



Globalization or A New Wave of Imperialism: Africa in the Contemporary International Political Economy

Eze Egwogu, Bonny Ikenna

Department of Political Science

Faculty of Social Sciences

Imo State University

Owerri-Nigeria.

Abstract

A new mantra in modern academic discourse and debate is the issue of globalization. This apparently new phenomenon has continued to elicit the interests of scholars from both the ivory towers and beyond and from the four corners of the world. Deploying aggregate data, this article seeks to interrogate the enigma that is globalization from a context that differs from the premise of mainstream liberal social science. The theoretical framework that is at play here is the Underdevelopment theory of the neo-Marxist approach and this is a descriptive work that draws heavily from secondary sources of materials. Our finding is that in spite of claims to the contrary; globalization is not exactly a new phenomenon. Indeed it is a fall-out from the contradictions of capitalism in the metropole more than five centuries ago during which time the logic of its continued survival necessitated the overflowing of the frontiers of the European nation-states in search of greener pastures in Africa as in elsewhere among the countries of Asia and Latin America. To be exact, what is mistaken as a new phenomenon is the boost that has been given to this often misunderstood issue by modern developments in transport and Information Communications Technology. This article contends that globalization may not always be in the interest of Nigeria-type societies in the third world and recommends that to vitiate its debilitating effects on the political economy of these countries, action should be taken to cage the negative nay ravaging effects of this chameleonic and or mutative metamorphosis of imperialism.

Key Words: Imperialism, Expropriation, new wave, Mutative, Chameleonic Contemporary

Introduction: Some Conceptual and Epistemological Issues

A new mantra in academic discourse of the contemporary times is the issue of globalization. This term which has assumed an untrammled dimension in recent times bestrides current academe like the proverbial colossus.

Accounts as to the origin of the idea itself have snippets of controversies and inconsistencies that would not be allowed to detain us here. Suffice it to say that many of these accounts readily agree that the first person to have used the concept in contemporary times is Professor Theodore Levitt who was said to **Introduction** have deployed the term in a celebrated article which appeared in the Harvard Business Review in 1983 (Eckes and Zeiler,2005,Wikipedia,2009)

The term globalization has attracted a lot of definitions from many scholars across the world. According to Eckes and Zeiler (2005,p 1) “ Defined broadly, globalization is the process of integrating nations and peoples-politically, economically and culturally-into larger communities. In this broad sense, it is little different from internationalization “

Let it be stated that a yawning lacuna exists in the above stated definition and this has crippled not only a proper understanding of the concept that we are trying to explain but also graphically vitiates what Ollawa (1979,p27) has characterized as the empirical import. We contend that globalization is not only a process it is a socio-cultural and political phenomenon which existence can be properly located in the empirical world.

Perhaps a rider is appropriate at this stage. Concepts in the social sciences have their universal and contextual meanings. A researcher would do well to be able to isolate and identify which variation applies in a given research undertaking. The importance of this awareness and the dexterity to apply same, issues from the fact that the misapplication of these variants may derail or infact cripple the generation of the appropriate inter subjective knowledge which is one of the main goals of a research undertaking. Indeed this is the ugly phenomenon of reification in which such concepts are most likely to convey meanings which are totally different from the empirical reality that exists and whose explanation is at the centre of the raison d’entre of the research effort.

Needless to say, it is in the same way that Ollawa (1979,p32) has warned of the dangers of lifting concepts from a socio-political and economic milieu that is somewhat different from the other without regard to the possible debilitating consequences which their explanatory powers would suffer. Indeed according to him “ If it is granted, that it is difficult to extrapolate concepts from one setting and apply them to a completely different historical and politico-economic context without their reification, it is equally true to say that generalizations about relationships between variables must have specified theoretic contexts ... “

To be exact, the ideological bias and trajectory of these authors became manifest as they tried to deepen their explanation of not only what in their view constitutes globalization but even the social ,economic and political pangs that are associated with it. Indeed in a much more provocative sense the referenced authors (Eckes and zeiler, 2005 p 1)posited that “ Globalization is also dynamic, transformational and synergistic ... contemporary globalization is a complex, controversial and synergistic process in which improvements in technology (especially in communications and transportation) combine with the deregulation of markets and open borders to bring about vastly expanded flows of people, money, goods, services and information“ We only need to add that seen from the prism of the above definition globalization is not only an ideological cloak for western capitalism and its associated imperialism, it is also an attempt to bring the whole world under its predatory control. The emphasis on the deregulation of markets and the so-called open borders are critical elements in the crystallization of capitalistic imperialism.

