



The Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria (1999-2007)

Vincent Nyewusira and Kenneth Nweke

*Department of Political Science, Rivers State University of Education,
Nigeria*

Email: kennwekem@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we addressed the questions of political development in Nigeria in the context of ongoing globalization process. This problem is analyzed in view of attenuated democratic institutions, inefficient public service, and rent seeking behaviours, disillusioned citizenry, erratic and conflicting state policies, dysfunctional electoral system and venal political class that have become the defining features of Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Firstly, we argued that neo-liberal policies of free market, competition, privatization, deregulation etc adopted by successive governments are pillars of contemporary globalization. These policies created economic and social conditions of poverty which are antithetical to participatory democracy. In other words, neo-liberal policies driven by globalization have not been supportive of democratization process. Secondly, the paper showed that the necessary economic infrastructure for sustainable democracy is undermined by transnational corporations for purposes of profit maximization. Clearly, the misuse of oil revenues by multinational oil companies in Nigeria has exacerbated political discontent and provoked internal political violence such that the country is predicted to be a failed state by 2015. Finally, the paper observed that agents of globalization, in clear pursuit of corporate interests, played active role in the culture of impunity and absolutism associated with the civilian administration of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization, in this study, means the intensification in the levels of political and socio-economic interaction, interconnection and inter-dependence between underdeveloped countries of the South, such as Nigeria and developed countries of the North, such as the United States of America (USA), Britain, France, Russia, and Canada. Akani (2004:4) has extensively argued that globalization is not a recent phenomenon. Olubamise (2005) also contends that globalization is not new to Africa as the phenomenon was

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

'unconsciously set in motion' when the continent's forefathers set out to 'conquer new territories through inter-tribal wars'. As a process to unify the world in all aspects for profit maximization, Akani said globalization can be 'located in the womb of the fifteenth century during the mercantilist era'. He traced the phenomenon from 1450-1800 when Europe passed through many 'globalizing phases' with the 'sole aim of primitive accumulation of the world'. Within this epoch, many voyages were financed to discover markets and expand trade and commerce, such as those of Christopher Columbus in 1492, Vasco Da Gama in 1498, Marc Polo and others. These explorations led to the 'discovery' of the new world and the introduction of slave trade. No one puts it better than Engel (1894) in Enwegbara (2006:16) when he made it clear that slaves provided cheap labour for industrial activities thereby making it possible for Western countries to focus on economic, political, intellectual and technological developments.

The period between 1850-1960 marked the second phase of globalization as a result of industrial revolution in Europe. Onyige (2000) identified this phase as the 'genesis of the scramble for African territories and colonial rule'. Colonialism introduced Nigeria and other colonized territories of the world to international capitalism, whose primary objective was to deepen dependency and underdevelopment (Okolie 2001 cited in Fidelis 2002). The historical circumstances of the colonial experience and subsequent emergent political class, most of whom Fidelis (2002:72) said have entered into 'some form of alliance with the emerging international capitalist elite whose influence on domestic decision' cannot be over emphasized in this phase of globalization. The scramble for spheres of influence in Africa by the mid-twentieth century led to First and Second World Wars between 1914-1918 and 1939-1945 respectively. According to Akani (2004:7), these wars, redirected the balance of power in the world and led to the creation of institutions which gradually caged the economics of the Third World and development of a world economy. They functioned to satisfy a neo-liberal market ideology. Any contrary idea was repelled.

The international capitalist institutions include the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization and Transnational Companies. The colonial state, according to Nnoli (2004:57) was an organization that concentrated on the 'promotion and advancement of the interests of a foreign financial oligarchy in the colonial territory'. The last phase or trend of globalization began with the wave of decolonization mostly in the 1960s to date. The decolonization process introduced neo-colonialism; survival of the colonial system in spite of formal recognition of political independence. Neo-colonialism makes independent countries victims of an indirect and subtle form of domination by political, economic, military or technical means (Ntete, 2004). Again, Nnoli (2004:56) argues that in a neo-colonial society, the objective of the state is to 'protect and advance the capitalist mode of production but in the interest of a ruling class that resides outside the country'. In fact, the emergence and sustenance of 'expatriate ruling class' is a salient feature of Nigeria's post-colonial economy. With the

improvements in science and technology, greater movement of goods and services, globalization, aptly described by Anikie (1997:117) as 'compression of the world and development of global consciousness' was achieved.

