



Globalization, Poverty and Development in Africa: The Nexus

¹Edmund A. Egbah, Ph.D., ²Okeke Martin Ifeanyi Mba, Ph.D, & ³Cornelius Chukwudi, Ph.D

¹Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

²Department of Political Science, Madonna University, Okija

³Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

Poverty, hunger and disease have today remained widespread in Africa. The worldwide promotion of neo-liberal economic policies since the 1980s and 1990s by global governance institutions has the more been accompanied by increasing inequalities within and between states. Within the Third World countries, the adverse impact of globalization has been more acutely felt as countries has been forced to adopt free market policies as a precondition for debt rescheduling and in the hope of attracting new investment to spur development. By and large, it is only in recent time that development scholars became better placed to engage with the interrelated issues of poverty, development and hunger in this era of globalization. This extended to influence the diplomatic world, where interest in these issues is necessary; spurred on by fears of terrorist threats and recognition of the uneven impact of globalization. This paper examined the interconnection between poverty, hunger, development and globalization. Theoretically it was anchored on the Liberal approach to politics. Analyzing these issues as they affect African countries vis-à-vis the other developed countries of the world in this era of globalization, the paper argued that globalization has led to African people losing their job in the local production process or as a long run effect, these local producers abandoning their own production as a result of lack of patronage in favour of foreign products; the domestic products in African countries being disrupted and consumer preferences in the importing countries changed in line with the cheap imports; export markets for the developed industrial countries in Europe being created; stress on the cash crop production resulting in the divorce towards export oriented, large scale, intensively mechanized productions; the African countries not being able to match these needs thereby leading to their GDP continually worsening with people living below poverty line increasing in the face of their underdevelopment. Yet, these African countries still co-exist with the European countries with developed market economy in the globalized world. The paper therefore concludes that Africa is faced with awesome development challenges and globalization accounts for this as Africa is thrown into a competitive situation with the west as an underdog. Equally is that if sub-Saharan African countries continue on their current course, it will take them another one hundred and fifty years to reach the millennium development goal (MDG) target of halving poverty and their underdevelopment situation continues to worsen.

Introduction

Poverty, hunger and disease have today remained widespread in Africa and women and girls continue to comprise the majority of the worst hit as they constitute the world's

poorest people. This situation is not peculiar to or confined to that part of the world that has been classified as the Third World. The worldwide promotion of neo-liberal economic policies since the 1980s and 1990s by global governance institutions has the more, been accompanied by increasing inequalities within and between states (Baylis, Smith and Owens, 2008:470). During this era in question, the Second World countries of the former Eastern bloc have been incorporated into the Third World configuration of states, and millions of people previously cushioned by the state have been thrown into poverty with the transition to market economies. In the developed (industrialized) world, rising social inequalities also characterized the social landscape within that period.

Within the Third World countries, the adverse impact of globalization has been more acutely felt as countries has been forced to adopt free market policies as a precondition for debt rescheduling and in the hope of attracting new investment to spur development. Gendered outcomes of these neo-liberal economic policies as observed through the global picture, (Buvinic, 1997:39), “is very mixed, with other factors such as class, race, ethnicity and religion contributing to local outcomes”.

Traditionally, studies in international political economic relations has focused on issues relating to inter-state economic conflict, and regarded security and development as separate areas. To this end, mainstream realist and liberal scholars neglected the challenges presented to human well-being by the existence of global underdevelopment. In the same perspective, dependency theorists were interested only in persistent and deepening inequality and relations between North and South, but they received little attention in the discipline.

Significantly, during the 1990s, intensified debate flourished, and several subfields on development agenda emerged which touched on matters of poverty, hunger and development, albeit tangentially (For instance, global environmental politics, gender and international political economy). More significant within the ‘90s also in raising within the discipline the concerns of the majority of humanity and states, were the contributions from post-colonial theorists, Marxist theorists (Hardt and Negril), scholars adopting a human security approach (Net, Thomas), and the few concerned directly with development (Saurin, Weber). At the beginning of the 21st century, development scholars became better placed to engage with the interrelated issues of poverty, development and hunger in this era of globalization. This extended to influence the diplomatic world, where interest in these issues is increasing, spurred on by fears of terrorist threats and recognition of the uneven impact of globalization (Thomas and Wilikin, 2004). This chapter is therefore concerned with an examination of the interconnection between poverty, hunger, development and globalization.



Theoretical Framework

The belief in the possibility of progress is one identifier of a Liberal approach to politics (Clark, 1989). Hence there is no general proposition that define the broad tradition of liberalism. Liberalism contends that the most effective systems of economic exchange is one that is largely market driven and not one that is subordinate to bureaucratic regulations and control, either domestically or internationally.

Although there are many writers who have tended to view Liberalism as a theory of government, what is becoming increasingly apparent is the explicit connection between Liberalism as a political and economic theory and liberalism as an international theory. Properly conceived, to the liberal thinkers - Jeremy Bentham, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, John and James Stuart Mills and Lucian Paine, liberal thought on a global scale embodies a domestic analogy operating at multiple levels. Although the character of states may differ, all states are accorded certain natural rights such as the generalized right to non interference in their domestic affairs. On another level, the domestic analogy refers to the extension of ideas that originated inside liberal states to the international realm such as the coordinating role played by institutions and the centrality of the rule of law to the idea of a just order (Ganor, 2005). In essence, the historical project of liberalism is the domestication of the international.

Liberalism is a theory of both government within states and good governance between states and peoples worldwide. Unlike realism which regards the international as an anarchic realm, Liberals seek to project values of order, liberty, justice and toleration into international relations (Kant 1991:104-5). The high-water mark of liberal thinking in international relations was reached in the inter-war period in the work of idealists who believe that warfare was an unnecessary and outmoded way of settling disputes between states and that the states should integrate and see themselves as one in a global village. More so, domestic and international institutions are required to protect and nurture these values; but notes that these values and institutions should allow for significant variations which accounts for the fact that there are heated debates within liberalism.

