

## **Chapter Six**

### **Globalisation and Development in the 21st Century**

Monday E. Dickson  
Ofonmbuk E. Atakpa

#### **Introduction**

During the past three decades, explaining the various changes in political, economic, and cultural relations that have occurred in the modern international system has become a greater focus for scholars in the fields of international relations, international political economy, and development studies. These include the complicated interrelationships between capitalism and democracy, the ease with which popular commodities are consumed due to the advancement of global technology, and the increasing significance of the many intergovernmental organisations (IGOs). Others include the expansion of cross-border trade and interdependence between countries, a new paradigm in international politics, and the worldwide reach of corporations in setting up branches in manufacturing facilities abroad (Dickson, 2022). Other changes include the dramatic increase in capital mobility, the global economy's increased structural differentiation and functional integration, the realisation that human skills, not resources, are the main source of wealth, the startling growth of information flows and information processing capabilities made possible by advances in mass communication technology, and the emergence of global culture in tandem (Clapham, 1996).

Globalisation has been widely used to describe these transformative actions that may extend the political, economic, cultural, and social spheres across national borders and increase the density of patterns of global interconnectivity (McGrew, 1997). Therefore, beginning in the 1990s, globalisation became the main concept in both academic study and public political discourse. It became closely associated with the Third Way political movement in the West, which rejected state socialism in its Stalinist and Social-democratic forms as well as neoliberal market fundamentalism (Kiely, 2005). Therefore, this has been the most significant international process of the last few decades that has brought about significant changes in the international system. As a result, globalisation has become a ubiquitous phenomenon in politics, economics, and society, impacting government, business, and all other spheres of life in one way or another (Alon, 2006).

Modern forms of interconnection in politics, economy, and culture have an impact on how the state and capital interact, as well as how different parts of the world grow. The global patterns of trade, investment, and production, the choices

state actors can make, and the range of developmental options available are being reshaped by the liberalisation of financial markets, the spread of information services, and the concomitant mobility of goods and services (Grugel & Hout, 1999). As a result, globalisation has weakened governments' ability to independently formulate policies and their efforts to develop internationally. Western capitalist nations appear to be able to lessen the consequences of globalisation as an uneven process, while weak governments, primarily situated in Africa, Asia and Latin America, suffer because they lack the resources to stop the plague (Migdal, 1988; Holm & Sorensen, 1995). As a consequence, developing nations in Africa and other regions of the world appear to be more affected by globalisation than the developed nations in the West.

### **Globalisation: A Conceptual Discourse**

The process of globalisation is not a new phenomenon *per se*. It dates back to the fifteenth century when advancements in the many technologies intended to shorten distances marked the start of a process that would evolve quickly. Therefore, (Lee (2006, p.3) and Hite (1998, p.2) characterise it as “the trend towards a single, integrated, and interdependent world”. Hence, the concept reflects increasing global integration, not just from the liberalisation of commodity and factor markets, but also of cross-border movements of labour and capital, transfers of incomes and technology and an increase in communication and the flow of information between countries (Bigsten & Durevall, 2003). A more precise definition according to Held et al. (1999, p.16) is that globalisation is “[a] process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions assessed in terms of their extensity, velocity and impact generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power”. This suggests that globalisation refers to a rise in the pace and intensity of connections made both within and across national borders.

According to Garrett (2000), globalisation refers to the process of accelerating global economic integration, or the international integration of markets for capital, products, and services. It symbolises a global economy where unique country economies and, thus, domestic national economic management strategies are becoming less and less significant. All these put together imply the emergence and operation of a single, worldwide economy measured by the reference to the growing intensity, extensity, and velocity of worldwide economic interactions and interconnectedness, from trade, through production and finance, to migration.

James Cypher (cited in Dowd 2000, p. 170) distinguishes between globalisation as a tendency and globalisation as an ideology: As an objective

tendency, globalisation implies a deepening and strengthening of trade, financial markets, and production systems across national boundaries. Propelling this tendency, we find broad institutional changes occurring, strengthening the integration of the circuits of trade, finance, and production. Globalisation implies a greater degree of convergence in markets and institutions and a greater degree of homogenisation of dysfunctional movements such as economic crises, which quickly shift across national borders. As an ideology, globalisation means both the inevitability and desirability of the above-described tendencies toward integration and the denial of the existence of dysfunctional movements arising from this tendency. It is an objective trend that denotes the expansion and bolstering of financial markets, commerce, and industrial networks worldwide.

