

Globalisation and Nigeria's Development: A New Order of Marginalization and Domination

Rose Nkechi Nwankwo
Department Of Public Administration,
Federal Polytechnic Oko.
Anambra State, Nigeria
Email: rosenwankwo@gmail.com

Abstract

The majority of the poor people live in rural areas of Africa. Lack of political commitment and public support programs for rural development are major hurdles of poverty reduction in this continent. The rural poor people experience very little access to credit, land and extension services. This study examines the processes, dimensions and consequences of globalization on Nigeria's beleaguered development process. We noted, inter-alia, that the expansion of capitalism and the integration of the world economy into one capitalist entity entrenched globalization. Our investigations derived its analytic and theoretical foundation from the dependency paradigm. This enabled us determine the asymmetric power relationship between Nigeria and developed countries of the North in the global political economy. The paper found that the dynamics of transnational structure of power is most unfavorable to Nigeria's political economy considering the fact that, the activities of the agents of globalization go beyond mere economic exploits to affecting policy formulation and implementation. For instance, most of the far-reaching socioeconomic reforms, characterized by the ascendancy of market ideology, foisted on Nigeria by industrialized capitalist countries' controlled World Bank and IMF, have not transformed the nation's economy. We conclude that this explains why Nigeria has, for several decades, continued to grope in political and economic crises, only relying on 'instruction and expert advice' from Western countries for elusive solutions. It is recommended that, if Nigeria must benefit from the present global political economy, the country's domestic economic and political structures must be strengthened.

Key words: Globalization, Nigeria, Marginalization, Domination, Political Economy

1. Introduction

Globalization has become the focus of extensive debate and scholarship regarding the "Third World" that emerged in the context of half a millennium of European expansion. It is a slippery and elusive concept. Although the Third World is increasingly differentiated internally, it has suffered the multiple impacts of colonialism and comparative poverty. A recent intensification of global processes has been marked by technological advances in communication, rapid movement of financial capital, growth of supranational legal and political institutions and advocacy networks; and sometimes extreme destabilization of families, historical identities, and communities. It is a process of global economic, political and cultural integration. It has made the world become a small village; the borders have been broken down between countries. "The history of globalization

goes back to the second half of the twentieth century, the development of transport and communication technology led to situation where national borders appeared to be too limiting for economic activity" (Economic Globalization in Developing Countries, 2002).

Despite intensifying interest in the phenomenon of globalization since the 1980s the term is still used to refer, variously, to a process, a policy, a market strategy, a predicament or even an ideology. The problem with globalization is that it is not so much an 'it' as a 'them': it is not a single process but a complex of processes, sometimes overlapping and interlocking processes but also, at times, contradictory and oppositional ones. It is difficult therefore to reduce globalization to a single theme (Heywood 2007, 143). Perhaps the best attempt to do this was in Kenichi Ohmae's (1989) idea of 'borderless world'. This not only refers to the tendency of traditional political borders, based on national and state boundaries, to become permeable; it also implies that divisions between people previously separated by time and space have become less significant and are sometimes entirely irrelevant.

However, the present international system is dominated by various tendencies of globalization. Former President Olusegun Obasanjo in Madunagu (1993:53) once described globalization as 'a fact of life and a reality of the new age'. Factors that brought about this phenomenon are controversial, but one important and fundamental influence in this direction is economic and technological changes (Fidelis, 2002). Behind the current wave of globalization are forces of trade, labour, capital flow, communication technology, investment and movement of people and culture across national boundaries. Therefore, any attempt at understanding the present character and orientation of the Nigerian State, its leadership, economic direction and development efforts must be done within the context of the impacts of globalization.

Globalization is often conceived as the increasing integration of world economic activities made possible by improvement in technology and means of communication in which the nation-state becomes increasingly weakened and subsumed under the forces of market (Ntete-Nna, 2004:276). It is the move towards a global economy in which national boundaries cease to matter given that it is rapidly developing process of complex interconnections between societies, cultures, institutions, governments, and individuals worldwide. This definition is suggestive of globalization being a product of systematic integration of autonomous economies into a global

system of production and distribution. As Ntete- Nna (2004:268) observed, globalization is part of the process of the internationalization of capital or the continuous expansion of the global economy'.