An important cleavage within liberalism which has become more pronounced in our globalized world is between those operating with a positive conception of liberalism, who advocate interventionist foreign policies and stronger international institutions to lead the globalization and intensification of the openness of state boundaries in all ramifications and those who incline towards a negative conception, who places a priority on toleration and non-interference on the basis that all states are not equal in capability and should be allowed to operate within their own capacity and confines Brown, Nartin and Rengger, (2002).

Early liberal thought on international relations took the view that the natural order has been corrupted by undemocratic state leaders and outdated policies such as the balance of power. Prescriptively, enlightenment liberals believed that a latent cosmopolitan morality could be achieved through the exercise of reason and through the creation of constitutional states (Smith, 1992). In addition, the unfettered movement of people and goods could further facilitate more peaceful international relations. Although there are important continuities between enlightenment liberal thoughts and 20th century ideas on the interconnectedness of states and the belief in the power of the world public opinion to tame the vicarious interest of states, liberalism was more pragmatic in solving these problems. In the thought of the idealists, the unbounded freedom of states is part of the problem of international relations and not part of the solutions. The two requirements that follow from this diagnosis are; first, the need for explicitly normative thinking on how to promote peace and build a better world in the African states in the face of globalization; and second, the need that African states must be part of the international organization or order on a relatively near equal basis and be bound by its rules and norms with comfort (Cox, Ikenberry and Inoguchi, (2000). The above have shown the fragmented nature of the international political community which is regularly expressed in terms of ethnic, linguistic or religious differences.

Critics of liberalism have argued that the universalizing mission of liberal values such as democracy, capitalism and secularism undermines the tradition and practice of non-western cultures (Gary, 1995:146). Also, that the emphasis on personal liberty, unfettered trade and the accumulation of property can negatively lend itself to a society ridden with inequality, suspicion and rivalry if globalized. Projecting this tension to a global stage leads to two possibilities for liberalism in the era of globalization. Pulling in the opposite direction, Liberalism contains within it a set of values that seek to provide for the conditions of a just society through democratic institutions and welfare-oriented economies strengthened by the interconnectedness and openness of states (Rhodes, 2003). Hence African states in the midst of globalization expects from the neo-liberal a society where relatively weak institutions try



to respond to the challenges of coordinating the behaviour of states in a decentralized international order. In this world therefore, economic growth is unevenly distributed where African states are at a disadvantage (Hoffman, 2006). As a consequence, preventive actions should remain an ever-present possibility in a liberalized world in order to deal with chaos and violence produced by dispossessed communities and networks. This is equally to be achieved in among African states by strengthening and making international institutions to which they are linked with, more democratic and accountable for the negative consequences of globalization.

The Issue of Poverty

Different conceptions of poverty underpin the mainstream and alternative views of development. There is basic agreement on the material aspects of poverty, such as lack of food, clean water, and sanitation, but disagreement on the importance of non-material aspects. Also, key differences has emerged on how material needs should be met, and hence the goal of development (Baylis, Smith and Owens, 2008:471). Most governments, national and international institutions and organizations in Africa just as many elsewhere around the world adhere to the orthodox conception of poverty. This refers to a situation where people do not have money to buy adequate food or satisfy other basic needs, and are often classified as unemployed or underemployed. This mainstream understanding of poverty based on money has arisen as a result of the globalization of Western culture and the attendant expansion of the market. Therefore, a community which provides for itself outside monetized cash transactions and wage labour, such as a hunter-gatherer pygmy group, is regarded as poor. In this regard, poverty is seen as an economic condition dependent on cash transactions in the market-place for its eradication. These transactions in turn are dependent on development defined as economic growth. Mistakenly, this is now an economic yardstick that is used to measure and judge all societies.

Poverty apparently may be difficult to define. This is because different people tend to have different perceptions of the concept. Hence two issues are often uppermost in the attempt to define poverty. These include the question of; (a) who are the poor? (b) at what level is poverty defined? These questions therefore show that poverty is a multidimensional concept. Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (2001) reports that poverty

encompasses different dimension of deprivation that relate to human capabilities, including consumption and food security, health, education, rights, voice, security, dignity and decent work. Rocha (2017) avers that the ample variety of poverty situation worldwide has led to an equally large number of essays in terms of its definition, measurement, and policies. Also, Maxwell (2016) observes that the complexity of measurement mirrors the complexity of definition. This complexity increases where participatory methods are used and people define their own indicators of poverty. Hulme and Mosley (2016) therefore explain that the definition of what is meant by ‘poverty’, how it might be explained and who constitute ‘the poor’ are fiercely contested issues.

The Copenhagen Declaration of 1995 seems to shed more light on what really constitutes poverty when it assists:

Poverty has various manifestations including lack of income and productive resources sufficient to ensure sustainable livelihood, hunger and malnutrition, ill health; limited or lack of access to education and other basic services; increase morbidity and mortality from illness, homelessness and inadequate housing; unsafe environments; social discriminations and exclusion. It is also characterized by a lack of participation in decision and in civil, social and culture life, (Edoh, 2013:68).

The definition by Adejo (2016) is equally relevant here. To him, poverty can be manifested in poverty of history, poverty of intellect and poverty of ideology. In any case and in whatever forms it manifest, the deprived are usually the poor. These are people of insufficient income, inadequate food intake, which lack basic healthcare, shelter and safe drinking water, poor environmental cleanliness, access to basic education and skills, ignorant of fundamental human rights, and access to information. These are not all and cannot comprehensively define the poor.

The above expositions there brings to the fore why at the heart of the debate about defining poverty stands the question of whether poverty is largely about material needs or whether it is about a much broader set of needs as listed above that permit well-being (Hulme and Mosley, 2016). The definitions by those who have looked at it from the Income/Expenditure perspective, concentrates on the measurement of consumption, usually by using the Income as a surrogate. The use of the income-poverty approach or the poverty line has often been strengthened by the fact that majority of national governments and



development agencies use the concept for their analysis of poverty and anti-poverty policies (Maxwell, 2016; Garba, 2006).