From these explanations, globalisation is a process of increasing global connectivity and integration" and "an umbrella term referring to increased interdependence in the economic, social, technological, cultural, political, and ecological spheres. It is the process by which the experience of everyday life... is becoming standardised around the world (Khaled, 2007). In this respect, therefore, globalisation reflects a widespread perception that the world is rapidly being moulded into a shared social space by economic and technological forces in which developments in one region of the world can have profound consequences for other regions of the globe. An alternative explanation given by Russett, Starr and Kinsella (2010) is that globalisation means a process whereby economic, political, and cultural transactions are less constrained by national boundaries and the sovereignty of national government. From this definition, two important points are obvious. First, the continuing advancement of technology has made the transnational movement of goods, people, and ideas both desirable and undesirable increasingly easy to accomplish. Second, national governments seem to be either less able or less willing to exercise control over the goods, people, and ideas that cross their borders.

From what has been said, globalisation has several salient features, all of which are apparent to a greater or lesser degree in Africa, Asia, and other regions and continents of the world. These include the triumph of capitalism and the emergence of a global market that transcends state boundaries and limits states' control of their economies; the spread of global culture, the spread of democracy as well as global civil society; and the growth of complex trans-governmental linkages, and so on. In a similar vein, globalisation and its effects may be seen in at least three important domains of study, economics, politics and culture.

Firstly, **economic globalisation** is defined as the growing interdependence of world economies due to the expansion of international capital flows, the wide and quick diffusion of technologies, and the scale of cross-border trade of commodities

and services. It encompasses cross-border trade and service flows, capital movements internationally, immigration, tariff and trade barrier reductions, and the international dissemination of technology and information (Samimi & Jenatabadi, 2014). According to Gallagher (2009, p. 79), economic globalisation is "the integration of the world's economies through an increasing array of bilateral and multilateral, regional trade and investment agreements." Economic globalisation is the process of increasing economic globalism. The primary forces behind economic globalisation are multinational corporations (MNCs). They engage in international production and their global expansions are also changing the macroeconomic mechanisms that govern how the world's economies function.

Secondly, **political globalisation** has to do with the stretching of political relations across space and time; the extension of political power and political activity across the boundaries of the modern nation-state" (Kaarbo & Ray, 2011). It is characterized by the rise in the number and significance of international and regional organizations and non-state transnational actors. There are global organizations such as the United Nations (UN), which are open for members from all parts of the world and regional organizations such as the African Union (AU), and the Organization of American States (OAS) open for members from their regions only. The UN is acting as a global governing system, providing a forum for debate, codifying developing norms, and at times, enforcing norms through its executive body and subsidiaries, for example, the Security Council and International Criminal Court (ICC) (Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006).

Thirdly, **cultural globalisation** has to do with global flows of culture and the worldwide spread of similar norms, values, and practices. For example, the spread of democracy as a political system is associated with the spread of democratic values that are part of cultural globalisation. Culture involves values, norms, traditions, and practices, and many see a homogenization of what people do, think, and value around the world. Cultural globalisation is the emergence of a specific set of values and beliefs that are largely shared around the planet. For instance, people in different regions and continents buy the same products, listen to the same music, play the same video games, eat the same food, and watch the same television programmes. In popular thinking, cultural globalisation is associated with certain global products and international companies that can be found 'everywhere' such as Coca-Cola, McDonald's, Nike, Hollywood films, Microsoft, etc. (Reeves, 2004). Moreover, the music of popular American singers such as Michael Jackson, Mariah Carey, Madonna, etc. seems to be reaching the remotest corner of the globe. Nollywood seems to have its sway all around the globe.

Furthermore, globalisation is often elided with the notion of interdependence or internationalization, liberalisation, universalization, Westernization and

capitalism. When interpreted as **internationalization**, it refers to the growth of transactions and interdependence between countries and various regions of the world. The integration of economies is more geographically widespread and deeper, trade, production, and investment as well as national economies become increasingly interdependent and internationalized.

Globalisation represents the triumph of political and economic **liberalisation**. Countries of the world have moved quickly toward political liberalisation, with the most conspicuous developments such as changes in countries that had previously been under one-party or military rule embracing multiparty systems, and adopting competitive electoral systems. There are reductions or removal in restrictions on international trade and capital. Therefore, there is a liberal trade and investment climate and greater openness to trade that offers smaller economies the chance to achieve fast rates of growth. Fukuyama (1992) equates globalisation with liberalisation to mean growth in free trade, civil society, and privatization of state-owned enterprises.

The notion that globalisation is **universalization** describes a process of dispersing various objects and experiences to people in all inhabited parts of the earth (Scholte, 2002). It underscores the idea that the world is becoming a 'global village'. On these lines, 'global' means 'worldwide' and 'everywhere'. Hence, there is a 'globalisation' of business suits, curry dinners, Barbie dolls, anti-terrorism legislation, and so on. Globalisation is often seen as **Westernization**. On the one hand, scholars who take an upbeat view see globalisation as a marvellous contribution of Western civilization to the world. On the other, it is a continuation of Western imperialism. As such, globalisation is regarded as a particular type of universalization, one in which the social structures of modernity (capitalism, industrialism, rationalism, urbanism, etc.) are spread the world over. Thus, globalisation has been interpreted as colonization, Europeanization and Americanization (Scholte, 2002).