From the foregoing, the expansion of capitalism and integration of the world into the one capitalist entity is what has enhanced the phenomenon of globalization. Akindele, et al (2002:4) identifies globalization as one of the recent developments currently 'changing the physiognomy of global polities'. It is against this background that this paper attempts to study the current state of globalization and its large-scale implications for Nigeria in terms of political development. In this study, political development connotes effective political institutions such as the executive, legislature, judiciary, political parties, civil service, electoral bodies, trade unions, pressure groups and civil society organizations, working in synergy to enhance participation and empowerment of the masses in the process of wealth distribution, decision making and democratic governance. We chose to consider the impact of globalization on political development mainly because it seems to us to be the nucleus of other dimensions of globalization.

The problem

A common feature of most African state, at independence was that they had an unsettled political culture. Not only had they political leadership that had no experience of operating a governmental system on a national scale, but the institutions, such as political parties, parliament, and civil service, through which they had to work were also relatively new and weak (Tordoff, 1993:2). At present, Nigeria is plagued with 'poverty' of leadership, attenuated democracy, political instability, and other problems associated with political development. These are symptomatic of a nation mired in crisis of political development. As a matter of fact, Onah and Nyewusira (2006:65) observed that the catalysts for a failed state already exist in Nigeria.

Some writers have argued that Nigeria is well positioned to be in the rank of Western industrializes nation based on her demographic and geographic features (Fasotin, 2005). Like Fasotin, many people are of the view that Nigeria is greatly advantaged to play a more dominant economic and political role in the 'global village', due essentially, to 'oil weapon' which gave many countries a significant economic and therefore, diplomatic leverage. In fact, it would not be incorrect to expect that the conceptualization of globalization in terms of emergence of global village, due mainly, to revolution in technologies will be a basic driving force for transformation of societies at the dawn of the millennium. These expectations have not been met in contemporary Nigeria. It is therefore an issue of concern to this paper.

In the light of the above, the basic problem in this study is to investigate why, in spite of expectations, the current state of globalization and its far-reaching implications have not scaled up political development in Nigeria.

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

The study is predicted on the hypothesis that: Globalization undermines political development in terms of democratic governance in Nigeria.

THE NATURE AND CONCEPTUAL EXPLICATIONS OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization is a complex term which has generated much controversy ranging from its definition, evolution, future and whether or not it will benefit all nations and peoples of the world equally (Owugah, 2004:119). Part of the controversy surrounding globalization, as Owugah noted, is that it cuts across almost all disciplines to the extent that it is impossible for any particular discipline to 'lay exclusive claim to it'. As a highly contested concept, denoting many things to many people, Kura (2005:22) described globalization as 'a very complex process that can be understood in different perspectives'. It is, perhaps, due to this controversy and complexity that made Fidelis (2002:48) conclude that the concept has 'remained largely indeterminate'. But in spite of the 'indeterminate nature' of globalization, it has continued to dominate the study of international relations in the 21st Century (Onuoha, 2001). Onuoha made reference to Waters (2000) as having said that globalization is 'the most significant development and theme in contemporary life and social theory'.

Globalization was created by the dominant social forces in the world, to serve their specific interests. Simultaneously these social forces ascribed to themselves the name 'international community' to 'oil' the idea of globalization (Madunagu, 1999). Amadi (2003:44) writes that even the critics of the neo-liberal economic reform policies that have become ingredients of the global capitalism still restate faith in globalization as a 'benign phenomenon that is irreversible'. It is understood as a 'process of thickening global interdependence' that will continue. As Akinterinwa (2007:13) puts it, 'globalization has become a fait accompli' given that it is rapidly developing process of complex interconnections between societies, cultures, institutions and individuals world-wide.

Extant literature on globalization refers to the phenomenon as rapid expansion, through multinational companies, of capitalism to different parts of the world, including areas where it had hitherto been resisted or checkmated. It is in the light of the above that Madunagu (1999:52) submits that 'globalization is globalization of capitalism, not the globalization of a 'neutral' economic system'. Even the Marxian perspective interprets globalization to be synonymous with Westernization or modernization; a process of spreading capitalism across the world. Globalization is, therefore equated with colonialism and imperialism (Ajayi, 2006). The point established here is that globalization is a process and ideology of expansion of capitalism. And capitalism by its very nature, cannot exist or be sustained without expansion, nationally or internationally. The phenomenal improvements in transportation, satellite and internet, media networks,

telecommunication and computer technology have also been described as 'the main vehicle for globalization' (Solanke, 2001). In this sense, the interconnectedness is making it possible for what happens to people in one part of the globe to have direct consequences for others in a completely different part. In this context, Kura (2005:2) defines globalization as;

a deeply differentiated phenomenon that embeds continuous processes and patterns of interaction in diverse areas of human activities — economic, political, cultural, military, environmental and citizenship, and through these web of activities, nation-states, societies, international institutions, non-governmental organization, multinational corporations are linked and networking together towards achieving their objectives.