Globalization describes the environment in the contemporary world in which peoples and nations have become closer than before. It also describes the process of expanding the nexus and interdependence of peoples with different social, economic and political backgrounds. This is why scholars such as Akani (2004), Oyeboade (2002) and Tamuno (2006) have argued that it is a complex phenomenon which explains rapid changes of contemporary world. In every sector, globalization introduced changes that made the world a global village. Although the impact of globalization is widespread, deep and complex, it is contentious whether or not the phenomenon is beneficial to all peoples and nations. In particular, scholars in the Third World are divided on the benefits of globalization for the development of their countries. For instance, Akani (2004:17) categorically stated that the changes brought about by globalization has not affected and does not have the prospects of affecting all countries equally.

It is, therefore, important to examine the position, dimensions, benefits and weaknesses of globalization in the emerging world order, especially as it affects weaker countries like Nigeria. The challenge for us, in this paper, is to evaluate the phenomenon, assess Nigeria is performing in the global environment and deduce its implications on the nation's political economy.

2 Theoretical Framework

In this study, we adopted dependency theory as our theoretical framework of analysis. This is for simple reason that it would be naive to analyze globalization and contemporary issues of political economy in Nigeria without placing the country squarely in the context of the increasing interdependent, yet highly unequal, global economy.

Dependency theory which understandably, has its proponents as Third World scholars was propounded in the 1960s and pieced together by writ such as Sunkel (1972), Furtado (19:7, Cardoso and Faletto (1979), Dos Santos. (1970). It was popularized by the writings of Andre Gunder Frank (1969) in his work entitled, *The Development of Underdevelopment*. Later scholars like Walter Rodney (1972), Samir Amin (1976), Daniel Offiong (1980) and Claude Ake (1981),

located African underdevelopment within the context of the global capitalist system and the incorporation of African economy into the global economic system. Their basic proposition is that African underdevelopment and those of other Third World nations is the result of its incorporation into, and subsequently peripheralisation within an exploitative and hostile international economy dominated by crass capitalism (Eremie 1998:15). These views are diametrically opposed to those of the modernization theorists, dominated by Euro-American social scientists.

The basic thesis of the dependency school is that development and underdevelopment are interdependent structures within the global economic system. The relationship between centre and periphery, according to Dos Santos (1970) in Peet (1991:45), assumes the form of a dependence in which some countries (the dominant) achieve self- sustaining growth while others (the dependent) can grow only as a reflection of the dominant countries. Dos Santos captures dependency as 'a situation in which the economy of some countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected'. Frank (1969) on his part, posits that, under development in the periphery is generated by the same process which develops the centre. In other words, underdevelopment in the periphery results from the loss of surplus which is expropriated for investment and development in the centre. The summary of Dos Santos and Frank's theses conveys an impression that the two zones of the world economy are linked together in an exploitative relationship in which wealth is drained away from the periphery to the centre. Secondly, it alludes to the fact that, it is the location of these countries within the structure of the capitalist world economy that constrains their behaviour and determines patterns of interaction and domination between them.

Dependency theorists hold a common view that, it is not valid to discuss the underdevelopment of Third World countries in isolation from the development of advanced societies. They also suggested that it is necessary to treat the world as a single system and to analyse or look at the manners and ways in which Third World countries were incorporated into the global economic system. They maintained that it is this incorporation of the Third World countries into the global capitalist system that is the root of their underdevelopment. This is probably why; Blomstrom and Hettne (1984:76) argued that dependency theory is holistic, in that it attempts to place a country into the larger (global) system.

Dependency theorists believed that without a major restructuring of the international economy, Third World countries would find it virtually impossible to extricate from their subordinate position and experience real growth and development. In other words, so long as Third World countries remain tied to the apron strings of global capitalism, they will remain underdeveloped. Therefore, dependency theorists, led by Frank (1969) suggested that, for the Third World countries to achieve development, they must de-link from the global capitalist system as that system not only hinder their development but depend on their (Third World) conditions of underdevelopment.

The basic weakness of dependency theory is explained by Fidelis (2002:5) when he opined that 'the political is sidelined for the economic in its analysis'. He contends that the nature of governments, political parties, elections etc., have been examined from the dimensions of the 'internationalist capitalist order' only.