Globalisation is defensibly said to be **capitalism** - an ideology of a global market economy or international economic integration (Glyn, 2006). These suggest that through globalisation, the world is struggling with a new form of 'imperial rule' or what African countries have for several centuries called 'colonization' or a renewal of the 'spirit of capitalism' in which power is based on new forms of commodification and mobility through networks.

### **Development: A Conceptual Analysis**

The Liberal and Marxist schools of thought have provided contending views on the concept of development. From the liberal perspective, development is primarily associated with economic growth, modernization, and the promotion of individual

freedoms. Liberals argue that globalisation facilitates development by enabling free markets, enhancing trade, and allowing for the diffusion of technology and ideas. This perspective emphasizes the role of institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in promoting economic policies that can lead to sustainable development across various regions. For example, liberal theorists posit that integrating developing countries into the global economy can lift them out of poverty and enhance their overall quality of life (Sachs, 2005).

The Marxists highlight the structural injustices that globalisation has exacerbated and challenge the liberal viewpoint. Marxists contend that as a result of globalisation, developing countries are frequently forced to exploit labour and resources, perpetuating a global capitalist system that favours wealthier countries at the expense of poorer ones. They contend that social justice and equity should be taken into consideration in addition to economic indicators when it comes to development. Due to the uneven nature of globalisation, wealth is concentrated in core countries while periphery regions continue to be excluded, a phenomenon known as "uneven development" (Harvey, 2003).

Accordingly, "words like 'growth,' 'progress,' 'transformation,' and 'social and economic change' have been used interchangeably with the idea of development" (Okereke & Ekpe, 2002, p. 2). Todaro (1979, p. 87) described development as "a series of successive stages of transformation," or what Thirlwall (1983, p. 8) defined as "change that often follows a well-ordered sequence and exhibits common characteristics across countries". Hence, development is seen as the processes through which a country (or group of countries) develops (in the economic, social, political, spiritual, educational, and scientific spheres, among others) to increase its capacity to meet its citizens' basic human needs and raise their standard of living.

Other scholars and writers have examined the meaning of development from other perspectives. First, development can be technology-based, implying that development is partly a process whereby a country can achieve reasonable self-sustaining growth, which facilitates and enhances industrial and technical progress in the interest of the people. A nation's progress is measured by its technological advancement. Second, GDP growth or a country's economy is the focal point of development. Rather than focussing on people, development now centres on the global market or profit. The degree of progress is determined by economic indices like GNP, per capita income, and so forth. It is interesting to note that the third viewpoint agrees with the majority of liberal theorists in believing that economics and development are intimately linked. This school of thought defined development as "the maximisation of the growth of the GNP through capital accumulation and industrialization (Okereke & Ekpe, 2002). Third, Dudley Seers proposed that the universally acceptable goals of development must include the decrease of poverty

and social inequality and the enhancement of job opportunities, among others (Seers, 1969).

Summarily, Todaro and Smith (2003) posit that development must, therefore, be conceived of as a multi-dimensional process involving major changes in social structures, popular attitudes, and national institutions, as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of poverty. Yusuf and Yusuf (2013) argue that development is simply about enlarging people's choices, identifying four important elements in human development productivity, equity, sustainability, and empowerment. Therefore, development is generally the process of moving from a low to a higher and more advanced stage in the social, economic, technological, cultural and political sphere.

### **Theoretical Approaches to Globalisation and Development**

Many works, some of which have been influenced by Marxist literature inspired several interpretations, and approaches and correspond to whether one views globalisation as primarily an economic, social or political phenomenon. Held et al. (1999) divide the debate into three perspectives – *hyperglobalists*, *sceptics* and *transformationalists*. Myint (2011) adds a *standardization* thesis.

#### ***The hyperglobalist thesis***

The adherents of this approach focus on the economic dimension of globalisation. They believe that changes in the global economy are ushering in “a new epoch of human history” (Mansbarch & Taylor, 2012, p. 190), in which territorial states have become obsolete economic units. This theory argues that the global economy is dominated by uncontrollable global forces in which nation-states are structurally dependent on global capital that is primarily determined by transnational corporations. Concerned primarily with *politics* and *power*, it has been argued that the growth of the international business, particularly of transnational networks of production, trade and finance has rendered nation-states practically irrelevant. National authorities have lost power over their economies and act as mere transmitters of global market discipline to the domestic market.