Poverty has widely been regarded as characterizing the Third World generally and African countries in particular. This informed the emergence of an approach whereby it is seen as incumbent upon the developed countries to ‘help’ Africa and the Third World eradicate poverty and increasingly address its scourge especially on women and children who has been seen as the most vulnerable. The World Bank (2000:15), had this to say, “Developed countries have regarded poverty as being something external to them and a defining feature of the Third World. This view has provided justification for the former to help ‘develop’ the latter by promoting their further integration into the global market”. Interestingly however, as globalization has intensified, poverty defined in such economic terms has come to characterize significant sectors of population not only in Africa and the Third World but also in advanced developed countries such as the United States of America, (Bello, 1994).

Critical alternative views of poverty exist in other cultures where the emphasis is not simply on money, but on spiritual value, community ties, and availability of common resources. In additional subsistence methods, a common strategy for survival is provision for oneself and one’s family through community-regulated access to common water, land, and fodder. The autonomy characteristic of such methods may be highly valued by those who have traditionally practiced them. Indeed, some such methods have been sustained over thousands of years but for many people in even developing world the ability to provide for oneself and one’s family may be preferable to dependence on an unpredictable market and/or an unreliable government.

Other assertions on poverty have emanated from within Western society also. As an instance, it has been asserted that our emphasis on monetary values has led to the creation of ‘a system of production that ravishes nature and a society that mutilates man’ (Schumacher, 2013). The issue of poverty and the challenges of poverty alleviation moved up the global political agenda with the UN’s first Millennium Development Goals. While World Bank figures for the 1990s showed a global improvement in reducing the number of people living on less than one dollar a day (its orthodox measurement of extreme poverty), the picture was

uneven as in sub-Saharan Africa the situation deteriorated, and elsewhere in the Latin America and some Middle East states, the picture remains bleak. Most of the global improvement resulted from trends in China, Malaysia, India, etc and even there, deep pockets of poverty remain (Baylis, Smith and Owens, 2008).

Below is the poverty profile of African countries vis-à-vis some other countries of the world.

Table I: Countries and Percentage of population living between <\$1.90-<\$5.50

Country	<\$1.90 (%)	<\$3.20 (%)	<\$5.50 (%)	Year	Continent
Algeria	0.5	3.9	29.2	2011	Africa
Angola	30.1	55.7	79.4	2008	-do-
Benin	49.6	76.2	90.6	2015	-do-
Botswana	18.2	37.1	57.5	2009	-do-
Burkina Faso	43.7	76.4	92.3	2014	-do-
Burundi	71.7	89.2	96.8	2013	-do-
Cameroon	23.8	44.8	69.0	2014	-do-
Cape Verde	8.1	26.5	53.1	2007	-do-
Central African Rep.	66.3	83.1	92.8	2008	-do-
Chad	38.4	66.5	86.2	2011	-do-
Comoros	18.1	38.1	63.5	2013	-do-
Congo D R	77.1	91.3	97.8	2012	-do-
Rep. of Congo	37.0	61.3	82.4	2011	-do-
Djibuti	22.5	44.6	74.8	2013	-do-
Egypt	1.3	16.1	61.9	2015	-do-
Ethiopia	26.7	61.4	84.7	2015	-do-
Gabon	8.0	25.8	56.1	2005	-do-
Gambia	8.0	25.8	56.1	2005	-do-
Ghana	12.0	32.5	60.5	2012	-do-
Guinea	35.3	70.3	92.3	2012	-do-
Guinea Bissau	67.1	84.5	93.4	2010	-do-
Ivory Coast	28.2	57.4	82.2	2015	-do-
Kenya	42.8	68.2	86.6	2005	-do-
Lesotho	59.6	78.1	89.9	2010	-do-
Liberia	38.6	73.8	93.0	2014	-do-
Madagascar	77.6	91.0	97.3	2012	-do-
Malawi	71.4	88.8	96.1	2010	-do-
Mali	49.7	79.4	94.9	2009	-do-
Mauritania	6.0	24.1	58.8	2014	-do-
Mauritius	0.5	3.2	18.1	2012	-do-
Morocco	3.1	17.0	48.1	2006	-do-
Mozambique	62.9	81.9	92.0	2014	-do-
Namibia	22.6	47.0	67.3	2009	-do-
Niger	44.5	76.9	93.4	2014	-do-
Nigeria	53.5	77.6	92.1	2009	-do-
Rwanda	59.5	81.1	91.3	2013	-do-
Sao Tome and Principe	32.3	70.1	92.3	2010	-do-



Senegal	38.0	67.5	88.1	2011	-do-
Seychelles	1.1	2.5	6.6	2013	-do-
Sierra Leone	52.2	81.3	94.7	2011	-do-
South Africa	18.9	37.6	57.1	2014	-do-
South Sudan	42.7	64.8	100	2009	-do-
Sudan	14.9	40.5	73.2	2009	-do-
Swaziland	42.0	64.4	82.0	2009	-do-
Tanzania	49.1	79.0	93.1	2011	-do-
Togo	49.2	73.2	90.1	2015	-do-
Uganda	35.9	67.4	87.1	2012	-do-
Zambia	57.5	74.3	87.2	2015	-do-
Zimbabwe	21.4	47.2	74.0	2011	-do-
Argentina	0.6	2.4	7.8	2016	South America
Australia	0.3	0.7	0.7	2010	Oceania
Austria	0.7	0.7	0.9	2015	Europe
Azerbaijan	0.0	0.0	7.8	2005	Asia Europe
Belarus	0.0	0.0	0.7	2016	Europe
Belgium	0.0	0.2	0.2	2015	Europe
Bosnia & Herzegovina	0.2	0.8	3.8	2015	Europe
Canada	0.3	0.7	1.0	2013	North America
Czech Republic	0.0	0.0	0.4	2015	Europe
Denmark	0.2	0.2	0.5	2015	Europe
Estonia	0.5	1.0	2.0	2015	Europe
Finland	0.0	0.0	0.2	2015	Europe
France	0.0	0.2	0.2	2015	Europe
Germany	0.0	0.0	0.4	2015	Europe
Hungary	0.5	1.0	2.7	2015	Europe
Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.2	2014	Europe
Ireland	0.5	0.5	1.0	2014	Europe
Kazakhstan	0.0	0.3	7.7	2015	Asia Europe
Lebanon	0.0	0.1	2.0	2011	Asia
Luxembourg	0.2	0.2	0.2	2014	Europe
Malta	0.0	0.0	0.0	2014	Europe
Netherlands	0.0	0.2	0.5	2015	Europe
Norway	0.2	0.2	0.2	2015	Europe
Slovenia	0.0	0.0	0.2	2015	Europe
Switzerland	0.0	0.0	0.0	2014	Europe