Kura, however, admits that the impact of globalization differs in degree and scope from one society to another. The Admission of Kura clearly demonstrates the unevenness of globalization process, such as that benefits and risks are unevenly distributed and differentially experienced, both geographically and across social division of class, gender, age by what Massey (1994) refers to as the 'power geometry' of globalization. This is why, as Tomlinson (1996:22) puts it, the process of globalization is 'frequently assumed to have negative implications for developing societies'. Held (2002) in Kura (2005:4) observes that globalization entails two phenomenal issues; first, it entails networks of political, economic and social activities that are becoming interregional and intercontinental in scope; second, it entails further intensification of degree of interaction between states and societies. Held also maintains that the transcontinental or interregional patterns of activity and interaction involves;

a stretching and deepening of social relations and institutions across space and time such that, in one hand, day to day activities are increasingly influenced by events happening on the other side of the globe and, on the other hand, the practices and decisions of local groups or communities can have significant global reverberations.

What do African scholars like Claude Ake think about the process of globalization? Ake (1996:5) paints the picture thus;

The process of globalization is many things of course. It is about structured differentiation and functional specialization in the world economy. It is about incremental inter-dependence, the growing spread and intensity of interactions among nations and about the nation-states coming under pressure from transnational phenomena, and so on. The process is complex, ambiguous and contradictory.

From a broader perspective, globalization refers to closer integration of the countries and people of the world and the breaking down of artificial barriers to the flow of goods, services, capital, knowledge and people across national borders (Afiana, 2004:36). This definition is suggestive of globalization being a product of systematic integration of autonomous economies into a global system of production and distribution. While admitting that the factors that brought about this phenomenon are controversial, Fidelis (2002:48)

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

singled out economic and technological changes as having 'important and fundamental influence' in globalization. The key element of this processes, according to Afiana (2004:36) are;

The interconnection of sovereign nations through trade and capital flows, harmonization of the economic rules that govern relationship between sovereign nations creating structures to support and facilitate dependence and interconnection and communication of a global market place.

Afiana also noted that the process has been facilitated by the enormous reduction in the cost of transportation and communication made possible by the rapid advances in information and technology whose immediate and concrete impact has been the creation of global society. This is why globalization defines a process through which events, decisions and activities in one part of the world can and do have significant consequence for individuals and communities in quite distant parts of the globe.

The concept of political development

Contemporary writings on political development show that there are writers who use the concept of political development as a synonym for political change, especially in discussing developing countries. Some simply focus the dynamic character of developing countries. Other authors apply the concept of political development to indicate that the political system is evolutionary or is a synonym for the political aspects of Westernization or modernization (Ake, 1979). As a matter of fact, the writing of Huntington (1968) shows that political development is conceived in the context of a struggle to maintain the world in a given condition where underdeveloped countries corresponds to and serves the interest of Western capitalism. This is why Ake (1979:60) illustrated that the ideological character of the theory of political development, as presented by Western Scholars, fosters capitalist values and institutions and 'legitimizes the consolidation of the dictatorship of Third World bourgeoisie who are the allies of international capitalism. In most of these writings, political development is used to describe the evolution of political system through one or more stage to some desired state of being. For instance, the position of Almond and Powell (1966) in Ake (1979) is that 'political system develops as it moves in the direction of more equality, structural differentiation and cultural socialization'. A summary of the main themes and proposition of the theory of political development, according to Ake, is that the concept entails 'an increase of one or more of the following attributes; structural differentiation, cultural socialization, equality and capacity', and that political development occurs when 'the political system is compelled to respond to certain types of problems or crises, such as legitimacy, participation and integration problems or crises'.

Tucker (1996:4) writes that political development is about the creation or transfer of institutions of government which are conducive to support the

economic processes and social goals. The basic assumption here is that, political system is simple transference of political process from one part of the world called 'developed' to other parts of the world called 'underdeveloped'. It also connotes that socio-economic conditions is a measure of political development. But the relationship between economic wealth and political development is articulated by Okemini (2002:16) in these terms:

If there is one indicator to measure the level of political development it is the amount of wealth it creates for the citizenry. In the same measure, the first indicator of an ailing political system is the prevalence of poverty and high rate of unemployment.