It must be stated that even from the realm of liberal social science, some definitions of the term globalization has tended to expose the soft underbelly of both the phenomenon and the process .Indeed even when such definitions would readily deny the actual purpose and nature of the phenomenon of globalization (in terms of its widening of the frontiers of western imperialism) such definitions have ipso facto brought into sharper relief the nature of the phenomenon in action. For instance, according to Scholte (2000,p 46) globalization is “The growth of supraterritorial relations among people creating a complex series of connections that tie together what people do, what they experience, and how they live across the globe. In participating and acting in these connections, individuals and communities see the world increasingly as one place and imagine new activities and roles for themselves in the world “

A forensic analysis of the afore-stated definition might as well gored our enterprise into a point of departure in which we hope to situate the phenomenon of globalization and the accompanying process into the contemporary world political and economic system. First the definition reveals the nature of globalization. In this way, it has led us into one of the often denied methods and goal of globalization namely, the creation of economic behemoths such as the Transnational Corporations that have tended to transcend the modern day nation -state as it pillages the third world for the advantage of the rapacious capitalists in the metropole.

We note that the definition in question unwittingly has also revealed how complex a process the phenomenon of globalization is. It is true that it failed to state in categorical imperatives the fact that its complex nature has tended to confound and confuse the individuals and entities that are forcibly grafted into the unequal relationships that it has created among nation - states (some of which it has placed in veritable advantages over the others) it has at least recognized the fact of this unfortunate situation. Perhaps it is also very cogent at this stage to draw attention to the fact most of the rural folks in Africa, Asia and Latin America whose energies and lives are expropriated through the institutional mechanisms created by globalization do not necessarily know what they are involved in much less the predatory interactional relations it has imposed on them. Let us state at once that we do not subscribe to some of the often mouthed advantages of globalization as are copiously advertized in the literature of western social science and would not allow an adumbration on these to detain us here. Suffice it to say that the so-called advantages of the phenomenon of globalization stem from a convoluted social science whose adherents are committed to an epistemology that advances the prevalence of their world -view and the dominance in world affairs that is its corollary. Take for instance such often stated advantage as the engendering of cooperation and partnership between and among the countries of the world. Indeed nothing could be farther from the truth. Globalization has not and would never enhance the growth of a genuine, equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation between the impoverished countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America; in a word between the Peripheral countries of the south and the developed Centre countries of the north. The reason for our position is very simple. Deploying Galtung's (1971) model of the Centre-Periphery approach, it is not difficult to discern that the much vaunted interactional cooperation is riddled with disadvantages that are staked against the underdeveloped countries of the south. In fact, in a word, the reason for the underdevelopment of these countries is their forcible integration into a world system that pillages their resources for the advantage of the imperialist nay capitalist north (Galtung,1971, Frank,1969,Dos Santos,1972,Ake,1979,Nnoli,1982,etc)

Perhaps it needs to be emphasized that there could never be symbiotic cooperation based on equal partnership between for instance Nigerian-type societies who are grafted into an international economic system that is at the behest of western and American imperialism. Cooperation properly so-called is a development that results from mutual agreement between equal and free-willing partners. It ceases to be so if one of the partners initiates the ground rules and forces these down the throat of the other. And there can

never be a cooperative arrangement in a situation in which one of the partners is conscripted through the instrumentality of a *modus operandi* that is worse than the deployment of material, psychological, economic and military violence.