Source: World Bank Report, 2017

Table II: Population Living Below National Poverty Line (%)

Country	World Bank (%)	Yr	CIA (%)	Yr	Others	Yr	Continent
Algeria	5.5	2011	23.0	2006	NA	NA	Africa
Angola	36.6	2008	36.6	2008	NA	NA	-do-
Benin	40.1	2015	36.2	2011	NA	NA	-do-
Burundi	64.9	2014	64.6	2014	NA	NA	-do-
Central Afr. Rep.	62.0	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	-do-
Congo DR	63.9	2012	63.0	2014	NA	NA	-do-
Equatorial Guinea	78.8	2006	44.0	2011	NA	NA	-do-
Eritria	69.0	1993	50.0	2004	NA	NA	-do-
Guinea Bissau	69.3	2010	67.0	2015	NA	NA	-do-
Nigeria	46.0	2009	70.0	2010	NA	NA	-do-
Sao Tome & Principe	66.2	2010	66.2	2009	NA	NA	-do-
Swaziland	63.0	2009	63.0	2010	NA	NA	-do-
Kazakhstan	2.7	2015	2.6	2016	NA	NA	Europe
Czech Rep	9.7	2013	9.7	2015	NA	NA	Europe
China	3.1	2017	3.3	2016	NA	NA	Asia
Brazil	8.7	2015	4.2	2016	NA	NA	S. America
Belarus	5.7	2016	5.7	2016	NA	NA	Europe

Source: World Bank Report, 2017

The Concept of Development

It is important to note that common and most popular conceptions of development necessarily reflect a particular set of social and political values. It is true to say therefore that “Development can be conceived only within an ideological framework” (Roberts, 1984:7). Over the years the dominant understanding, favoured by the majority of governments and multilateral agencies, has seen development as synonymous with economic growth within the context of a free market international economy. Economic growth is identified as necessary for combating poverty, defined as the inability of people to meet their basic material needs through cash transactions. This is seen in the influential reports of the World Bank, where countries are categorized according to their income. Those countries that have the lower



national incomes per head of population are regarded as being less developed than those with higher incomes, and they are perceived as being in need of increased integration into the global market-place.

Bye and large, Development assumes a process of change which creates a better ordering of relationships among people, their physical environment and their social organizations in order to provide a more satisfying life, for all man's nature is such that he can never be satisfied if he continues to live in hunger, poor conditions and lack of comfort that will enhance his social life and that of his children. Mba (2002), Almond and Powell (2001), Ake (1992), Offiong (1989), as well as Pye (1970), conceive development from a Political perspective to mean the process whereby roles change and become more specialized, autonomous or where new types of roles are established or new structures and subsystems emerge or are created. When we speak of role differentiation and structural transformation and differentiation, we refer not only to the development of new types of roles and the transformation of older ones: we refer also to changes which may take place in the relationship between roles, between structures or between subsystems. Development refers to the building of capacity by the people in such a way that they can be able to do what they might not have been able to do or do better what they already know how to do.

Some scholars dissatisfied with the economic development approach to development based on increased GDP and GNP have advocated that emphasis on development should be based on Basic Need Approach. Sandbrook (1982) has intimated that the economic growth of GDP and GNP when translated to the actual populace may not convey increased material benefit especially in third world societies. The situation is even worse in Africa. In advocating Basic Need Approach, members of the World Commission for Economic Development argued that the basic needs of development such as roads, shelter, food, health, education, electricity, tap water, employment, etc. should be tackled so as to get to everyone. In fact, they argued that development should be identified by the percentage of people who enjoy the basic needs of life within a particular country (Ejiofor, 2017).

In conceptualizing development therefore we have to define it in such a way that it will reflect on those broader perspectives. Development could be seen as a process through which the various faculties of man which include socio, political, cultural environment etc,

are improved so as to make him adapt within his given environment. It has to entail technological know-how which will help man to actualize his various potential to his utmost ability. Development is not static. It should be in ever changing world and changing needs. Development is oriented towards the satisfaction of human needs within his specific environment. There is no limit to development and as long as human live on this planet there would always be quest for development (Okonkwo and Obidike, 2016).

An alternative view of development also has, however, emerged from a few governments, UN agencies, grassroots movements, NGOs, and some academics. Their concerns have centered broadly on entitlement and distribution. Poverty is identified as the inability to provide for the material needs of oneself and one's family by subsistence or cash transactions, and by the absence of an environment conducive to human well-being broadly conceived in spiritual and community terms (Onyewuenyi, 2017). These voices of opposition are growing significantly louder, as ideas polarize following the apparent universal triumph of economic liberalism. The language of opposition is changing to incorporate matters of democracy such as political empowerment, participation, meaningful self-determination for the majority, protection of the commons, and an emphasis on pro-poor growth (Elbadawi and Hegre, 2003).