Dependency theory, in this study, will guide us to determine the asymmetric power relationship between Nigeria and developed countries of the North in the present world order. The thrust of the theory is that international economy, driven by capitalism, is characterized by inequalities, exploitation, domination and oppression. Through international interactions, the socio-economic and political structure of states in the periphery is subordinated, through the forces of globalization, to foster the economic interests and requirements of states in the center. Thus, the theory is used to offer explanation of how globalization, in the form of the activities of international capitalism, shapes the structure and character of Nigeria's political economy.

3 Debates and Theories of Globalization

There are two contending opinions on the issue of globalization. Some observers believe that globalization has brought development to Third World countries while others argue that globalization serves the needs of the metropolitan countries at the expense of the peripheral countries. Opponents of globalization believe that it revives the dependency theory of past decades. According to Amadi (2003:44) 'the systems of rigged rules of trade, coercive economic institutions and policy discrimination against developing countries' are obvious in globalization as they were in the colonialism and imperialism of the past. Proponents of globalization hold the view that globalization has enhanced the interchange of ideas and the frequency of interactions among

peoples of the world. But Aaron (2001:20) opines that the exchange brought by globalization have meant 'stupendous wealth for a few countries and wrenching poverty for majority of mankind'. This implies globalization has enabled - concentration of global wealth in few, hands and countries. Oyebode (2000:204) summarizes the adverse effects globalization by submitting that;

Globalization is merely a new form of an old phenomenon-imperialism. While the rich industrialized countries are happy with and rejoice in globalization, it should be seen as serving to entrench the skewed terms of trade between the North and South, based on the historical lopsided international division of labor which sentenced the peripheral parts of the world economy to the labyrinths of poverty and underdevelopment while the metropolitan countries continue to bask in affluence, power, influence and privilege.

The above submission provides the need to examine the extent to which Third World nations have been involved in the globalization trend. The globalization trend according to Oyebode, is skewed against states in the South.

As globalization debate continues, Nnoli (2003:24) confirmed that its reality makes it impossible to argue that boundaries of sovereign States impermeable as state boundaries are n clearly permeable'. Consequently, globalization has resulted in fc phenomenon of what Nnoli refers 'penetrated society' where 'foreigners participate directly in local politics instead of indirectly through external relations'. He emphasized that this 'transnational form of politics' has become a significant mode of internal affairs such that sovereign states only retains the form but not the substance of its 'Westphalia existence'. In this wise, Iyayi (2004:24) has provided a more elaborated definition of globalization as:

a process of expanding a certain form of economic practice and hence culture to all comers of the globe on terms and conditions arranged by and favorable to leading capitalist countries, organizations, institutions and individual capitalists. In today's unipolar world of American domination, globalization means very simply the 'Americanization' of the world.

Some scholars who drew inspiration from the theses of Afiana (2004), Nnoliand Iyayi (2004) have argued that globalization reflects widespread perception that the world is rapidly being moulded into a shared social space by political, economic and technological forces. But for Olubamise

(2003:40) this linkage, interconnectedness and interrelationship of countries is also associated with a 'sense of political fatalism and chronic insecurity' in that the sheer scale of contemporary political, social and economic changes appear to 'outstrip the capacity of national governments or citizens to control, contest or resist that change'. The limits of national politics, in other words, are 'forcefully suggested by globalization'.

Many questions have been raised on how globalization penetrated the political, economic and ideological space of Nigeria and how it manifests. Madunagu (1999:53) traces the penetration of globalization to the abuse of credit facilities by Nigerian leaders and the use of credit by donors in the exercise of political power leading to the debt burden. Madunagu revealed that:

The Nigeria, ruling classes, in collusion with the imperialists and in pursuit of private capitalist accumulation, devastated the economy and accumulated huge debts. When they could not, longer manage the economy or repay the debts, or even the interests on them, the ruling classes went to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The 'prescriptions' handed to the ruling class are liberalization, commercialization and privatization with a model of 'democratization' that advances the course of neo-liberalism. Onah and Nyewusira (2006) identified these policies and debt overhang as the cause of Nigeria's increasing marginalization in the world economy.