The above supposition implies that globalisation has produced a single global market in which transnational corporations from many countries vigorously compete with one another through foreign direct investment, control of income-gathering assets and engagement in international production. As a consequence, economic globalisation is bringing about a 'de-nationalization' of economies through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade, and finance, and a borderless economy in which national governments are relegated to little more than transmission belts for global capital (Mansbarch & Taylor, 2012). To *hyperglobalists*, therefore, globalisation means a drastic shift in structural power

and authority away from nation-states toward non-state agencies and from national political systems to global economic systems.

***The sceptic thesis***

Advocates of this school of thought focus on the international integration of national markets and argue that 'globalisation', must be understood as a worldwide process of integration of national economies. In contrast to *hyperglobalists*, the *Sceptics* maintain that contemporary levels of economic interdependence are not historically unprecedented following the important role of regional organizations in promoting the world economy. They assert that in comparison with the age of world empires, the international economy has become considerably less global in its geographical embrace (Held *et al.*, 1999; Smith *et al.*, 1999). On the economic dimension of globalisation, the *sceptics* argue that its features such as high levels of inter-state trade and the expansion of regional common markets as applicable to the European Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement reduce global economic integration. States retain a dominant role in these activities, including the ability to regulate and even unravel globalised economic processes. The power of governments has not ebbed, state sovereignty has not eroded, and transnational corporations remain under national control (Mansbarch & Taylor, 2012).

***The transformationalist thesis***

The *transformationalists* believe that globalisation is a central driving force behind the rapid social, political and economic changes that are reshaping modern societies and world order, and have no historical parallel (Held *et al.*, 2006; Mansbarch, 2010). This social phenomenon is time-space compression, culminating in the total 'annihilation of space through time'. It has been brought about by the fusion of telecommunications and information technology and it has brought not just 'the Internet' and with its e-commerce and e-business, but it has also, fundamentally, brought about the ascendancy of 'real-time' over 'physical time', and with that such a transformation of the dominant sectors of economic activity that it deserves a new label: the 'new economy'. It has brought about a transformation of cross-border economic activity that deserves to be identified with a new concept.

According to this school, two consequences of interconnectedness are: First, the merging of the foreign and domestic policy arenas; and second, the erasure of physical distance and reduced role of territory owing to the micro-electronic revolution. According to *transformationalists*, international, sub-national, and transnational groups are growing more important as state power ebbs and with the declining capacity of sovereign states and the reduced importance of territory, the role of identity based on features such as religion and ethnicity has grown. The

*transformationalists*, like the *hyperglobalists* reject the thesis of global convergence, arguing that the existence of a single global system is not evidence of global convergence or the arrival of a single world society. They believe that globalisation would result in "global stratification" since some states, societies, and communities are enmeshed in the global order at the expense of other countries, thus marginalizing some so-called less competitive economies in the process of globalisation.

### ***The standardization thesis***

The fourth perspective identified by Myint (2011) is embedded in the expression of the anti-globalisation social movements around the world. These social movements raise awareness of the economic, political, and social consequences of globalisation. The *standardization* thesis states that globalisation is a standardization project of both hegemonic states and their partners (e.g., multinational conglomerates and global non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who jointly command and control the neo-liberal economic and state-centric order of the world and consumers of conglomerate capitalism. The adherents of this school see globalisation as a project of standardisation that seeks to comprehend and control their worlds. For instance, Scott (1998) contends that "globalisation is a logical tool for hegemonic states and groups to expand total control over resources and people across the globe".

Furthermore, the *standardization* thesis focuses on what globalisation may eliminate, diminish, or replace, such as diverse human institutions, religions, cultures and vernaculars. This is because local, indigenous, and tacit vernacular practices all stand in the way of standardization. While standardization theorists acknowledge globalisation's benefits, they also argue that the disappearance or transformation of these indigenous institutions, religions, cultures and vernacular practices is the "dark side of standardization" (Myint, 2011, p. 395).

### **Theories of Development and Underdevelopment**

The twin theories of *modernization* and *dependency* describe the difficult interplay between forces of globalization, development and underdevelopment. The modernisation theory, which is centred on the economic state of a particular "traditional" civilisation, is rooted in the traditions of Adam Smith and classical political economy and is most famously articulated by W. W. Rostow (1960). The main argument of the modernisation school is that the archaic and primitive nature of these cultures, along with a lack of policies focused on self-actualization, are what organically generate and sustain underdevelopment in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Therefore, Rostow attributes Africa's underdevelopment to its inability to westernise or to pursue the same developmental route previously followed by the

industrialised nations in the West: a progressive transition from a traditional, pre-industrial, agrarian civilisation towards a modern, industrial, mass-consumption society.