The explanation of this thesis is that socio-economic condition determines a society's level of political development. This is why Okemini thinks that the key factor to political development is the creation of 'adaptable and coherent institutions capable of responding to citizens demands'. Ibeanu (2008:11) also refutes Tucker's claims when he argued that political development is not a 'product' packaged in Europe or America and transferred to people in the 'form of democratic reforms'. Instead, Ibeanu posits that political development is a 'process of using affluence to eliminate affliction through the instrumentality of state power'. It is simply about the state using its resources (human and material) to address the challenges of poverty, ignorance and diseases.

Political development involves the reorganization and reorientation of entire structures of state towards a direction that engender core values of democracy, good governance and rule of law. It must also make provision for popular participation in the political process and for the protection of civil rights and essential freedoms (Tordoff 1993:254). Ibeanu (1994) in Omerje (2001:17) refers to state structures as 'the gamut of public institutions and social relations they express. They will normally include the executive, legislature, and judicial arms of government; the bureaucracy, army, police, the system of preferences dominant in a society and their institutional expressions'. In fact, Nyewusira (2007:26) believes that the effective operation of the modern state is a natural drive to all dimensions of development, especially political development. This is because the power of the state is 'potent and its influence overwhelming'. Thus, state structures affect or influence the chances of political development.

Democratic institutions, political freedom and popular participation in decision making are considered essential to political development by Alapiki (2000:171). On this note, Alapiki opines that political development is achieved when people are able to determine the system of government, those who constitute the government, what government does in their name and on their belief, and are able to change governments through peaceful means. From this perspective, political systems are understood by the people they serve and suited to their own value systems. Interestingly, Huntington (1965) in his seminal work entitled *Political Development and Political Decay* set

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

out to understand why there were political disorders in developing countries, particularly Africa in the 1960s and 1970s. His argument is that the litany of political problems, which plagued Africa then, such as ethnic strife, coups, mass riots and violence, were possible because government in those countries do not govern. Wherever government does not govern, there is a vacuum of power; multiple centres of competing powers emerge, and the society reclines into crisis. What than occurs, Huntington concludes, is not political development but political decay.

Finally, to Mclean (1996), in Akoloh (2007:13), political development has been defined in a number of ways that reflect the 'passage of societies and analysts preoccupation'. One formulation dwells on the emergency of national sovereignty and the integrity of the state as an actor, able to exert respect and uphold commitments in the international system. Other accounts draw attention to the domestic attributes of constitutional order and political stability, attained through the formation of a settled framework of government and reliable procedures to ensure leadership succession. The foregoing literature of political development considers the concepts as a framework of developmental analysis.

GLOBALIZATION AND ITS IMPACT ON NIGERIA'S POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

It is often believed that globalization is more directly related to the economic than the political sector. In fact, economic globalization rather than the globalization of democracy is the defining framework of the post-war era (Tamuno, 2006). However, this study is of the view that one African caveat on globalization is the pronounced emphasis on its political consequences. The position adopted by some African countries, including Nigeria, during the First Jubilee South-South Summit, Johannesburg, South Africa in 1999 is very instructive. The 'Lusaka Declaration' emphasized that any Action Plan for genuine development contemplated by African leaders must be based on 'freedom, justice, and equality for all genders and communities'. (Onwudiwe, 2001:1). This call for a genuine development anchored on freedom and justice, and in community equity, positively expresses the need for democratic values and political development.

Contrary to the 'Lusaka Declaration', This study finds that the impact of globalization has eroded both democratic values and political development in Nigeria. Neo-liberal paradigm of free market, competition, privatization, deregulation and liberalization, which have been adopted by successive governments in Nigeria and other African countries, are pillars of contemporary globalization (Grimm & Gunther 2007; Iyayi 2004; Owugah 2004). These policies, according to Onah and Nyewusira (2006:63) have resulted in 'increased poverty, income inequality, illiteracy, medical neglect, premature mortality and unemployment'. These economic and social conditions of poverty affect individuals, households and communities

resulting in social polarization and the lack of access to basic necessities of life. Onah (2006:76) holds the view that poverty in Nigeria limits 'access to social and political life' when he argued that the high incidence of electoral fraud and votes racketing in Nigeria's democratic practice is a function of poverty. He puts it succinctly;

In line with the popular political slogan-he who controls the purse, controls the politics, and since majority of the electorate are poor, the minority rich Nigerians use the state and economic power to buy their votes. As a result of poor incomes, the electorates see the election period as opportunity to earn income for survival, so they sell their votes to earn income and improve their well being.