The inter-connectedness of the human race across the globe and the use of modern technology to communicate have the potential to improve quality of life for all. But Adekunle (2004:10) posits that the potentials of globalization in improving quality of life will depend on whose vision defines globalization and whose interests it serves'. Adekunle argued further that in several instances, globalization also leads to increasing exploitation, greater gaps between the rich and the poor (globally and within nation-states), and less freedom for individuals and communities to act in their respective interests. No wonder Aina (1996) in Tamuno (2006:33) stated that globalization is about 'exploitation, accumulation, inequality and polarization' in world politics.

Against the above, Adekunle (2004) contends that the globalization driven by International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and World Trade Organization play major roles in inducing developing countries, especially in the African continent, to adhere to economic policies that

conform to 'free market' vision in exchange for loans, investments, development funds, and negotiation of debt repayments. In line with these policies, many developing countries are now selling off public enterprises to private sector and multinational companies such that basic social services as education, transport, water and health are now driven by profit for a few shareholders rather than interests of the broader society. Adekunle concludes that:

Politicians, 'money bags' and multinationals with the resources are often the beneficiaries of these sales of public assets, and of the latter, the profits are repatriated to their various home countries, so that the country in which they now operate does not experience the full benefits except for a few local elite with whom the multinational enters into partners.

This is, perhaps, why Madunagu (1999) describes privatization that goes with globalization as 'appropriate, through stealing, fraud or legal subterfuge, what belongs to the community or society as a whole'. The result is that Nigerians, as a community, lost virtually all resources to a few individuals who are in partnership with the 'globalist'.

Nwogwugwu (2007:60) corroborates the impact of globalization-driven privatization when she averred that:

It had led to job losses in previously run State enterprises, the concentration of immense wealth in a few hands and has widened the gap between the haves and have-nots. Worst of all, the privatization programme has contributed to the creation of near monopolies and oligopolies in certain sectors of the economy.

The submissions of Madunagu and Nwogwugwu may have explained why Kema (2005:1) described globalization as 'economic terrorism'. In the present globalization, the capitalists are united across borders and consolidate their entrenched power through the production of social knowledge, through the agency of trained economists and policy experts in multinational institutions and state agencies. The transnational capitalist class is not domiciled in any particular country, but works to undermine the welfare of the working class in the world (Amadi, 2003:44). In fact, globalization makes it possible for the powerful international corporations to have unfettered freedom to operate anywhere around the globe, without any limitation by the policies of host nations, irrespective of the consequences of their operation to the interests of the host

nations (Obadina 1998:32). Thus, the present globalization, in economic and political terms, prescribes 'a regulatory, not a participant State' that only sets the basic rules of 'free exchange', leaving the market to allocate resources and values.

While arguing that the hostility of some developing countries towards globalization is misplaced, especially on the issue of imbalance in the development index which determines a nation's performance in the global market, Kolodko (2004:52) maintained that globalization brings about 'new trends, new opportunities and possibilities' if national leaders, intellectuals and businessmen take advantage of the benefits of globalization, such as new technologies, new managerial skills and foreign capital. Kolodko, however, admitted that some countries are in a better position to reap from globalization because of 'legacy of the past, culture component, and geo-political position'. From this perspective, the poor political leadership, inefficient bureaucracy and weak domestic political institutions in Nigeria may deny the country the capacity to benefit from globalization. Accordingly, Kolodko (2004:52) posits that:

How good the game of globalization is depends on the quality of the institution, quality of strategy for development, quality of political leadership at a given time ... if there are weak institutions or lousy policies, lack of interests in investing in infrastructure, in human capital, in education, there is no way globalization will be of benefit.

This is, perhaps, why it is accepted that one apt image of globalization is that of a train and the countries of the global village it is connecting are either on or out of it. Regrettably, Olubemise (2005:40) noted that 'globalization train is overrunning Nigeria'.

The reality of asymmetric globalization, as we discussed above, has opened up a debate among social scientists as to whether globalization is the cause or cure of underdevelopment, especially in Africa. In this context, Adekunle (2004) observes that globalization that imposes 'free market' and 'free trade' vision assumes that every country starts on an equal basis and there is, therefore, a 'level playing field' for all States to compete in the global market. This assumption is grossly misplaced. The fact is that a few countries, many of which grew wealthy from their colonial legacy of primitive accumulation, are able to compete much more effectively than poorer countries, many of whose present underdevelopment is rooted in colonial exploitation (Orij, 2000).