Thus, Rostow's model of development had five stages. The first is the 'traditional society,' with its focus on the family and agriculture. The second stage is the 'pre-conditions for takeoff'. This stage, which started in Europe in the late sixteenth century included, among other things, a political system, banks, and a growing merchant class now involved in spreading the tenets of globalisation. The third stage is the 'take-off', defined as an increase in the volume and productivity of investment in a society, such that a sustained increase in per capita real income results. During the takeoff, new industries expand, profits are reinvested, savings increase, society and political structures change, and production exceeds consumption. The fourth stage is the 'drive to maturity', where the economy continues to grow at a steady pace. The final stage is the 'age of mass consumption', where production turns to service-based industries and the focus on social security and the welfare state begins.

From the analysis of the stages of development, this chapter observes that W. W. Rostow had created a capitalist 'alternative' to communism that developing countries could follow to develop. The implication is that Africa must go through these stages to break away from the shackles of backwardness and underdevelopment. From the perspective of this school, underdevelopment is a transactional phenomenon that can be removed sooner or later by creating certain favourable conditions within the underdeveloped region. It is argued that economic dynamism could be unleashed by the construction of appropriate institutions and policies for harnessing the positive benefits of nationalism, leading to sustained growth based on higher levels of investment. This argument found justification for development through industrialisation, appealing to both nationalist elements in countries of Asia and Africa and capital-exporting industrialists in the developed world (Preston, 1996).

The dependency school, which arose in Latin America in the 1960s, emerged as an alternative to the explanation of modernisation theory for Africa's underdevelopment. The theory is based on a materialist understanding of the international economic structure and highlights the inequality between the developed Western economies and the underdeveloped or developing economies," particularly that of the global South. However, Theotonio Dos Santos gives perhaps the best explanation of the state of dependence in which all underdeveloped regions of the world find themselves as "a situation in which a certain group of countries have their economy conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected" (Santos, 1970, p. 3). Santos goes further

to say that the basic situation of dependence leads to global situations in dependent countries that situate them in backwardness and under the exploitation of the dominant countries. Andre Gunder Frank visualises the state of dependence to mean a whole chain of constellations of metropoles and satellites [which] relate all parts of the whole [capitalist] system from its metropolitan centre in Europe or America to the farthest outpost in the Latin American countryside (Frank, 1967).

The above assertion by Frank implies that capitalism, which expanded from Europe, incorporates the whole world in a single international economic system divided into a whole chain of metropolises and satellites with a monopolistic structure, which entails the buccaneering, plundering, and misuse or squandering of resources all over the system. A particularly important form of misuse is the expropriation and appropriation of a large part or even all of and more than the economic surplus or surplus-value of the satellite by its local, regional, national, or international metropolis (Larraín, 1989). Therefore, each of the satellites ...serves as an instrument to suck capital and economy and to channel greater parts of this surplus to the world metropolis. Such satellite development is dependent because it is neither self-generating nor self-perpetuating. Hence, the crux of dependence lies in the inability of a country to determine an autonomous and self-propelling growth process.

Therefore, Frank (1967) sees capitalism as preeminently a global system that intrinsically generated polarisation between rich and poor countries. As a result, underdeveloped countries found predominantly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America face cumulative disadvantages in attempting to transform their conditions. Their integration into global capitalism had over time created politically powerful domestic interests linked to the advanced capitalist powers and therefore uninterested in autochthonous industrialisation. In other words, the plunderage and systemically corrupt enterprises established in the colonies to expropriate natural resources in Africa to Europe have facilitated the underdevelopment of Africa while engendered the development of Europe (Rodney, 1983).

Corroborating the views of Santos and Frank, Daniel Offiong posits that in the dependency situation, crucial economic decisions are made, not by the countries that are underdeveloped but by foreigners whose interests are carefully safeguarded. He opines further that dependency is a conditioning situation in which the specific histories of development and underdevelopment transpire in various societies (Offiong, 1982). In line with this thought, dependency is what the history of imperialism creates in underdeveloped countries as is a situation of unprogressive reliance on one country or continent by another for survival. In summary, underdevelopment is a condition imposed by the international expansion of capitalism and its inalienable partner, imperialism. Thus, what has been said

could be summarised in three broad statements: first, dependence and underdevelopment are the results of the world expansion of capitalism; second, dependence leads to economic exploitation and third, dependence leads to underdevelopment.

### **Globalisation and Development Among World Regions**

Since the 1990s when the globalisation process has intensified, the debate on development has raised critical questions regarding the impacts on different world regions.