The various concepts of development have tried to show that the issue of development cannot be properly posited in one disciplinary perspective or in one social index or factor. The various definitions and views on development cannot be totally dismissed as well. Each of the explanations or perspectives explain some salient point on what development is, but surely not enough to conceptualize what development is in its totality. Political development alone cannot guarantee other indices of development because a country can be politically developed and yet may not be said to be developed in other respects (Toyo, 2002). Agricultural development is quite good and in fact tends to facilitate development. However, agricultural development alone cannot make room for effective development in the entire country. Likewise, some negative traditional cultural practices cannot help in development. Industrial development is equally good and could help in development but it is not all there is to development. Industrial development without recourse to socio-cultural factors including the cherished cultural values may negate development. In sum, following the alternative liberal conception of development, the process of development should be:

- Need oriented (material and non-material);
- Endogenous (coming from within a society);



- Self-reliant (in terms of human, natural, and cultural resources);
- Ecologically sound; and,
- Based on structural transformations (of economy, society, gender, power relations) (Ekins, 2012:99).

The Concept ‘Globalization’

Globalization can be thought of as a process characterized by:

- (a) A stretching of social, political and economic activities across political frontiers such that events, decisions and activities in one region of the world come to have significance for individuals and communities in distant regions of the globe. For instance, civil wars and conflicts in world’s poorest regions for instance increase the flow of asylum seekers and illegal migrants into the world’s affluent countries (Best, 2015).
- (b) The intensification, or the growing magnitude of inter-connectedness in almost every sphere of social existence from the economic to the ecological, from the activities of Microsoft to the spread of harmful microbes such as the SARS virus, from the intensification of world trade to the spread of weapons of mass destruction (Eme, Okeke and Ugwu, 2009).
- (c) The accelerating pace of global interactions and processes as the evolution of worldwide systems of transportation and communication increases the rapidity or velocity with which ideas, news, goods, information, capital and technology move around the world (Okeke, 2000).
- (d) The growing extensity, intensity and velocity of global interactions is associated with a deepening enmeshment of the local and global in so far as local events may come to have global consequences , creating a growing collective awareness or consciousness of the world as a shared social space, that is, globality or globalism. This is expressed, among other ways, in the world-wide diffusion of the very ideas of globalization itself as it becomes incorporated into the world’s many languages (Best, 2015).

As this brief description suggests, there is more to the concept of globalization than simply interconnectedness. It implies that the cumulative scale, scope, velocity and dept of contemporary interconnectedness are dissolving and significances of the borders and boundaries which separate the world into its 193 constituent states or national economic and

political spaces. The concept of globalization seeks to capture the dramatic shift that is underway in the organization of human affairs; from world discrete but interdependent national states to the world as a shared social space (Baylis, Smith and Owens, 2008). The concept of globalization therefore carries with it the implication of an unfolding process of structural change in the scale of human social and economic organization. Rather than social, economic and political activities being organized primarily on a local or national scale, today they are also increasingly organized on a transnational or global scale.

Best, (2015:337) defines globalization as “a process which intensifies the integration of the world economy and the people through technological advancement in several areas, particularly in the area of information technology. It is also a product of differentiation in the production process”. To Hamouda, (2000:31) globalization has been described as “a neo-liberal ideology which tries to elevate the role of the market as an instrument for nurturing and encouraging innovation among social actors and as an instrument also for rationalization in the distribution of the planet’s resources.” Ake (1995:23) observed that globalization “is all about growing structural differentiation and functional integration in the world economy; it is growing interdependence across the globe; it is about the nation state coming under pressure from the surge of transnational phenomena; it is about the emergence of a global mass culture driven by mass advertising and technical advances in mass communication.”

Globalization therefore denotes a significant shift in the scale of social organization in every sphere from the economic to the security, transcending the world’s major regions and continents. Key issues or points of note here are:

- i. Globalization is evident in the growing intensity, extensity, velocity and deepening impact of worldwide interconnectedness;
- ii. Globalization denotes a shift in the scale of social organizations, the emergence of the world as a shared space, the relative deterritorialization of social, economic and political activity, and the relative denationalization of power;
- iii. Globalization can be conceptualized as a fundamental shift or transformation in the spatial scale of human social organizations that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across regions and continents;
- iv. Globalization is to be distinguished from internationalization and regionalization.

Contemporary globalization occurs in different patterns. Hence, globalization to varying degrees is evident in all these principal sections of social activity thus;

- a. *Economic:* In the economic sphere, patterns of worldwide trade, finance, and production are creating global markets and in the process, a single global capitalist



economy. Here, Multinational corporations organize production and marketing on a global basis while the operations of global financial markets determine which countries get credit and upon what terms.

- b. Military:* In the military domain, the global arms trade, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the growth of transnational terrorism, the growing significance of transnational military corporations and the discourse of global insecurity points to the existence of a global military order.
- c. Legal:* The expansion of transnational and international law from trade to human rights alongside the creation of new world legal institutions such as the international criminal court, international court of justice, etc, is indicative of an emerging global legal order.
- d. Ecological:* A shared ecology involves shared environmental problems from global warming to species protection, alongside the creation of multilateral responses and regimes of global environmental governance.
- e. Culture:* This involves a complex mix of homogenization and increased heterogeneity given the global diffusion of popular culture, global media corporations, communications networks, etc., simultaneously, with the reassertion of nationalism, ethnicity, and difference. But few cultures are hermetically sealed off from cultural interaction.
- f. Social:* Shifting patterns of migration from the south to the north and east to the west have turned migration into a major global issue as movements come close to the record levels of the great 19th century movement of people. This is mostly from Africa and Middle East to Europe which has attendant consequences on both directions.

The Nexus

It is however recognized (UNDP, 2001:xii) that “though the process of globalization intensifies the integration of peoples and nations, it has impacted on different countries and peoples in an unbalanced manner, marginalizing some and rewarding some, with unequal distribution of benefits and losses.” In this process, developing countries particularly African countries, have been marginalized, their options limited by institutionalized global regime for

the allocation of globally available resources. This imbalance leads to polarization between the few countries and groups that gain and the many countries and groups in society that lose out or are marginalized Khor, 2001:16).