Amadi (2003:44) identified Stiglitz (2001), Rodrick (2002) and Birdall (2002) as some Western economists that hold the view that globalization has not benefited Africa. These economists fault the soundness of the reform policies forced on African States by International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. According to Rodrick (2002) in Amadi (2003) 'the bad returns to economic policy reforms in Africa are failure of market fundamentals, not of economic sciences'. On the other hand, proponents of globalization have explained Africa's underdevelopment in a 'globalized world' in terms of 'lack of significant openness and application of wrong policies' (Okanna 2001). An obvious point made by Amadi is that globalization is 'constructed by powerful interests to ratify and legitimise self-serving modes of social organization'. This position is complemented by Stiglitz (2001) in Amadi (2003) in the remarks that globalization is 'the driver of neoliberal reform policies and a structured ideological response from an organized corporate and technocratic class whose interests are well served asymmetrical opportunities and outcomes of global capitalism'.

The earlier submissions of Afiana (2004) and Kolodko (2004) depict pictures of optimism about the globalization process. Open competition and the possibility of benefiting from doing business in a global market seem to be worthwhile benefits of globalization. Even Efemini (2003:100) acknowledges that globalization creates 'an efficiency norm' using the instrument of competition. But the views of Ake (1996) on globalization show that the phenomenon reinforces the existing structural division of labour in the world economy. This partly explains why globalization is likely to pose more threats for Africa in the present circumstances. Ake (1996:6) restates the point in the following words:

Globalization is uneven in its impact. It produces winners and losers. For it is not Hausa that is globalized but English, not Togolese technology but American and Japanese. The trajectory of the financial flows which fuels the global economy is well known.

The point about concentrating power and marginalizing the poor is the crux of Ake's thesis. Efemini (2003:100) supports Ake's position when he stated that the process of globalization 'produces winners and losers' and creates 'abstract opportunities for all countries to compete and develop, while creating a concrete situation of domination'. Efemini restates the point when he submitted that the ideology of globalization is the 'universalization of market'. Such universalization, according to Efemini, has often implied the 'loss of autonomy of nations in taking

decisions on the control of their local economies'. One remarkable outcome of this universalization is again offered by Efemini in the remarks that 'the fortunes of countries are automatically dependent on the quality, quantity and crucial nature of products for the markets'. This is what creates a situation of 'winners and losers'. In like manner, Okafor (2006:37) admits that globalization, as a term, has acquired 'considerable emotive force' that is viewed as 'a key to future world economic development' in some quarters while others regard it with 'hostility and even fear'. In simple political economy terms, Tomlinson (1996:22) admits that globalization is a process 'which distributes its benefits' and its risks unevenly'.

From the foregoing, the very idea animating the concept of globalization shows that it is a system of relations or multiplicity of linkages among States and societies with different magnitude of power, which make up the present world system.

4 Nigeria and Globalization

One major feature of the new globalization is the increasing powerlessness of Third World countries, at least, as far as regulating the movement of information, ideas, capital and even skills is concerned (Ihonvbere, 2004:522). This has brought about a tendency to present the vintage position of the Western world as reflective of, and representative of the conditions of poor, dominated, and underdeveloped nations. This study reveals that, in most of the template that direct globalization, Africa including Nigeria, is hardly considered or taken seriously. In other words, this paper agrees with Toyo (2000) that globalization is an 'imperial policy'. Most of the far-reaching socio-economic and political reforms which African governments have been forced to adopt, according to Ihonvbere (2004:524) 'have served, in no small measure, to erode the autonomy and sovereignty of African States'. He summed his position thus;

The combination of externally designed, imposed and supervised political and economic conditionalities structural adjustment and political pluralism is part of the conditions determining Africa's integration into the emerging global order, as a dependent, vulnerable, weak, dominated, and almost helpless periphery actor in the new division of labour and power.

The phenomenon of globalization is nothing but a new order of exploitation, domination and marginalization of Nigeria. It's externally generated and directed policies, rather than engendering

new ideas and development orientation in Nigeria, subverts her autonomy and powers of self-determination. In fact, globalization establishes the ascendancy and authority of Western capitalism over Nigeria.