#### ***Sub-Saharan Africa***

In Sub-Saharan Africa, globalisation has led to increased foreign investment but also significant challenges, such as dependency on commodity exports and vulnerability to global market fluctuations. (Rodney, 1972). African countries have continued to face severe social, political, and economic developmental problems, notwithstanding the abundance of human and natural resources in the region. They remain fractured, fragile, dependent and weak, and the realization of other benefits, especially economic development remains elusive. While some countries experienced significant progress toward socio-economic development, the antecedents of underdevelopment became widespread even in the successful ones. Accordingly, Africa can best be described as a continent overburdened with multifaceted, causally related precursors of underdevelopment. The situation has worsened in the past few decades, a period marked by the major structural transformation of the global business environment known as globalisation.

Two reasons have been advanced for these unfortunate scenarios. First, Africa is said to have been left out of the process of development and growth of globalisation which marked a continuation of the trend of increasing global integration and interdependence (Mukandala, Fox & Liebenthal, 2006). This implies that during the era of unprecedented global economic growth propelled by globalisation, Africa was left behind. While other continents increased per capita income, raised literacy rates and improved health care, per capita income, Africa was roughly the same a few years ago as it was at independence in the 1960s. The second reason is the continent's record of economic failure owing to its vulnerability to internal fragmentation and external penetration (Callaghy, 1991). Consequently, many African countries cannot take part in international economic transactions.

Another aspect of globalisation relevant to Africa is global mobility. The revolution in mobility has enabled the rapid movement of goods around the world. But Africa's ability to take advantage of this has been hampered by poor intra-African infrastructure and industrial production. Moreover, road transportation

accounts for the largest share of world freight. Africa's poor road networks make it prohibitive for the continent to participate effectively in the global economy (Juma, 2016). Overall, globalisation, characterized by liberalisation, competition and free market policies, undermines Africa's fragile political systems and economies and creates phenomenal developmental challenges for the continent. Driven by the explosive growth of information, communication and other forms of technological changes, the interrelated processes of Globalisation, marginalization and integration profoundly influenced Africa's development needs, challenges and opportunities.

As Africa enters the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the continent faces numerous development challenges, most of which must be viewed in light of the global political and economic narrative and not as isolated issues. Globalisation provides the structural backdrop against and within which recent histories of development have played out. Associated particularly with the liberalisation of trade, production and finance, globalisation has come to be identified by many with the global spread of capitalism during the neo-liberal era. As such, "globalisation is seen to have radically constrained developmental and wider 'progressive' political economy options for the continent" (Strange, 2014, p. 13). Furthermore, globalisation has weakened the state's control over important international political economy actors who move with enhanced freedom between the domestic and the external spheres with the result that the state now finds it more difficult to bracket off the domestic sphere and, as a consequence, faces more externalized constraints than it once used to.

Globalisation has had devastating effects on Africa by rendering nation-states irrelevant, while the transnational corporation becomes rootless and as such able to move freely around the world to maximize profit through foreign direct investments. These corporations frequently displace national corporations and exert extensive economic and political influence on the state. This is carried out in strict compliance with the rules of the imperialist theory of comparative advantage propounded to keep underdeveloped countries of the world permanently dependent on the economy of Western capitalist nations. Because of its acute dependence on developed countries in most major areas such as technology, trade, foreign investment, human resources, military hardware, aid and information flows and technology, Africa faces major obstacles in its attempts to industrialize or develop (Chandra, 1992, p. 7).

### ***East Asian Region***

East Asia has leveraged globalisation to achieve rapid economic growth, illustrating how regional contexts can shape developmental outcomes differently. For instance, countries such as China, South Korea, and Japan have leveraged global markets to boost their economies. China's entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in

2001 marked a turning point, facilitating increased foreign investment and trade. As a result, East Asia has experienced rapid industrialization, with a shift towards manufacturing and exports, making it a crucial player in the global economy (Ohno, 2009). In a similar vein, globalization has led to both integration and tension within East Asia. The region has seen a rise in multilateral organizations, such as ASEAN and APEC, fostering cooperation among member states. However, globalization has also exposed national vulnerabilities, prompting countries to navigate complex relationships, particularly in light of territorial disputes and historical grievances. Culturally, globalisation has facilitated the exchange of ideas and values, resulting in the proliferation of East Asian cultural products worldwide, such as K-pop and anime (Iwabuchi, 2002). In summary, globalisation has been a double-edged sword for East Asia, driving economic growth while presenting political challenges and cultural dilemmas.