In other words, more than six hundred years of the Euro-Africa connection was initiated and reinforced by an interactional modality that was not only determined by Europe and its allies but has also been maintained by same. The result has been that such so-called cooperative interaction has been to the utter disadvantage of Africa and her peoples. Indeed that the resources of Africa has been expropriated in a mindless orgy of brigandage has been more than adequately documented to be allowed to detain us here (Rodney, Jalee,1968,Ake,1978,Eze,2010,Wilmot,1979, Frank,1969,Chinweizu,1978,et) It is therefore trite to say that the idea of cooperation between the Euro-American conundrum and Nigeria-type societies is really a mirage as the result of such cooperation is nearly always a zero-sum game against the underdeveloped countries who do not have the requisite clout to exert their interests in such interactions. Perhaps Wilmot (1979,p 132) was alluding to this when he stated that "...when the ant enters into partnership with the elephant, it can be crushed by the friendliest of gestures by its partner, such as scratching its back, or stroking its antennae. A lunch to celebrate participation between tigers and rabbits is very likely to have rabbit stew on the menu. And there can be no 'mutual benefit' between the strong who do as they will and the weak who suffer as the must "We hasten to add that nothing could be more graphically stated.

To be exact, stripped of all its outward trappings and reduced to its basic irreducible elements globalization as conceived and propagated by orthodox western social science is nothing but a very important adjunct of capitalism which has undergone chameleonic mutative process into imperialism. This then is our point of departure and must mark the point at which we must state the case that what is erroneously advertised today as globalization is neither a new process or a new phenomenon but rather a historical development that has lasted more than six hundred years as the contradictions of capitalism in western Europe had by its logic necessitated the overflowing of the frontiers of the nation-state in an attempt to garner the needed resources to solve the contradictions at home in the metropole. The remaining apart of this enterprise would be devoted to an exhaustive adumbration of this position.

Alternative View; The correct Meaning of Globalization

The literature on globalization from the perspectives of orthodox western social science is replete with positions which have tended to glorify the process and or the phenomenon. Much of this literature posits in superlative terms the importance of globalization particularly as it seeks to universalize a mono culture across the world's firmament. Indeed one of the most vocal and most unrepentant protagonists of this position is Francis Fukuyama (2006) who has not only audaciously presented what in his view is the unassailability of the liberal democratic institutions (free market economy, representative democracy, etc) and the global dimensions these have taken but that this tendency is the last man standing in a contest that according to him ended with the disintegration of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic nay the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

This brief essay is not a review of Fukuyama's work. However our thesis is that the author in reference here was too much in a hurry to drive the death-nail on the coffin of the former USSR and the concomitant socialist system it practiced that the ensuing euphoria cajoled him into forgetting that there is still a vibrant and continuing epistemological body of knowledge that continues to present a credible challenge to his pejorative view.

In other words, there is a viable alternative view with respect to what contemporary globalization really is. This alternative view does not speak glibly of the process of globalization it also captures in vivid terms what the phenomenon represents in reality.

We posit that protagonists of orthodox western social science are glued to talking about the process of globalization utterly refusing to venture beyond the superficial aspect of the issue they claim to be treating. In fact we are compelled by this orthodox prevailing tendency to posit that there is a perplexing fear of being confronted and compelled by the logic of the situation to expose what globalization really is and the debilitating effects it continues to visit on more than one half of the world's humanity.

To be exact, to expose the duality in the nature of globalization is to draw attention to the fact that the phenomenon itself has a determinate origin in history and that what is mistaken as a new thing has devised new and continuously changing instruments to carry out its mission across the surface of the earth.

Capitalism and the Origin of Globalization.

Globalization is not a new phenomenon and the processes it deploys in the service of its mission varies from one historical epoch to the other. Indeed globalization is an outgrowth of the mature stage of capitalism in Europe of the great industrial revolution and as already stated, the instruments and or vehicles it employs in order to accomplish its goals have varied from one historical period to the other. In order to properly situate this position, let us bring into focus Lenin's theory of imperialism (1916) According to this view, capitalism liberated the productive forces during the industrial revolution in Europe. Although this was a period of mass production of goods, it was also a period of adverse social dislocation and generalized poverty among the great mass of workers that made the production lines possible because these workers only received a slave wage that only enabled them to reproduce themselves.