Again, the observation by Onwudiwe (2001:3) that 'very poor people are too absorbed in the fight for subsistence and survival to care for democratic rights' is very persuasive. This implies that as long as the economic reality of Nigerians remains such that the struggle for daily subsistence consumes most hours of the day, political rights will rarely be in the priority list of the majority of Nigerian citizens. As Ajayi (2006:116) affirmed, 'poverty is antithetical to democracy'.

The above findings bring to the fore the issue of relationship between poverty, democratization and political development. It shows that the 'mantra' of democracy advocated in the present global order does not go beyond 'electoralism and the rituals of voting' to ensure the upliftment of the conditions of life for millions of Nigerians. Thus, in this era of globalization and democracy, Ihonvbere (2004:530) remarks that the Nigerian state remains 'distant, aloof, violent and insensitive to the plight of the majority'. What this means is that, the much trumpeted globalization has failed to raise the bars of democratic practice and politics in Nigeria. Bekweri (2005:12) gives credence to this finding in the assertion that 'no matter the intensity of the attractiveness of globalization to Nigeria, political development will not take root in the country in the presence of abject poverty, created by neo-market undertone of globalization'. The global politico-economic liberalization has according to Kura (2005:3) 'continuously weakened the political spirits of states, weakened the economic potentialities of people, as well as excluded the poor from political and economic participation, making them impotent in democratization process'. Our argument, therefore, is that poverty-related problems facing Nigeria is a threat to the sustainability of the on-going democratization process. In other words, a neo-liberal policy driven by globalization has not been supportive of the democratization process in Nigeria.

Closely related to the above findings is the role played by globalization, through transnational companies, in undermining economic structures germane to political development. Transnational corporations, according to Sklar and Becker (1999), are not only the 'primary beneficiaries of globalization but are also its main movers and shakers'. This means that the transnational companies are major actors whose decisions or policies in the new era of globalization can promote or diminish the prospects of

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

consolidating political development. They exercise reasonable degree of leverage over domestic political and economic policy choices, implementation and policy outcomes (Kura, 2005:12). For instance, the ability of Nigeria to build the necessary economic infrastructure for sustainable democracy depends on how much gain from trade and foreign investment is left behind by the transnational companies. The study finds that transnational companies provide avenue through which the continued exploitation in massive scale, of the human and material resources of Nigeria is achieved. Akani (2004:17) supports the finding when he observed that globalization, through transnational corporations, have facilitated the appropriation of Nigeria's resources for the 'advantage of the industrialized rich countries'. These companies are only interested in the repatriation of enormous profits they make in Nigeria back to Europe and United States of America, without re-investing such profit for development of social and physical infrastructure. Their activities, according to Akani (2004:18) have resulted in 'corporate greed and crime because of their unbridled piracy in the maximization of profit'. Little wonder, Ihonvbere (2004:527) described transnational corporations as 'profit and hegemony-seeking corporations'. The backwardness, underdevelopment and economic conundrum generated by the appropriation of Nigeria's resources by transactional companies could precipitate conditions that deepen the vulnerability of the polity to the extent that government may become weak, unpopular and alienated from the masses. As is evident in Nigeria, the state is increasingly under pressure and attack, and at a time have become stagnant, exhausted and predicted to be a failed state in the next fifteen years (United State Intelligence Report 2005 cited in Onah & Nyewusira, 2006).

This study also shows that globalization is the main 'purveyor' of human rights violation in Nigeria. Although Obadina (1998:32) contends that 'the concept of absolute freedom underlies the rationale for globalization', the forces of globalization, represented by multinational oil companies, largely account for the incidence of repression and human rights violations against local and indigenous communities of the Niger Delta, on whose territories oil is produced. In spite of being in a democratic and constitutional government, grave violation of human rights, perpetrated by multinational oil companies, persists in the Niger Delta, with increasing brutal repression of peaceful community protest, extra-judicial killings, detention without trial and violation of sources of livelihood (Volmen 2003 in Onah & Nyewusira, 2005). The instruments of terror, coercion, repression and military conquest adopted by multinational oil companies in the course of oil exploration in the Niger Delta became so cruel that Rowell (1996:201) quoted Ake as describing the situation in the region as the 'militarization of commerce' and the 'privatization of the state' amounting to 'a clear case of drilling and killing' in the Niger Delta. In fact, the misuse of oil revenues by multinational oil companies in Nigeria has exacerbated political discontent and provoked internal political violence (Ibeanu, 2005). These developments

have continued to weaken efforts at nation-building, heighten citizens' disaffection and challenge the process of democratic consolidation.