The study also finds that globalization is one of the changes or developments that is currently affecting 'the physiology of human society', especially in Third World countries, such as Nigeria, through its imposition of constraints on the policy-making autonomy or independence of member states *vis-a-vis* their capacities for the authoritative allocation of scarce and critical societal values. As Akindele *et al* (2002:13) noted, globalization changes 'the determinism of the State, its actions and inactions'. It also influences the way in which major institutional actors think and operate. In several instances, globalization has led to the adoption of economic and political policies that emphasizes reduction in public sector expenditure. These policies affect the delivery of public good within Nigeria's political system. This is disturbing in Nigeria which, according to Ikpendu (2006:34), is 'a victim of public policy manipulation and external domination' considering the fact that:

The Nigerian government seem to have lost control of the policy making process, and are under pressure to accept dictations from creditor nations and financial institutions. Nigerian government now tend to discuss development issues less with their nationals, and more with donors and creditors, multinational corporations and other rapacious instruments of globalization.

As a result of the monopolization of decision-making processes by Western countries, global policies have mainly driven and responded to the needs, values, and interests of the developed countries. Hence, it is difficult to identify Nigeria' as a distinct political identity with autonomous decision making power in the pursuit of national objectives. In other words, democratic decision-making process within political institutions is censored (Kura, 2005:1). This, indeed, explains why the International Monetary Fund (IMF) issued a query to Nigeria in respect of over four hundred billion naira appropriated for capital expenditure in the 2001 budget, and why the IMF and World Bank (two institutions that are driving forces of globalization) contributed substantially in the drafting of Nigeria's budget in 2001 (Akindele *et al*, 2002).

Nigeria has been on World Bank- sponsored Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) since 1986. The harsh economic policy forced Nigeria to drastically reduce national expenditure on education. As a result, federal budgetary allocation to education has diminished considerably. Total federal budgetary allocation to education declined from 24.5 per cent in the 1970s to 8 per cent in 1996 and 7 per cent in 2001. It was the same trend in 2006 Appropriation Law, where the education sector got only N166.6 billion or 8.77 per cent of a total of XI.9 trillion, which is far below the recommended UNESCO standard (Asobie, 2007; Nyewusira, 2007). The table below shows that what Nigeria spends on education as a proportion of Gross National Product is lower than that of any African country.

Table 1: Spending on Education as % of GNP, 2000

<i>Country</i>	<i>Spending on Education (% of GNP)</i>
Angola	4.9
Cote d'Ivoire	5.0
Ghana	4.2
Kenya	6.5
Malawi	5.4
South Africa	7.9
Tanzania	3.4
Uganda	2.6
Nigeria	0.76
Mozambique	4.1

Source: B. O. Ukeje, 'Financing Education in Nigeria' in Asobie (2007) *The World Bank and Education in Africa* p.43.

Asobie (2007: 43) stated that the reason why Nigeria spends less on education than all other African countries is because the regimes in Nigeria capitulate very easily to external dictates on matters of economic policies, in a manner that the governments of some other African countries might not.

Our findings show that the above trends have been largely dictated by the asymmetry of powers that accompany globalization. That is, inequality in the status of members of the 'globalised world' and inability of some to resist imposed policy options. This view is corroborated by Akindele *etal* (2002:8) in the submission that:

Nation-States in Africa today rarely define the rules and regulations of their economy, production, credits and exchange of goods and services due to the rampaging menace of globalization. They are hardly now capable of volitionally managing their political, economic and socio-cultural development; globalization has imposed heavy constraints on the internal management dynamics of most, if not all the polities in Africa.

This is most exemplified in Nigeria where the government finds it difficult, in most cases, to meet the genuine demand' of the masses on many issues of national urgency. The reality in Nigeria today is that globalization has made it difficult for government to perform 'positive functions', which is everywhere a primary duty of the State. Raphael (1976) in Nyewusira and Nweke (2007:33) writes that the 'positive function' of the State is to promote general welfare and maximize social goals in the society. Such welfare functions include providing food, houses, medical care, education, water, roads, electricity, transportation services and employment. According to Nwosu (2005), the provision of these services has helped many developed nations to 'maintain social cohesion and domestic political support'. This study reveals that the said 'social cohesion and domestic political support' is lacking in Nigeria due to the inability of the State to perform 'positive functions'.