Accentuated by the other contradictions it carries in its womb, capitalism was faced with a formidable crisis at home. There was the problem of markets for the mass-produced goods. There was the crisis of diminishing returns on investments. There was in addition the crisis from labour who would begin to ask for adequate remuneration for work done due largely to the fact that these workers had gotten concientized and were now aware of the cheating and asynchronous relationship that had hitherto characterized the capitalist environment. In a word, the workers were now educated and had metamorphosed from being ordinary workers to becoming the industrial proletariat who in Marxian terms are the grave diggers of capitalism. According to Lenin (1916,p) faced by the grim prospect of annihilation, capitalism had to devise an ingenious method and process through which it could run rings around the problems at home. At the epicenter of the said ingenious method was that capitalism had to overflow the boundaries of the modern day nation-state to Venture into other continents in an orgy of global brigandage during which the resources of these other lands have been expropriated to solve the contradictions of capitalism at home. Indeed once capitalism left the shores of Europe in order to mobilize for itself, the resources of the peoples of the world; it has undergone a mutative process into the stage of imperialism.

Nonetheless we must remember that we had highlighted the dual nature of the octopus that is normally referred to as globalization. Here we are drawing attention to the phenomenon which is capitalism nay imperialism and the process of venturing out into other areas of the world which in itself

is globalization. In other words, one could not correctly talk of globalization without mentioning these two aspects of a dual phenomenon. This is the grievous shortcoming of mainstream western social science. When a body of knowledge or a treatise falls into this type of an unpardonable ditch either deliberately or otherwise it is suffering from the fallacy of reductionism in the sense that it has reduced what it had sought to explain into nothingness (Isaak,2001). Our thesis is that globalization, contrary to the mantra it has become among some strands of scholarship in contemporary social science is neither a new process nor a new phenomenon. It is indeed both a phenomenon and a process that has lasted more than half a millennium.

Put in unabashed language, globalization is an aspect of imperialism which is on a massive journey across the surface of the earth. The methods it employs are as old and as portentous as the phenomenon itself. This is because as soon as the logic of the phenomenon dictated that it had to embark on this global journey, it ignited the great voyages of discovery by people like Christopher Columbus, Bartholomew Diaz, etc who had to venture out to discover new lands and capture their resources for the various imperial establishments across Europe at the time (Chinweizu,1978)

However it is pertinent to add that contemporary globalization has been aided massively by developments in modern transport and Information Communications Technology, ICT. In any case, this is not new and can be compared with a historical parallel in antiquity. The invention of the Steamship and such other things like the telegraph did in their way fortify the wings of globalization at their inception. It is therefore wrong to talk of contemporary globalization as though it is a new phenomenon. Worst still, it is totally wrong to continue to highlight one aspect of the issue, namely the process without mentioning the other which is the phenomenon itself. Consequently, it is trite to state that what is wrongly designated as both a process and even a phenomenon that is new is one that is given an overarching momentum by developments in modern transportation and information communication technology. We hasten to add that the contemporary global mission of globalization is a massive reinforcement of its operations across the world in a new wave to enhance the continued exploitation of same. Indeed contemporary globalization is a new wave in the chequered enterprise of imperialism as it seeks to bring the whole world under its control. Both the process and the phenomenon are historically related and have a commonality of interests in the goals that they seek to accomplish at the behest of capitalistic hegemonic forces in the contemporary world system.

Globalization and its Structural Instrumentalities

We already established the inevitable and indeed inexorable nexus between what is contemporaneously touted as globalization. We have also stated that it is capitalism in its chameleonic stage of imperialism. To be exact, we also stated the fact that imperialism had embarked on a world-wide conquest of the globe in a desperate search for resources to seize, grab and expropriate in order to solve the contradictions it was faced with in the metropole more than five hundred years ago. However there is nothing that we have said so far which would assist in exposing much more clearly, the soft underbelly of the masquerading phenomenon of imperialism as globalization. This is why it is apposite at this stage to begin an exposition on the modern tendencies with respect to the invidious methods and instrumentalities deployed in the service of the phenomenon in reference here. Let us state at once that capitalism is predatory (Chinweizu, 1978) Note also that as we have already stated it is the progeny of imperialism and globalization. Indeed it is also a corollary of this premise that in seeking to achieve their aims and objectives, these tripod amalgams of social-cultural, economic and political vices do not harbor any moral qualms. In fact capitalism respects the bonds of friendship and strategic partnership to the extent that the overriding outcomes are to its selfish advantage.