### ***Latin America***

In Latin American nations, globalisation has had a profound impact in several ways, resulting in a complex web of positive and negative effects in the political, economic, and cultural domains. An explanation of these effects is provided below, along with citations. Foreign direct investment and trade prospects have expanded, as observed by Baldwin and Taglioni (2016). Trade accords like NAFTA (now USMCA) have helped nations like Brazil and Mexico by increasing their exports and GDP growth. Larger marketplaces become accessible to local producers, perhaps creating economies of scale. For example, globalisation has resulted in a large growth in Chile's fruit exports, which has raised farmers' incomes (Hinojosa-Ojeda & Cordero, 2015). It has aided in the dissemination of democratic principles and practices in politics. Human rights and governance changes have been aided by the influence of international organisations and non-governmental groups in nations such as Brazil and Argentina (Fukuyama, 2014). Moreover, exposure to international best practices has sparked the development of novel policies in economic management and governance. Countries such as Colombia have implemented reforms influenced by international standards in transparency and anti-corruption measures.

Wallerstein (2004) argues that cultural interchange has been facilitated by globalisation, enabling the sharing of concepts, customs, and practices. Global awareness of Latin American music and art has strengthened cultural pride and identity. Consequently, greater movement has made it possible for Diasporas to emerge, which support both cultural diversity and remittances from the economy. These relationships have strengthened cultural bonds and given families back home financial support. On the negative side, many Latin American countries have become overly reliant on commodity exports, making them vulnerable to global

market fluctuations. For example, the decline in oil prices significantly affected Venezuela's economy, which heavily depended on oil exports (Mena, 2016). Piketty (2014) asserts that while globalisation has created wealth, it has also exacerbated income inequality within countries. The benefits of globalisation have often accrued to urban elites, leaving rural populations and marginalised groups behind.

Globalisation has led to the erosion of national sovereignty as MNCs and international organisations wield significant influence over local policies. This has undermined local governance and reduced the ability of states to act in their citizens' interests (Strange, 1996). The economic disruptions caused by globalisation can lead to social unrest and political instability. In recent years, countries like Bolivia and Ecuador have seen protests against perceived neoliberal policies that favour foreign corporations over local populations (Harvey, 2005). As globalisation promotes individualism and consumerism, traditional social structures may weaken, leading to increased social fragmentation and loss of community cohesion. It presents a dual-edged sword for Latin American countries, offering opportunities for growth and development while also posing significant challenges.

### **Conclusion**

The chapter has shown that Africa is one of the continents of the world which has suffered the most from the processes of globalisation. The existing inequalities among regions of the world attest to the fact that globalisation has led to an increasingly sharp division between 'core' states of the global North, which share in the values and benefits of a global world economy and polity, and 'peripheral' states scattered across the global South, some of which are already branded 'failed' states when measured from the levels of political stability and socio-economic development. Thus, the impacts of globalisation on economic, political and cultural fronts seem to be greater on the developing and underdeveloped countries of Africa than on the developed ones of the West.

There is a need for governments of developing countries to diversify their economies away from colonial patterns of production and exchange and instead build an industrial base capable of generating skilled jobs and prosperity. Thus, developing and underdeveloped regions of the world would have to challenge the technological and financial hegemony of Western countries to carve out sufficient economic space for themselves and to resist dependency. For African countries, interdependence should start locally or continentally by strengthening regional economic integration as countries that cannot compete regionally are unlikely to compete globally. Implementing regional interdependence policies can foster global competitiveness.

## REFERENCES

Alon, I. (2006). Introduction. In R. E. Lee (Ed.), *Globalisation, language and culture* (pp. iii–xvii). Chelsea House.

Bigsten, A., & Durevall, D. (2003). Globalisation and policy effects in Africa. *The World Economy*, 26(8), 1119–1136.

Callaghy, T. M. (1991). Africa and the world economy: Caught between a rock and a hard place. In J. W. Harbeson & D. Rothchild (Eds.), *Africa in world politics* (pp. 103–118). Westview.

Chandra, R. (1992). *Industrialization and development in the Third World*. Routledge.

Clapham, C. (1996). *Africa and the international system: The politics of state survival*. Cambridge University Press.

Dickson, M. E. (2022). Globalisation and development challenges in Africa: Prognosis for the 21st century. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 23(3), 63–78.

Dingwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global governance as a perspective on world politics. *Global Governance*, 12(2), 185–203.

Frank, A. G. (1969). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. Free Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalisation of democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gallagher, K. P. (2009). Economic globalisation and the environment. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 34(1), 279–304.

Glyn, A. (2006). *Capitalism unleashed: Finance, globalisation, and welfare*. Oxford University Press.

Grugel, J., & Hout, W. (1999). Regions, regionalism and the South. In J. Grugel & W. Hout (Eds.), *Regionalism across the North-South divide: State strategies and globalization* (pp. 3–12). Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Held, D., McGrew, T., Perraton, J., & Goldblatt, D. (1999). *Global transformations*. Polity.