Critically, the process of globalization manifests in the areas of economic reforms also termed economic openness. As Best (2015) observed, state economy relations constitute a set of relations central to the understanding and expression of globalization and social policy. Thus, globalization programmes the economy to reform or be reformed. These reforms were initiated by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank through the Structural Adjustment Programme. In a sense, it is the global application and implementation of the SAP which is now more appropriately referred to as globalization. The elements of these SAP reforms include deregulation and liberalization of the economy, privatization of public enterprises, withdrawal of subsidy from some public services where this is to be the case and devaluation of the national currency and other market related reforms.

The consequences is that by adopting SAP, the African countries have had to withdraw from their developmental roles and this has hampered the recovery of many countries and led to further deterioration in social service (Khor, 2001:20). This is why the greatest area of impact of globalization on African states and on the people is in the areas where the state used to play significant roles in the life of the people through social welfare policies and programmes. The cancellation of these policies and withdrawal of such welfare programmes and the uncontrolled adoption and promotion of market reforms have significantly weakened socio-economic equilibrium. This has been the source of poverty and underdevelopment in Africa. Hence, depending on the capacity of the state (Aina, 1997:42), “all of these interactions create a dynamic set of forces that in certain cases provoke turbulence, serious instability and possibly disintegration.” The inability of government of most African states to proffer measures to cushion the effects of these drastic economic reforms puts them under severe economic and social stress, hunger, poverty, and underdevelopment consequently further undermining their political stability and social harmony (Best, 2015:338).

The orthodox liberal assessment of African development suggests that states which have integrated most deeply into the global economy through trade liberalization have grown the fastest, and it praises these ‘new globalizers’. It acknowledges that neo-liberal economic policy has resulted in greater inequalities within and between states, but regards inequality positively as a spur to competition and the entrepreneurial spirit. It is clear at least from the past ten years that trickle-down (the benefits that overall economic growth as measured by



increases in the GDP would automatically bring for the poorer classes) had not worked. Despite impressive rates of growth in GDP per capita enjoyed by some countries among the developing world, this success was not reflected in their societies at large, and while a minority become substantially richer, the mass of the population saw no significant change. The even greater polarization in wealth among Africans evident in recent decades is not regarded as a problem, so long as the social and political discontent which inequality engenders is not as extensive as potentially to de-rail implementation of the liberalization project itself (Nnoli, 2000). The discontent would have been alleviated by the development of national PRSs, which it is claimed put countries and their peoples in the driving seat of development policy, thus empowering the local community and ensuring a better distribution of benefits (Brown and Kane, 2015).

Advocates of a critical alternative approach emphasize the pattern of distribution of gains within global society and within individual states, rather than growth. They had believed that the economic liberalism which underpins the process of globalization has resulted and continues to result in increasing economic differentiation between and within countries which is problematic.

Democracy is at the heart of the alternative conception of development. Grassroots movements are playing an important role in challenging entrenched structures of power in formal democratic societies. In the face of increasing globalization, with the further erosion of local community control over daily life and the further extension of the power of the market and transnational corporations, African people are standing up for their rights as they define them. They are increasingly making case for local control and local empowerment as the heart of development. They are increasingly protecting what they identify as the immediate source of their survival – water, forest and land. They are increasingly rejecting the dominant agenda of private and public (government-controlled) spheres and setting an alternative one, (Jega, 2004:3). As an instance, wide spread protests in many countries as a result of some obnoxious government policies (economic, political and social) are indicative of an increasingly widespread discontent with the process of globalization and with the distribution of its benefits. Such protests symbolize the struggle for substantive democracy which communities across the world are working for.

In this context, development is about facilitating a community's participation and lead role in deciding what sort of development is appropriate for it. It is not about assuming the desirability of the Western model and its associated values. This alternative conception of development therefore values diversity above universality, and is based on a different conception of rights. Enshrined here are the principles of community participation, empowerment, equity, self-reliance, and sustainability. This is antithetical and therefore rejects the economic liberalism accepted by the globalization thesis, seeing it as a path to aggravation rather than alleviation of the global poverty and social crisis.

Voices of criticism have been growing in number and range. Even among supporters of the mainstream approach, voices of the disquiet are heard as increasingly the maldistribution of the benefits of economic liberalism are seen to have been a threat to local, national, regional, and even global order. It is therefore possible to explain the contemporary occurrence of poverty, hunger, and underdevelopment by reference to the process of globalization. As we have earlier seen, globalization means that events occurring in one part of the globe can affect, and be affected by, events occurring in other, distant parts of the globe (Nnoli, 2000). Often as individuals, we remain unaware of our role in this process and its ramifications. If we look at the effect of the establishment of a global, as opposed to a local, national or regional economic system we will better understand the impact of the African countries opening up their market and economy to the world where in a disproportionate and unequal level, the Western economy and market subsumes and overshadows that of African nations.

A first instance here is with food production. Since after the Second World War, a global food regime has been established, and as we enter the globalization era, we have an increasing global organization of food provision and of access to food, with transnational corporations playing the major role. With local system of food production incorporated into the global system, local subsistence producers no more produce for the need of themselves and their family but are now involved in the production for a distant market. With many involved in this industrialization process the local market now suffer, yet they cannot effectively compete with the foreign market (Nwanegbo, 2018). This leads to people either losing their job in the local production process or as a long run effect, these local producers abandoning their own production as a result of lack of patronage in favour of foreign products. This is equally as a result of the following: the domestic productions in African countries was disrupted; consumer preferences in the importing countries changed in line with the cheap imports; export markets for the developed industrial countries in Europe were



