing, with no common interest. It is a one-sided process, the developed nations’ government and the transnational corporations are the ones wielding and exerting the strongest influence, with strong tendencies towards the exclusion of the continent of Africa from the trade governance system. The current debate on global governance reflects the inadequacy of the new global economic rules and is indicative that globalization and its “utopian logic of managing the world through the market system is not taking the world anywhere. It is erroneous to imagine that without globalization, in its present form, the world economy cannot function. There is need for leadership within the system. The United States in collaboration with other developed countries have been in leadership position of the global economic system. During this period, tremendous resistance to globalization, and the US role in international economic management became rife. These criticisms and oppositions is indicative that globalization is not only a failure, the United States leadership in liberalizing the international economy has equally failed. Thus, there is the need to create multilateral regimes to govern global economic system, a regime that will give the poor nations the opportunity to play a role in global governance as well as an economic order that they could benefit from.

The focus in recent times is directed at the effect of globalization on national sovereignty and independence. The nation-state that had traditionally remained the main pillar of cooperation and a key element in managing conflicts in international economic relations has since lost out completely, as states become increasingly subjected to exogenous influences. They have been dispossessed of the power to drive the process of development and the power to control their national economies. This study concludes that nation-states are the building blocks of development all over the world, and the most commonly identifiable development circuits in the world. Any development theory that ignores this fact is bound to fail. Therefore, the nation-states should be allowed to play this role.

REFERENCES

[1]. Amin, Samir (2011). “Global History: A view from the South”: *The challenge of Globalization,* Pambazuka Press, Nairobi.

[2]. Arrighi, G. (2005)” Globalization in world- system perspective”. In: Appelbaum RP and Robinson, W. I. (eds) *Critical Globalization Studies*. London: Routledge, 33-44.

[3]. Bella Naija - http://www.bellanaija.com/2015/03/23/nigeria-reportedly-pays-chadian-nigerien-soldiers-n146-million-monthly-to-fight-boko-haram/

[4]. Cha, Victor D. (2000), "Globalization and the Study of International Security," Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 391-393.

[5]. Cronin, Audrey Kurth (2002/03), ‘Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism’, *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 3, p. 30-58

[6]. Helleiner, B. (2000). globalization and Transformation; politics, Economics and culture. Stanford; Stanford Press.
[7]. Hettne, Bjorn (1995), Development theory and the three worlds: Towards an international political economy of development. Second edition. Longman Scientific & Technical, New York.
[8]. Hout, Wil (1993), Capitalism and the Third World: Development, Dependence and the World System. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Hants GU11 3HR, England.
[9]. Ibukun, Yinka & Olukayode, Michael (2015), Boko Haram's Cost to Nigeria's Borno:$1 Billion and Rising (Bloomberg)
[10]. Jeffery, A. (2002) "Globalization and the Late Modern State," in Baer, D. (ed) *Political Sociology: Canadian Perspectives*, Ontario: Oxford.
[11]. Khor, Martin (2001, 2003). Globalization and the South: *Some Critical Issues*, Spectrum Books Ltd. Ibadan.
[12]. Nayyar, D. (1997). "Globalization": *The Past in Our Future*, Penang, Malaysia, Third World Network.
[13]. Nnonyelu, A.U.N. (2009) "A Globalizing World and Social Value Disorientations in Nigeria": *University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 3 Nos. 1 & 2, 2009.
[14]. Okafor, E. E. (2011). 'Youth Unemployment and Implication for Stability of Democracy in Nigeria'. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(1), 358-373.
[15]. Okereocha, C. (2012), "Heartache for the Economy", *TELL*, May 14, Pp. 46 – 47.
[16]. Prah, K. K. (2004) "Catch as Catch: Obstacles to Sustainable Development in Africa" in Ukaga and Afoaku (eds.) *Sustainable Development in Africa: A Multifaceted* Challenge. Trenton NJ: Africa World Press.
[17]. Robinson, W. I. (2007), Theories of globalization. In: Ritzer, G. (ed) Blackwell Companion to Globalization. Oxford: Blackwell
[18]. Robinson, W. I. (2011) Globalization and the sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A critical Appraisal. London: Sage.
[19]. Rourke, John T. (2005), Taking sides: Clashing View on Controversial Issues in World Politics 11th edition.
[20]. Seers, Dudley (1971), 'The Transmission of Inequality' in Robert K. A. Gardiner (ed.), Africa and the World, London: Oxford University Press.
[21]. Sklair, L. (2000) The Transnational Capitalist Class. London: Blackwell.
[22]. Sklair, L. (2002) Globalization Capitalism and its Alternatives. New York: Oxford.
[23]. Spero, J. E. and Hart, J. A. (2010), The politics of International Economic Relations, Seventh Edition; USA, Wadsworth.
[24]. Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2002) Globalization and Its Discontents. New York: Norton.
[25]. Strange, Tracey & Bayley Anne (2008), Sustainable Development. *Linking economy, society, environment:* OECD Publication.
[26]. ThisDaylive.com/articles/2013 Budget and Nigeria's Fiscal Consolidation Target. Retrieved on 20/5/13
[27]. UNCTAD (1997). Trade and Development Report, 1997, New York and Geneva, United Nations.
[28]. UNHCR (2017), Nigeria Situation: UNHCR Regional Update.
[29]. Wallerstein. I. (1974); the modern World system, vol. l New York: Academic Press.
[30]. Wolf, Martin (2004), Why Globalization Works. Part II: Criticism of Market System Globalization. Futurecasts online magazine; www.futurecasts.com Vol. 6, No. 11.
[31]. World Bank (1991), World Development Report 1991: The challenge of development, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

DR. PETER DICKSON AKPAN . "Globalization and Contradictions of Development in African States." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(9), 2020, pp. 31-45.