Therefore the old tranche of globalization may have been carried out through such often misconceived voyages of discovery during which gold bullions and nuggets were expropriated (did you say stolen ?) and brought home to the various monarchical ruling houses in Britain, Spain and Portugal (Chinweizu,1978, 1968) In later days, we would be confronted with the indefensible brigandage carried out through the so-called free trade, mercantilism, Christian evangelism and all sorts of covert means (Rosenberg,1982) Indeed it did not matter if in the service of the ultimate aim of garnering resources that were very vital in bolstering capitalism, an entire race was annihilated through ethnic cleansing. This was the tragedy of the Amerindians of the New World who were exterminated so that their land could be forcibly appropriated (Chinweizu, 1978).

Note also that at a time that the Young Men Christian Association and its twin brother, the Student Volunteer Movement were recruited in their thousands and exported overseas to effect the Christianization nay the westernization of the so-called Heathens in Africa and Asia as elsewhere in the world, the profit motif compelled the capitalist and the cronies to perpetuate the most brutal narcotic trade in china in which even women and

underaged children were forced into the consumption of narcotics which proceeds were very critical in the survival of capitalism in the metropole (Chinweizu) To be exact, we have deliberately refused to exhaustively analyze the evils perpetrated against the people of African descent on account of the slave trade. Suffice it to say that, that heinous crime which resulted in the inestimable depopulation of Africa was carried out not only at a time of the so-called evangelization process in Africa but was indeed a contrivance from the logic of capitalism and the need for its survival. Today the hegemonic centers of the world through their wide-world outreach of news media and information communication technology propagate the virtues of organizations such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) to which some past African Heads of States are being tried for war crimes and or offense against humanity, (Charles Taylor of Liberia, Laurent Gbagbo of Cote D'Ivoire) Paradoxically the same authors of these arrangements are in fact the real offenders who should have been sent to such courts for trials. We posit that the slave trade was a heinous crime against humanity; the pre 1949 narcotics trade against innocent Chinese population was a crime against humanity. So also was the United States Unilateral invasion of Iraq in 2003 without the consent of the United Nations Organization. Indeed the bare-faced irony of the contemporary politico-economic system prevalent in the world today can really not stand even a modicum of moral scrutiny. It is a tragedy that these courts which operate on the aegis of the United Nations Organization and which were created with at least the

Passive acceptance of the United States are denied recognition by the same United States ostensibly because they do not want their armed forces personnel or leaders to be answerable to the court.

Contemporary globalization has recreated the world in the image of America. Indeed, the world is said to be existing in a century that unabashedly belongs to the United States (Eckes and Zeiler,2005) This is truly the case particularly since after the end of the Second World War in 1945. At the end of that war a devastated Great Britain that lay prostrate on the ground could no long stand up to America in the control of world events. There was therefore the emergence of the United States which wasted no time in grabbing the opportunities that had arisen. The ground work and the pedestal that were deployed in the service of American upstaging of Great Britain were established during the conference of the big three's president, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the prime minister of Great Britain-Mr. Winston Churchill and of course Joseph Stalin of USSR during the Atlantic Charter but much more so at the Bretton Woods Conference which opened up at the Mount Washington Hotel in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, July 1,1944 (Benn

Steil,2013) As already stated, an overbearing United States ever willing to maximize its national interest wasted no time in letting Britain know that it was no long the international hegemon of the emergent system. Indeed in an account that drips of the willingness of the strong to assert his might against the weak, the nature of the exchanges that went on in Bretton Woods between Mr. John Maynard Keynes who represented Great Britain at what has been Christened **The Battle of Woods** and Mr. Harry Dexter White who represented the United States left the former in no doubt that the game was virtually over for his country and that a new master was on the saddle (Benn Steil ,2012). Starting from these epochal events, the United States as we already have noted