A strategic mission of globalization is maximum appropriation of resources of least developed economies of Africa, Asia and Latin America by developed countries of the West. Owugah (2004) paints globalization as having a 'historical process of profit maximization'. In the process, a form of inequality, ideological dependence and global values are established to enhance the capacity of capitalism to 'remake the world in the preferred image of developed countries' (Akani 2004). Globalization has even affected Nigeria more than how Akani perceived it. Our study found that the political implication and consequence of achieving this mission of 'crass capitalism' is that Nigerian leaders are coerced to follow the prescriptions of globalization. The prescription includes the implementation of political and economic policies and programmes that, in the words of Akani (2004) engender 'social tension, unending wars as a result of militant ethnic militia, massive pile-up of weapons of mass destruction, breakdown of democratic institutions and fascist leadership'. In the process, state-sponsored violence is unleashed on the masses by the indigenous ruling class that have external orientation.

It is the findings of this study that most protests, revolts, riots, strikes of labour unions, students' bodies, civil society organizations and human rights groups against neo-liberal policies of successive Nigerian governments have attracted brutal repression and extra-judicial killings by agents of the state. As Patterson (2003:92) averred, government monopolization of power and decision making process is a major source of conflict in the society. In almost all cases, state response to legitimate demands of the masses reflected a leadership that displayed authoritarian, dictatorial, autocratic and fascist tendencies. Obasi (1999:37) specifically noted that antagonism and intransigence were the dominant features of state labour relations under Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in Nigeria, such that the Nigerian state adopted repressive measures to check and control incidence of strikes and demonstrations by workers and students.

The above trend gained currency under the civilian administration of Olusegun Obasanjo, when there was unrelenting efforts by the Nigerian state to repress labour and civil society organization's opposition to harsh economic policies. Clearly, the economic recovery programme of the regime, called 'NEEDS', was a rehash of the old SAP doctrines. It required the dismantling of the public sector through a renewed privatization, deregulation and liberalization programmes to shrink the public sector. While privatization began a rapid transfer of public wealth to the friends and cronies of former president Obasanjo, deregulation ensured that the price of petrol per litre went up from N20 in 1999 to N70 per litre in 2007. The regime actually increased the price of petrol about seven times between 1999 and 2007 (Fashina 2009:51). These policies, no doubt, weakened the economic base of the less privileged, disempowered the masses politically and deepened the corruption of political processes. As Fashina (2009:52)

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

remarked, 'Obasanjo's government created the ground full implementation of the IMF/World Bank Vision for Nigeria'. The resistance of labour unions to deregulation and the increases in the prices of petroleum products made the Obasanjo's regime resort to extra-judicial and political maneuverings to curb and weaken the inherent strength of labour and civil society organizations. For instance, the Trade Union (Amendment) Act of 2005 sponsored by the government allowed only strikes that constitute a 'dispute of right', i.e matters concerning negotiation, application or interpretation of a contract of employment and collective bargaining. In other words, strikes on political and economic matters were disallowed by the Act. The Trade Union (Amendment) Act of 2005 also allowed the registration of other Federation of Trade Unions (apart from the Nigeria Labour Congress). The apparent aim of the government was to weaken the NLC, which was the harbinger of the popular strikes and protests against the deregulation of the oil industry and the politics of oil price increases. The obnoxious Public Order Act was also invoked by the government to ban all public gatherings and assembly without police permit. The then president of NLC, Comrade Adams Oshiomhole, was even arrested and physically assaulted at Murtala Muhammed International Airport, Lagos, by agents of State Security Service on his way to mobilizing workers against the government in 2005. The hostility of the government that was rabidly intolerant of dissenting views and opinions not only undermined democratic governance, but the fact that the Nigerian state was run by a parasitic and irresponsible elite, nurtured by the capitalist powers through the IMF and the World Bank, intensified what Huntington (1965) refers to as 'political decay' In the remarks of Adeleke (2004:3), any opposition to the neo-liberal market ideology which the United States of America controlled World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) imposes instills in the Nigerian state 'the pathological drive to kill'. The implication on political development is the virtual monopoly of policy making without consideration of alternative policies, breakdown of democratic institutions, clear absence of a people-oriented state and the enthronement of a 'Hobbesian state'.