created; there was a stress on cash crop production resulting in the drive towards export-oriented, large scale, intensively mechanized productions. Only the West could have matched these needs. In the wake of this, the GDP of African countries continues to worsen with people living below poverty line increasing (World Bank, 2017) as seen in the Table I above. As could be seen, only such African countries like Mauritius ($< \$1.90 = 0.5\%$; $< \$3.20 = 3.2\%$ and $< \$5.50 = 18.1\%$ as at 2012), Algeria ($< \$1.90 = 0.5\%$; $< \$3.20 = 3.9$ and $< \$5.50 = 29.2$ as at 2011), and Seychelles ($< \$1.90 = 1.1\%$; $< \$3.20 = 2.5\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 6.6\%$ as at 2013) are the best performers having a small percentage of the population living below \$1.90 a day. This is opposed to the scenario in the developed European countries like Belarus ($< \$1.90 = 0.0\%$; $< \$3.20 = 0.0\%$ and $< \$5.50 = 0.7\%$ as at 2016), Belgium ($< \$1.90 = 0.0\%$; $< \$3.20 = 0.2\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 0.2\%$ as at 2015), Czech Republic ($< \$1.90 = 0.0\%$; $< \$3.20 = 0.0\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 0.4\%$ as at 2015) whose performance are quite impressive as zero percent are living below \$1.90 and just a little percentage are living on less than \$5.50 a day. The preponderant situation that typifies African countries' poverty could be seen where countries like Guinea Bissau ($< \$1.90 = 67.1\%$; $< \$3.20 = 84.5\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 93.4$ as at 2010), Lesotho ($< \$1.90 = 59.6\%$; $< \$3.20 = 78.1\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 89.9\%$ as at 2010), Liberia ($< \$1.90 = 38.6$; $< \$3.20 = 73.8\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 93.0\%$ as at 2014), Madagascar ($< \$1.90 = 77.6\%$; $< \$3.20 = 91.0\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 97.3\%$ as at 2012), Malawi ($< \$1.90 = 71.4\%$; $< \$3.20 = 88.8\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 97.3\%$ as at 2012), Nigeria ($< \$1.90 = 53.5\%$; $< \$3.20 = 77.6\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 92.1\%$ as at 2009) and Rwanda ($< \$1.90 = 59.5\%$; $< \$3.20 = 81.1\%$; and $< \$5.50 = 91.3\%$ as at 2010), among others have high percentage of their population living below \$1.90 a day and a staggering percentage living below \$5.50 a day. Yet these African countries still coexist with these European countries with developed market economy in the globalized world.

The scenario of African countries whose percentage population is living below national poverty line is equally worrisome. This can equally be seen from Table II above where for Burundi, the World Bank report (2017) posted 64.9% (2014) and CIA report, 64.6% (2014); in Congo Democratic Republic, World Bank report posted 63.9% (2012) and CIA report, 63.0% (2014); for Sao Tome & Principe World Bank report posted 66.2% (2010) and CIA report, 66.2% (2009). This is in contrast with what is obtained in the developed

industrial nations who benefit most from the globalization process like Kazakhstan (Asia Europe) where the World Bank report posted 2.7% (2015) and CIA report, 2.6% (2016); for China (Asia), World Bank report posted 3.1% (2017) and CIA, 3.3% (2016) and for Belarus (Europe), World Bank report posted 5.7% (2016) and CIA report, 5.7% (2016) among others as percentage of people living below the national poverty line. As lamented by a World Bank report in a about Nigeria (Daily Sun, 2017:8) it notes, “Over 1.1 million Nigeria has slipped into extreme poverty in just four months. This has brought the number of Nigerians living in extreme poverty or below \$1.90 a day to 88 million”. In June 2018, Nigeria was named as the poverty capital of the World with 86.9 million extremely poor people. Nigeria overtook India as the World poverty capital despite being six times smaller in population than the Asian country”. According to the World Poverty Clock, created by Vienna-based World Data Lab., 88,011,759 Nigerians are currently living in extreme poverty. As bad as the situation in Nigeria just as in other African countries is, the World Bank, IMF and the United Nations as well as other major development institutions across the world had forecast that Nigeria will not hit the 2013 target for ending global poverty. In the same light, the Bill and Melinda Gate Foundation also suggested that West Africa, primarily Nigeria, will likely host 40% of the World’s poorest people by 2030 (Daily Sun, 2018).

The implication is that the negative impact of globalization is more on these African countries than on these European and Asian countries. Development is equally more in these European and Asian countries than in the African countries. On the other hand, poverty and hunger will be more in these African countries as against these Asian, North American and European countries. Likewise such vices as unemployment, domestic crises, inflation, bad governance, malnutrition, sick conditions, ethnicity, religious bigotry, kidnapping, prostitution, war and other criminal acts will be negatively induced more in these underdeveloped African states than in these developed industrialized European countries. Other negative consequences of globalization, poverty and underdevelopment on African countries include:

- i. The human toll when families cannot meet basic needs, particularly the consequences for children;
- ii. The impact on communities as war destroys social fabrics and coping mechanisms;
- iii. The effects on national economies as resource basis are devastated and reoriented from productive to military equipments;



- iv. Repercussions within national political institutions when traditional institutions and power relations are altered;
- v. Threats to stability and security if political disputes spill over into neighbouring areas (many IDPs in Nigeria today);
- vi. Humanitarian and reconstruction aids costs incurred to rebuild violence prone societies (the North East and North Central areas in Nigeria today);
- vii. Lost opportunities for development , commerce, and investments as the economy diminishes and scarce humanitarian funding is siphoned off into emergency relief;
- viii. Decadence in moral and ethical values as a result of cultural assimilations and associations as well as cultural crisis;
- ix. Escalation of terrorism, violence, insurgency and other vices;
- x. Technologically, African heritages will be lost to the Western-type technologies and that will have impact as well on our ideology;
- xi. Indigenous institution erosion as emphasis will be more on the foreign or Western-styles and institutions such as health, education, arts and crafts, legal and political, economic and social welfare institutions, etc.