Began the process of recreating the world in its own image. It also became the quintessential imperial power that could deploy certain levers in the determination of the nature and dynamics of the political economy of the world. It did not only banish the Gold Standard that was universally applicable, it also replaced it with the US Dollar as the medium of international trade and commerce. In addition, it also supervised the creation of the International Monetary Fund,(IMF) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) also known as the World Bank. Of course the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was to follow in quick succession. With its control of these economic structures, the United States assumed a larger than life image in the economic and political affairs of the world. In turn these structures were to strengthen the wings of capitalist imperialism as it sought to globalize the whole world not only in terms of the control of the world economy but also in attempting to create a world mass culture in addition to controlling the world's political dynamics. Nonetheless for reasons of brevity and space, we would refuse to carry out an exhaustive exposition of the views of Marx and Lenin on the emergence of big capitalist combines that are capable of bestriding the world breaching in the process, the boundaries of the nation-states. That exercise is beyond the province of this work.

However it is apposite to state that contemporary capitalism under the aegis of American leadership has grown full-swing. In the process, there have arisen big capitalist enterprises which have their headquarters in the metropole but with tentacles all over the world. These are the modern day Transnational Corporations (TNCS) These business behemoths transcend the boundaries of the modern day nation- States and their economic muscles derive from the abundant resources that were the results of massive primitive accumulation over the centuries and the continued unequal

exchange between the underdeveloped countries and the developed one which it supervises. Indeed if there was any contemporary economic structure which is at the epicenter of the globalization of the world, it would certainly be the Transnational Corporation which business (and at times political) activities cut across national frontiers but with its decision making headquarters in the capitalist centres of the world.

Summary Recommendations and Conclusion

It is patently false and ahistorical to claim as some writers have done that globalization is a new phenomenon. It is even much more so when these authors deliberately refuse to see the obvious link between capitalism, imperialism and contemporary globalization. Needless to say the forces of contemporary globalization are at the roots of the underdevelopment of Nigerian-type societies in Africa. This process and phenomenon which started many centuries ago continue to supervise the expropriation of the resources of the peoples of the continent. While it generates poverty and squalor in Africa, it generates development in Europe and America (Frank, 1969) This then is the main problem that this brief survey has set out to solve. It is suggested that African scholars should embark on serious process of rethinking the Euro-African relations and the consequent problematic that it has inflicted on the continent. This would involve a fundamental reworking of the contents of certain curriculum in the social sciences and the liberal arts that have tended to foist over African universities during a certain pro-western world view. These pro-western world-views have over the years perpetuated views or positions that re at the advantage of the imperial enterprise in Africa. In fact we would want to associate ourselves with the views of certain scholars who have called for a re-education of mis-educated Africans (Chinweizu,1978)This is a task that is as urgent as it is a necessity. Indeed Ake (1979) may have over-stated his case but it could be said that to some extent he was right in describing the gamut of the Social Sciences as taught in African universities as 'imperialism'

Needless to say what is masquerading as a new phenomenon in the guise of globalization is at best a strand of the old imperialism from the west. Its presence is evident everywhere but the recognition of this fact requires sharper tools of analysis than the dominant contemporary social science extant in African universities are capable of grasping. Indeed as posited by Ake (1978, p18) "Reality is full of contradictions, and we cannot grasp it unless we learn to think dialectically "

To be exact, Africa is at the cross-roads of a historical conjunction. This particular historical epoch is replete with the devastating effects of capitalist imperialism masquerading as globalization. As the politics of the sharing of the world's resource gets much more dangerous, these countries are held in a strangle hold by the structural nature of the imperialist grip on their resources. It is also trite to state that in the games that nation-states play at the international level, the national interest is the prime motif (Morgenthau, 1967, p5, Waltz and Art, 2009, p 16-22) Every other consideration is secondary at least according to the principle of realism in international politics. Indeed even a casual observation would readily expose the inanities of globalization across Africa. The poverty of the continent, the internecine wars across the continent, the political instability; all these are traceable one way or the other on the negative influence of the so-called globalization. In fact in the particular case of the numerous wars that the continent is saddled with Ekwe-Ekwe (2011) has argued that the west could hold onto their so-called economic aid while also spearing Africa of the supply of arms manufactured in their countries. This is indeed another way of saying that these weapons that fuel the deadly conflicts that are prevalent in Africa ride on the crest of the so-called globalization in order to be available to the desputants. The truth is that one can go and on as evidence abounds about the negative effects of globalization on the continent.