As extensively illustrated above, globalization and its agents not only causes militarization of the polity and denial of democratic rights, it actually institutionalized what the Civil Liberties Organization described as 'epoch of impunity' under the civilian administration of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo between 1999 and 2007. In fact, the organization and other human right groups view that political dispensation as 'the nearest approximation of the Hobbesian state of nature in which human existence was effectively solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'. A careful analyses of the practices and policies in governance, human rights, and social welfare issues reflected tendencies towards a civilian dictatorship. The Civil Liberties Organization (CLO) specifically noted that these tendencies 'manifested in various developments whose common characteristic was the concentration of political power in the hands of the social forces allied in, and represented by the PDP and President Olusegun Obasanjo'. The regime, no doubt, created a polity that was authoritarian in attitude and practice. These tendencies

coalesced to define the character of the administration as one opposed to the democratic transformation of social relations in Nigeria. The culture of absolutism was manifested in the political and administrative strategies which Obasanjo, in collaboration with his foreign business allies, adopted in the attempt to extend his tenure through a constitutional amendment process that was against all known norms of democracy, civility and morality (Onyishi, 2007; Nyewusira, 2007). The political malfeasance, from our findings, was effectively funded by the forces and institutions of globalization, such as multinational companies, in clear pursuit of corporate interests. It amounted to what Chukwumerije (2006:221) referred to as 'fascist political economy', where privatization programme, for instance, was primarily used as a process of 'creating and empowering a clique of mega moneybags who in turn are made to finance the political schemes of the regime' under former president Obasanjo. The forces and agents of globalization that benefited from such programme are therefore believed to have funded the 'Third Term Project': a political subterfuge that created palpable tension in the polity, traumatized the civil society, led to a near cataclysmic conflict among the political class and other conditions of political instability. Hence, globalization and its agents played active role in the inversion of the basic tenets of democracy and political development in Nigeria under the administration of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend as follows:

- a. The first pre-requisite for decision and action on globalization is the emergence of a patriotic and informed leadership in Nigeria. In the present era of knowledge economy, Nigerians should strive to elect into public office, people who have large measure of character, credibility and commitment for leadership. An enlightened, visionary, sensitive, transparent and accountable leadership is critical to not just recovery but also the restructuring of patterns of participation in the global order. We make this recommendation on the basis that the relationship between globalization and the effects that it produces are not a direct one; rather they are mediated by the type of leadership that exists in a country. A political leadership with values that drive genuine development will relate with the forces of globalization in a way that advances the interest of its people. The challenge of such leadership should be restructuring the state to be effective and capable of supporting the necessary projects to encourage private and collective initiatives.
- b. Given that Nigeria is weak to benefit from present globalization, due mainly to frail institutional capacity, there is need for Nigeria to put in place a policy framework geared towards benefiting the country in the

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

globalization process. A step in this direction is for Nigerian government to invest substantially in academic institutions, which must be given priority in order to enhance the capacity of Nigerians to continuously generate knowledge, ideas and strategies for responding to the challenges of a rapidly globalizing world. The thrust of this recommendation is that Nigeria should pay special attention to the advancement of policy science and policy analysis which 'increase significantly the capacity of humanity to direct its future'.

c. There is the urgent need to strengthen democratic institutions in Nigeria and mobilize the people across gender, regional, ethnic and religious lines for the critical tasks of reconstruction, growth, and development. This can be achieved through full democratization of all aspects of economic and social activities, and in all stages, from decision-making to implementation. We believe that democracy is at the heart of people-oriented programmes because in substantive democracy, development is about facilitating peoples' participation and lead role in deciding what sort of development is appropriate for them. Under this practice, there is emphasis on community participation, empowerment, rights, equity and self-reliance rather than operating under 'external policy command' that result in social hardship and political tension. Therefore, it is only through the motivation and empowerment of the people as well as insisting on the equitable distribution of income that political development can take place on a sustainable basis.

d. In view of dependency relationship brought about by globalization, the study recommends that the Nigerian state should effectively control economic activities in its territory. There is every need to put an end to the 'commodification' of human lives through imposition of neo-liberal policies that value markets and profits at the expense of human welfare. Leadership of Nigeria state should muster the political will and formulate appropriate agricultural productivity, economic diversification and increased investment in human and physical infrastructure. The history of development in advanced Western democracies tends to support this approach. In these countries, state action was central to capital accumulation and distribution that created the infrastructure for economic growth and political development.

e. Major stakeholders in the Nigerian project, who have a deep understanding of the nature and consequences of globalization, such as civil society organizations, human rights groups, workers, intellectuals and students should organize sustained campaign against certain strategies, methods and agents of globalization that are inimical to Nigerians. This measure should involve educating the masses on the negative consequences of globalization on the Nigerian people.