Hinojosa-Ojeda, R., & Cordero, J. (2015). The impact of globalization on Latin American agriculture. *Global Policy Journal*, 6(1), 14–26.

Hite, J. (1988). *Land use conflicts on the urban fringe: Causes and potential resolution*. Strom Thurmond Institute.

Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalisation in question*. Polity Press.

Hoffmann, S. (2002). Clash of globalisations. *Foreign Affairs*, 81, 104–115.

Holm, H. H., & Sørensen, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Whose world order? Uneven globalisation and the end of the Cold War*. Westview.

Iwabuchi, K. (2002). *Recentering globalization: Popular culture and Japanese transnationalism*. Duke University Press.

Kaarbo, J., & Ray, J. L. (2011). *Global politics* (10th ed.). Thomson Wadsworth.

Kiely, R. (2005a). *Empire in the age of globalisation: US hegemony and neoliberal disorder*. PlutoPress.

Kiely, R. (2005b). *The clash of globalisations: Neoliberalism, the third way and anti-globalisation*. Brill.

King, D. (2001). *Globalisation, trade policy and sustainable human development in Jamaica*(Draft). University of the West Indies.

Larraín, J. (1989). *Theories of development, capitalism, colonialism and dependency*. Polity Press.

Lee, R. E. (Ed.). (2006). *Globalisation, language and culture* (pp. iii-xvii). Chelsea House.

McGrew, A. (1997). *The transformation of democracy?* Open University Press/Polity Press.

Mena, C. (2016). The economic impact of oil price fluctuations in Venezuela. *Latin American Policy*, 7(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lamp.12088>

Migdal, J. (1988). *Strong societies and weak states: State-society relations and state capabilities in the third world*. Princeton University Press.

Mukandala, R., Fox, L., & Liebenthal, R. (2006). The political economy of pro-poor policies in Africa: Lessons from the Shanghai Conference case studies. In L. Fox & R. Liebenthal (Eds.), *Attacking Africa's poverty: Experience from the ground*. The World Bank.

Myint, T. (2011). Globalisation and the institutional dynamics of global environmental governance. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 18(1), 395–420.

Offiong, D. A. (1982). *Imperialism and dependency: Obstacles to African development* (Classic Edition). Howard University Press.

Ohno, K. (2009). How to make a successful economic partnership with ASEAN: Lessons from Japan and Korea. *ERIA Research Project Report*.

Okereke, O. O., & Ekpe, A. E. (2002). *Development and underdevelopment: Politics of the North-South divide*. John Jacobs.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Preston, P. W. (1996). *Development theory: An introduction*. Blackwell.

Reus-Smit, C., & Dunne, T. (2017). Introduction. In C. Reus-Smit & T. Dunne (Eds.), *The globalization of international society* (pp. 3-17). Oxford University Press.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle L'Ouverture Publication.

Rodney, W. (1983). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle L'Ouverture.

Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth*. Cambridge University Press.

Russett, B., & Starr, H. (1981). *World politics: The menu for choice*. Freeman and Company.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. Penguin Press.

Samimi, P., & Jenatabadi, H. S. (2014). Globalisation and economic growth: Empirical evidence on the role of complementarities. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), 1-7.

Santos, T. D. (1970). The structure of dependence. *American Economic Review*.

Santos, T. D., & Randall, L. (1998). The theoretical foundations of the Cardoso government: A new stage of the dependency theory debate. *Latin American Perspectives*, 25(1), 53-70.

Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalisation: A critical introduction*. St. Martin's Press.

Scholte, J. A. (2002). What is globalisation? The definitional issues – again. *CSGR Working Paper*, No. 109/02.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human conditions have failed*. Yale University Press.

*M. E. Dickson & O. E. Atakpa*

Seers, D. (1969). The meaning of development. Paper presented at the Eleventh World Conference of the Society for International Development, New Delhi.

Shangquan, G. (2000). Economic globalisation: Trends, risk, and risk prevention. *CDP Background Paper*.

Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139058225>

Strange, G. (2014). *Towards a new political economy of development: States and regions in the post-neoliberal world*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Thirlwall, A. P. (1983). *Growth and development with special reference to developing economies*. Macmillan Education Ltd.

Todaro, M. P. (1979). *Economics of the developing world*. Longman Group Ltd.

Torado, D. (2003). *Development in historical perspective, populism, nationalism and industrialization*. Dictman.

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2003). *Economic development* (8th ed.). Pearson Education India.

Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.

Yusuf, H. E., & Yusuf, A. A. (2013). Transcending an elitist approach and making a paradigm shift from growth without development to “populist” development. In T. Falola & J. Achberger (Eds.), *The political economy of development and underdevelopment in Africa* (pp. 311-341). Routledge.