The political history of Nigeria shows that the country from independence in 1960 was under non-democratic government for over twenty-five years. Successive military regimes turned governance into 'banditry, looting and outright criminality' (Agbese, 2000). The cumulative impact of policy inconsistency, graft and corruption, economic mismanagement, arrogance of power and lack of commitment to democracy and democratic values displayed by successive military regimes had devastating consequences on the political economy of Nigeria. During these periods of autocratic regimes, especially under the military regime of General Ibrahim Babangida, Nigeria had no pressures from her 'global partners' to return the country to democratic rule, despite dissents from within. While Nigeria was engulfed in crises of governance for almost two consecutive decades, the international economic institutions and multinational corporations continued to 'trade' with the country not minding the destruction of Nigeria's political psyche by the military. This is why Kura (2005) believes that global actors and institutions conspired either out of commission or omission to engender a longer period of military dictatorship in Nigeria. It is also the opinion of several human right groups and civil society organizations that globalization unleashed on Nigeria

political crises of cataclysmic dimensions. The abdication of the role of globalization in democratization in Nigeria in the 1980s and 1990s is also described by Kura (2004) as 'a failure of globalization'. It is the findings of this study that the 'globalized world', its forces and institutions, could not mount any pressure on military institution in Nigeria because the military regimes 'succeeded' in launching the country into the global networks. It is instructive to note that the integration of Nigeria into global political economy with dependent and peripheral status, has not changed the political terrain of governance in Nigeria, even under democratic regime. In the final analysis, globalization and its forces 'eclipsed the dreams of Nigeria's founding fathers (Akani, 2004) and 'eroded the development prospects that heralded Nigeria's independence in 1960' (Nyewusira, 2007).

5 Conclusion

The central thesis of our study is that globalization is a new order of marginalization, exploitation, domination, control and decolonization in a 'neo-colonial fashion' of the Nigerian State. It is presently implemented with and conditioned by colonial and neocolonial tendencies. The changing phases of globalization show that its central and primary focus is to exploit Nigeria's resources, disintegrate its economies, weaken its political processes and incorporate her into the international capitalist system. In other words, the essence of the construction of globalization is to entrench the dependency of Third World countries, such as Nigeria, to capitalist centres in the North. It is indeed the maturation of Nigeria's exploitation and dependence which dates back to decades of slavery and colonialism.

The dynamics of globalization shows that no nation can extricate itself from the forces of globalization. But for any country to benefit from it, its domestic economic and political structure must be strengthened. China and India are two examples of emerging economies which have performed well under the forces of globalization. These countries concentrated their energies in building strong domestic economic structures, minimized corruption of public officials and created sustainable institutions. Today, their goods and services compete favourably in the global economy. In contrast, Nigeria, at present lacks adequate physical and social infrastructure as well as strong institutions; such that it is categorized as 'fragile' and 'failing' state.