We note that nothing that we have said so far has drawn attention to the negative political, economic and social activities of the Transnational corporation which in the modern age are the real harbingers of globalization. Apart from the mindless exploitation of the resources of the African continent, their proclivity towards irredeemable environmental degradation is unsurpassed in the annals of man's existence on planet earth. In the particular case of Nigeria for instance, the environmental destruction of Ogoni land in Rivers State of Nigeria has been acknowledged by organs of the United Nations and have been well documented by Bassey (2012) Therefore modern globalization is only universalizing capitalist imperialism and in the case of Africa reinforcing her unenviable position in the vertical international division of labour created by the same capitalism more than five hundred years ago. Paradoxically the dangers of globalization have been acknowledged by a notable liberal scholar like Stiglitz (2003) who indeed had carried out a most trenchant criticism of the phenomenon. Stiglitz did not only expose the inanities of this phenomenon, he also has suggested a reformist trajectory towards curtailing the evils of the same (Stiglitz, 2007) We posit that the fact that a thorough bred liberal scholar in the mould of Stiglitz could vocally and audaciously condemn the practice of modern

globalization presents a very big question mark on the credentials of African scholars who are in the habit of glorify the same thing that is at the roots of the continents underdevelopment.

References

- Ake, C. (1978) *Revolutionary Pressures in Africa*. London: Zed Press Ltd.
- Ake, C (1981) *A Political Economy of Africa*. London: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Ake,C (1979) *Social Science As Imperialism ;The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Akindele, R and Ate, B (2000) *Selected Readings on Nigeria's Foreign Policy and International Relations*. Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
- Amin, S (1974) *Accumulation on a World Scale*. Vol. 1, New York; Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, S (1974) *Accumulation on World Scale* .Vol.2.New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Art, R and Waltz, K. (2009) *The Use of Force; Military Power and International Politics*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Bassey, N (2012) *To Cook A Continent: Destructive Extraction and the Climate Crisis in Africa*. Cape Town: Pambazuka Press.
- Chinweizu, (1978). *The West and the Rest of US*. London Nok Publishers.
- Dyck,R.(2006) *Studying Politics; An Introduction to Political Science*. Toronto Thomson Nelson.
- Eckes, A and Zeiler, T (2005) *Globalization and the American Century*. New York: Cambidge University Press.
- Ekwe-Ekwe, H. (2011) *Readings from Reading: Essays on African Politics, Genocide, Literature*. Dakar; African Renaissance.
- Eze,O. and Sesay, A (2010) *Africa and Europe in the 21st Century*. Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
- Frank, A. G (1975) *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Francis, F (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press.
- Galtung, J (1971) *A Structural Theory of Imperialism*. Journal of Peace Research Vol.18, No.21,p 81-117.
- Isaak, A. (2001) *Scope and Methods of Political Science ; An Introduction to the Methodology of Political Inquiry*. California: Wadsworth and Thomson Learning.
- Jalee, P (1968) *The Pillage of the Third World*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Kagan, R.(2013) *The World America Made*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Morgenthau, H. (1967) *Politics Among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A, Knopf.
- Ollawa, P (1979) *Participatory Democracy in Zambia; The Political Economy of National Development*. Devon: Arthur Stock well Ltd.
- Rosenberg E.(1982) *Spreading the American Dream; American Economic and Cultural Expansion 1890-1945*.New York: Hill and Wang.
- Spero,J and Hart J.(2003) *The Politics of International Economic Relations*. Toronto: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Steil,B.(2013) *The Battle of Bretton Woods; John Maynard Keynes, Harry Dexter White and the Making of a New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. (2003) *Globalization and Its Discontents*. London Penguin Books.
- Stiglitz, J. (2007) *Making Globalization Work*. New York: W W. North and Company.
- Wilmot,P.(1979) *In Search of Nationhood: The Theory and Practice of Nationalism in Africa*. Ibadan: Lantern Books.
- Wikipedia, 2009.

(HRH) EZE EGWUOGU, BONNY IKENNA.