Conclusion

Africa is faced with awesome development challenges. Indication is that the UN Millennium Development Goals has not been met in Africa. Globalization accounts for this as Africa is thrown into a competitive situation with the West as an underdog. If sub-Saharan African countries continue on its current course, it will take another 150 years to reach the MDG target of halving poverty and the underdevelopment situation continues to worsen there.

References

- Adams, N. B., (1993). *Worlds Apart: The North-South Divide and the International System*. London: Zed.
- Adejo, A.M. (2016). Poverty in the Land of Plenty. *NUBESS Journal of Contemporary Issues*. 1(2).
- Aina, T. A., (1997). *Globalization and Social Policy in Africa: Issues and Research Directions*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

- Ake, C. (1992). *The Political Economy of Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Publishers.
- Ake, C. (1995). "The New World Order: The View from Africa". In Hans-Henrik Holm & George, Sorenson, (eds) *Whose World Order: Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*. London: Westview Pres
- Baylis, J., Smith, S. & Owen, P., (2015). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Best, S. G., (2015). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa: A Reader*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Bellow, W., (1994). *Dark Victory: The United States, Structural Adjustment and Global Poverty*. London: Pluto Press.
- Brown, C., Nartin, T, & Rengger, N. (eds) (2002). *International Relations in Political Thought: Text from the Ancient Greek to the First Worlds War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, M. B. & Kane, T. (2015). *Africa's Choice after Thirty Years of the World Bank*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Buvinic, M., (1997). 'Women in Poverty: A New Global Underclass'. *Foreign Policy*. (Fall): 38-53.
- Clark, M. (1989). "Meaningful Social Bonding as a Universal Human Need." In Burton J. (ed). *Conflict: Human Need Theory*. N.Y.: St. Martin's Press.
- Cox, M., Ikenberry, G. J. & Inoguchi, T. (eds). (2000). *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies and Impacts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Development Assistance Committee, (2001). *Rising to the Global Challenge: Partnership for Reducing World Poverty*. Policy Statement by the DAC High Level Meeting upon Endorsement of the DAC of the DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction. Paris: 25-26 April.
- Edoh, I. (2013). Poverty and the Survival of Democracy in Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Policy and*
- Ejiofor, D. (2017). *Managing Government Owned Companies*. Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publisher
- Ekins, P., (2012). *A New World Order: Grassroots Movement for Global Change*. London: Routledge.
- Elbadawi, I & Hegre, H. (2003). "Globalization, Economic Shocks and Armed Conflicts", Paper Presented at the 2nd ECPR Conference, Marburg, Germany, September, 18-21.
- Ganor, B. (2005). *The Counter Terrorism Puzzle: A Guide to Decision Makers*. New Brunswick: N.J. Transaction.
- Garba, A. (2006). *Alleviating Poverty in Northern Nigeria*. A Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of Zamunta Association, Mineapolis, MN, USA, July 28-29.
- Gary, J., (1995). *Enlightenment's Awake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age*. London: Routledge.



- Hamouda, D. (2000). "Perspectives on Globalization and its Structure." *CODESRIA Bulletin, No 1*.
- Held, D. & McGraw, A. (2002). *The Global Transformation Reader 2nd Edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hoffmann, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism: Revised and Expanded Edition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hulme, D. & Mosley, P. (2016). *Finance Against Poverty, Vol.1*. London: Routledge.
- Jega, A. (2004). "Democracy, Economic Crisis and Conflict: A Review of the Nigerian Situation." *Quarterly Journal of Administration, xxxii(1)*. March.
- Kant, I., (1991). *Political Writings* (ed) Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khor, M. (2001). *Rethinking Globalization: Critical Issues and Policy Choices*. London: Zed Books.
- Maxwell, S. (2016). *The Meaning and Measurement of Poverty*. Retrieved from: <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/2227.pdf>.
- Mba, C. C., (2002). "Towards a more Sustainable Development in Nigeria in the next Millennium: Issues and Problems". *Arts and Social Sciences Forum Journal, II(8)*; 35-43.
- Nnoli, O. (2000). "Globalization and Democracy in Africa." In Nabudere, D. W. (ed) *Globalization and the African Post-Colonial State*, Harare: AAPS Books.
- Nwanegbo, C. I. J. (2018). *Internal Conflict and African Development: An Overview of Nigeria Situation*. Awka: Pound Academic Publisher.
- Offiong, D., (1989). *Imperialism and Dependency*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Okeke, I. M., (2000). *International Relations – An Introductory Course*. Enugu: Bismark Publications.
- Okonkwo, N. O. & Obidike, C. P. (2016). "Commercialization and Privatization Policy in Nigeria: A Review". *International Journal of Innovative Development & Policy Studies 4(1)*:45-54.
- Onyenwuenyi, S. A. (2017). "Government Statutory Corporations and State Owned Companies: Nigeria Power Review" Lagos: PHCN Quarterly Publications.
- Pye, L. (1970). *Aspects of Political Development*, Boston MA: Little Brown.
- Rhodes, E. (2003). The Imperial Logic of Bush's Liberal Agenda. *Survival 45*: 131 – 154.
- Roberts, G., (1984). *Questioning Development*. London: Returned Volunteer Action.

- Rocha, S. (2017). On Statistical Mapping of Poverty: Social Reality Concepts and Measurement. Background Paper Prepared for the Expert Group Meeting on Poverty Statistics, Santiago, Chile, May, 9.
- Schumacher, E.F. (2003). *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, M. J. (1992). Liberalism and International Reform; In T. Nardin & D. Mapel (eds). *Traditions of International Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 201 - 224.
- The Daily Sun, (2018). '88m Nigerians now living in extreme poverty – Report'. Thursday, November 1. P7.
- Thomas, C., & Wilikin, D., (2004). *Global Governance, Development and Human Security*. London: Pluto.
- Toyo, E., (2002). *Background to Globalization*. Ibadan: ASUU.
- UNDP, (2001). "Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration: Report of the Secretary General". General Assembly Document A/56/326.
- World Bank (2005). *Global Economic Prospects 2005: Trade, Regionalism & Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.