Because globalization is 'a fact of life and a reality of the new age', Nigeria cannot opt out of the process. But for Nigeria to engage the world without policy framework based on an in-depth and interpretative understanding of the structures and processes of the global economic and political order is to ignore the very idea animating the concept of globalization. Therefore, until the mission of globalization is understood and, properly discerned, globalization will continue to make the Nigerian State vulnerable to the vagaries of external manipulation, such that the capacity of government to manage the whole process of statecraft will be severely eroded. The most likely consequences will be an eruption of legitimacy crises for the government and the turning of the country into a 'theatre of chaos and anarchy'.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, K. (2001). 'Playing without the Kits: Towards a Beneficial Participation of Africa in a Globalised World'. *Annals of the Social Science Academy of Nigeria*. No. 13 (January-December).
- Adekunle, T. (2004). 'Globalization and Cultural Diversity in Africa'. *This Day*, September 18.
- Afiana, L. (2004). 'Globalization and Industrial Development in Nigeria'. *This Day*, October 5.
- Agbese, D. (2000). *Fellow Nigerians: Turning Points in the Political History of Nigeria*. Ibadan: Umbrella Books.
- 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. (1996). *The Marginalization of Africa: Notes on a Productive Confusion*. Lagos: Malthouse.
- Akindede S.T. *et al* (2002). 'Globalization, Its Implication and Consequences for Africa' <http://www.globalizationandpoliticaldevelopment.org>.
- Amadi, S. (2003). 'Globalization and the African Challenge'. *This Day* July 23.
- Asobie, A. (2007). 'The World Bank and Education in Africa; Implications for Peace and Development: The Nigerian Experience' in C. Akani (ed). *Africa in the 21st Century*. Port-Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- Blomstorm, M. & Hettne, B. (1984). *Development Theory in Transition*. London: Zed Books.
- Efemini, A. (2003). *Claude Ake's Philosophy of Development: Implications for Nigeria*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press Ltd.
- 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.
- Fidelis, A. (2002). *The Economic in Political Freedom: Selected Issues in African Politics*. Uyo: Abigab.
- Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics*, 3rd edition. London: Palgrave MacMillan
- Ibeanu, O. (2008). 'Affluence and Application: The Niger Delta as a Critique of Political Science in Nigeria'. Nsukka: University of Nigeria Senate Ceremonial Committee.
- Ihonvbere, J. (2004). 'Nigeria in The New World Order: Implications and Options for the 21st Century in Bello-Imam, & Obadan, M. (eds) *Democratic Governance and Development Management in Nigeria's Fourth Public (1999-2003)*. Ibadan: JODAD Publishers.
- Ikpendu, C. (2006). 'The South in the Globalization Era'. *Daily Independent*. September 21.
- Iyayi, F. (2004). 'Globalization, The Nigerian Economy and Peace' In Akani, C. (ed) *Globalization and the Peoples of Africa*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co.
- Kema, I. (2005). 'Globalization and the Development of Underdevelopment in the Third World' *Journal of Third World Studies*. Vol.2, No. 1
- Kolodoko, A. (2004). '*Globalization and Catching-up in Emerging Market Economies*'. *This Day*,

July 28.

- Kura, S. (2005). 'Globalization and Democracy: A Dialectical Framework for Understanding Democracy in Nigeria'. <http://www.globalisation.org>
- Madunagu, E. (1999). 'Globalization and Its Victims'. The Guardian, July 26.
- Nnoli, O. (2003). Introduction to Politics. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd.
- Ntete-Nna, N. (2004). Contemporary Political Analysis: An Introduction. Owerri: Springfield Publishers Ltd.
- Nwogwugwu, I. (2007). 'Has privatization Gone Awry'. This Day, July 11.
- Nyewusira, V. & Nweke, K. (2007). 'The Political Economy of Privatisation Policy in Nigeria'. Nigerian Journal of Educational Management 4(4).
- Nyewusira, V. (2007). 'Selected Socio-Political Issues in Nigeria: Religious Institutions as agents of Change' Journal of Pedagogy and Educational Development. 12(1).
- Obadina, T. (1998). 'Globalization Human Rights and Development' Africa Today, October.
- Okafor, E. (2000). 'Globalization, Casualization and Implications for manpower Development in Oil and Gas Sector in Nigeria'. Journal of International Politics and Development Studies. 2(1).
- Okanna, S. (2001). 'Globalization of Telecommunication'. The Punch, November 11.
- Olubamise, B. (2003). 'Globalization, Human Rights and Development'. Thisday, May 21.
- Olubamise, B. (2005). 'How Globalization Train is overriding Nigeria'. This Day, January 26.
- Onah, F. & Nyewusira, V. (2006). 'Foreign Debt Conundrum and Nigeria's Socio-Economic Development': Journal of International Politics and Development Studies. 2(1).
- Oyebode, A. (2000). 'External Impera' in Oseni T, Sambo, A. and Samuel K (eds) *Nigeria: Path to sustainable Democracy*. Lagos: Obafemi Awolowo Foundation.
- Peet, R. (1991). *Global Capitalism: Subversion on the Environment* Mo: London: Routledge.
- Tamuno, S. (2006). *Globalization: A New Concept for an Old World Order*: Port Harcourt: Publications Coy.
- Tomlinson, J. (1996). 'Cultural Global: Placing and Displacing The Wes: *European Journal of Development Re*: 8(2).
- Toyo, E. (2000). *Background to Global Ibadan*: Academic Staff Union of Universities.