REFERENCES

- Adekunle, T. (2004, September 18). Globalization and Cultural Diversity in Africa. *Thisday*.
- Adeleke, T. (2004, July 3). The Challenge of Development. *Thisday*.
- Afiana, L. (2004, October 5). Globalization and Industrial Development in Nigeria. *Thisday*.
- Ajayi, K. (2006). The Political Economy of Globalization and Possibilities for Regional Economic Development in Africa. *Journal of Social Science* 13 (2).
- Akani, C. (2004). The Policy of Globalization and African Security. In C. Akani (ed.) *Globalization and the Peoples of Africa*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.
- Ake, C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Ake, C. (1996). *The Marginalization of Africa: Notes on a Productive Confusion*. Lagos: Malthouse.
- Akindele, S. T. et al. (2002). Globalization, Its Implications and Consequences for Africa. Retrieved June 30, 2011, from <http://www.globalisationand.politicaldevelopment.org>
- Akinterinwa, B. (2007, October 28). Challenges Before Nigeria's Ambassadors-Designate. *Thisday*.
- Akoloh, E. (2007). A Critical Analysis of Military and Political Development in Nigeria (1985- 1993). *Unpublished B.Sc (Ed) Thesis*, Department of Political Science, Rivers State College of Education.
- Amadi, S. (2003, July 23). Globalization and the African Challenge. *Thisday*
- Anikie, H. (1997). *Globalization and the Post Colonial World*. London: Macmillian Press.
- Bekweri, F. (2005, September 2). Globalization of Mass Media. *Thisday*.
- Chukwumerije, U. (2006). The Constitution Amendment Bill 2006. *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies*, 2 (1), 218-221.
- Enwegbara, B. (2006, June 19). Many sins of Africa. *Thisday*.
- Eremie, V. (1998). The Comprador and African Underdevelopment: The Case of Nigeria. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Fashina, O. (2009). *Labour and Politics: The Challenges of Social Transformation of Nigeria*. Lagos: KMF
- Fasotin, U. (2005). *The Economy of African States*. Ilorin: Olugab Press.
- Fidelis, A. (2002). *The Economic and Political Freedom: Selected Issues in African Politics*. Uyo: Abigab.
- Grimm, M. and G. Gunther, (2007). Growth and Poverty in Burkina Faso: A Reassessment of the Paradox. *Journal of African Economies* 16 (1): 70-101.
- Hintington, S. P. (1968). *Political Order in a Changing Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Impact of Globalization on Political Development in Nigeria

- Ibeanu, O. (2005). Our Mother's Courage Silenced all Guns: Women and Conflict in the Niger Delta. *Journal of Political Economy* 1(1): 52-73.
- Ibeanu, O. (2008). Affluence and Affliction: The Niger Delta as a Critique of Political Science in Nigeria. *Inaugural Lecture* of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka Delivered on February 20, 2008.
- Ihonvbere, J. (2004). Nigeria in The New World Order: Implications and Options for the 21th Century. In Bello-Imam, & Obadan, M. (eds.) *Democratic Governance and Development Management in Nigeria's Fourth Republic (1999-2003)*. Ibadan: JODAD Publishers.
- Iyayi, F. (2004). Globalization, The Nigerian Economy and Peace. In C. Akani (ed.) *Globalization and the Peoples of Africa*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.
- Kura, S. (2005). Globalization and Democracy: A Dialectical Framework for Understanding Democratization in Nigeria. Retrieved June 30, 2011, from <http://www.globalisation.org>
- Madunagu, E. (1999, July 26). Globalization and its Victims. *The Guardian*.
- Nnoli, O. (2003). *Introduction to Politics*. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd.
- Ntete-Nna, J. (2004). *Contemporary Political Analysis: An Introduction*. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- Nyewusira, V. (2007). Is Education Necessary? In C. Akani (ed.) *Africa in the 21st Century*. Port Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- Nyewusira, V. (2007). Selected Socio-Political Issues in Nigeria: Religious Institutions as Agents of Change. *Journal of Pedagogy and Educational Development* 12 (1): 29-36.
- Obadina, T. (1998, October). Globalization Human Rights and Development. *Africa Today*
- Olubamise, B. (2005, January 26). How Globalization Train is overring Nigeria. *Thisday*.
- Onah, F. & Nyewusira, V. (2005). Oil Exploitation and Sustainable Development in the Niger Delta Area, Nigeria. *African Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, 2 (1), 151-166.
- Onah, F. & Nyewusira, V. (2006). Foreign Debt Conundrum and Nigeria's Socio-Economic Development. *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies* 2 (1): 55-71.
- Onah, F. (2006). *Managing Public Programmes and Projects*. Nsukka.