

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON GLOBALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE THIRD WORLD

Jonathan Yeriworikongha AYIBATARI (Ph.D.)

Department of History and Diplomacy, Niger Delta University Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State
ayibatariyjonathan@gmail.com

Agala Igwe DANOLA

Department of History and International Studies, Federal University Otuoke, Bayelsa State
agaladi@fuotuoke.edu.ng

.....

ABSTRACT: Studies have revealed that the universe is in a perpetual state of change, and human societies are inherently part of this dynamic process. While the precise direction of change remains uncertain, humans are aware of their ongoing progress and the steady enhancement of their condition. And since his emergence, modern man has advanced tremendously in his effort to improve on the quality of life on earth. In this process, the base of world civilization has shifted from one region of the world to another. However, this shift has favoured some regions to the detriment of others. Since the middle of the fifteenth century, Africa and the third world nations have remained the source of raw materials and markets for European industries. This paper posits that the third world nations are victims of westernization of the social, economic and political affairs of the world. Globalization is not a new phenomenon; it is the new name for an old historical process; an old wine in a new wine skin, scrounge one of the biblical cliché. Globalization is a swathe name for the twenty-first century phase of neo-colonialism and the third world nations are perpetual victims of western imperial domination. Some global and internal restructuring is required to empower the developing nations to enable them equal part in current and future changes in global order.

Keywords: Globalization, Development, Neo-colonialism, Third World, Domination.

References to the paper should be made as follows:

Ayibatari, J. Y., & Danola, A. I. (2025). A historical perspective on globalization and development in the third world. *International Journal of Leadership, Quality Education and African Development*, 2(4), 527-536. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18056707>.

.....
Copyright © 2025 IJLQEAD

INTRODUCTION

In the distant past, several people in the world had existed independently without contact with their immediate or distance neighbours. Since each group could not operate in a vacuum, focusing only on how to handle its internal affairs, the acts and/or inactions of these autonomous individuals have had an impact on one another. As a result, members of the group of independent nations had to deal with the fallout from enjoying their freedom in a context of interdependence rather than full independence.

The people of the western world had a long time relations with each other, but were to an extent ignorant about Africa South of the Sahara, the oriental world and the rest of the world. In the same vein, most people of Africa South of the Sahara had contact with each other but had no direct contact with the peoples across the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans as well as the

Mediterranean Sea. This implies that while Europe was not aware of other parts of Africa, the coastal fringes of North Africa, Egypt and the Nile Valley had had contacts dating back to the early period of the Greco-Roman civilization, the far East (the oriental world), the Americas, the Caribbean and Africa South of the Sahara were at best subjects of speculations among the peoples of Europe

Before the fifteenth century all influence from the outside world penetrated Africa from the North across the Sahara desert and African contact with Europe and Asia was made indirectly through North Africa and the Pacific Ocean. This situation changed gradually from the fifteenth century owing to Portuguese exploration.

In the earliest times, the Mediterranean peoples had contact with parts of Africa South of the Sahara. It is probable that this contact began in 600 B.C, when Pharaoh Necho 11 of Egypt commissioned an expedition of Phoenician sailors, which sailed around the continent of Africa. It is also known that the Carthaginian fleet of sixty ships and crew of 30,000 men under Admiral Hanno. The Carthaginian founded colonies along the North West coast of Africa. Euthyminus, a Greek, is also said to have reached the Senegal River between 400 and 300 B.C. Eudoseus, another Greek explorer, sailed from Arabia down the east coast of Africa, and thence round the south and west coast, returning to the Mediterranean through the "Pillars of Hercules"

It was the inquiring mind and expeditionary efforts of the Portuguese and the Spaniards that opened up contact between the hitherto unknown parts of the world and Europe. These early expeditions constituted parts of the attempts to open up the world. They could thus be regarded as part of the early efforts to globalize. Globalization therefore, is not a completely new phenomenon. It grew partly out of the inquiring effort and the desperation of Europeans to link up with other parts of the world for economic purposes. The present surge of globalization is in a way a continuation of the trend which began in the fifteenth century. This trend was accelerated by the industrial revolution in the second half of the nineteenth century. But modern globalization process is generally acknowledged to have been in place in the fifty years preceding World War II. There were significant cross-border movements of people, capital, and goods during this time. Similar to the current era, the previous globalization was fueled by the removal of trade restrictions and significant drops in transportation costs brought about by the construction of railroads and steamships.

What is Globalization?

The term "globalization" is a contemporary term used to describe the increasing interconnectedness of nations and people on a global scale. According to a sociologist, globalization is a fundamental notion from the 1990s that helps us comprehend how human civilization changed into the third millennium (Waters, 1995:1). Asobie claimed that the idea of globalization is debatable. Its significance is up for debate. There is disagreement on its nature. Although its ideological connotations are largely uncontested, its history is tainted by debate, and its consequences for various geopolitical zones of the international system are a moot issue (Asobie, 2002:36). More specifically, globalization describes a world where economics, politics, civilizations, and cultures have all somewhat converged (Kiely & Marfleet, 1998).

According to Giddens, the idea is the strengthening of global social ties that bind disparate societies together in such a way that events far away influence local events and vice versa. For example, a coal miner's job in Great Britain is influenced by events in South Africa or

Poland just as much as by local management or decisions made by the national government (Giddens, 1990:64).

But the idea goes beyond just mentioning how interrelated the world is. In the interlacing of distant social links and events with local contexts, it best exemplifies the essential elements of time-space distancing (Giddens, 1991:21). The integration of markets, money, and technology is another way that globalization is seen as reducing the size of the globe from a medium to a small one and making it possible for each of us to go further, quicker, and more affordably than ever before. Friedman (1999:1). The post-modern era and the development of new communication technologies are closely related when globalization is seen in this way of compressing time and distance. The emergence of a new information society and the ensuing reduction of the globe to a global village are largely due to the development of satellite television and information technology (Kiely & Marfleet, 1998:3). However, other academics believe it is a liberal Western plan to recolonize the developing or impoverished countries.

However, it is pertinent to remark that the millennial concept of globalization appears to transcend worldwide mutual interdependence woven round North/south dichotomy of mutual interdependence and integration. It is therefore, outside the so called age long concept of mutual interdependence that we would begin to unravel the mystery behind the concept of 'globalization', which to some is a long, awaited magic wand needed to overcome, the problems of the global system be they economic, security related, environmental, or political (Ihonvber, 2002:1)

Some other scholars see globalization differently. In other words, globalization is perceived as the invisible, and sophisticated stage of imperialism. A.W. Kayode-Iyasere, a sociolinguist, described globalization as "the product of 'economical' integration, where 'economical' means economic imperialism. Imperialism predicated on the economic dominance of the world by the industrialized nations" (Kayode-Iyasere: 2003). This dominance is not so much political as it is economics, though economic dominance subsumes political dominance. Whereas in the colonial era the colonizing state was physically present in the colonized state, but modern times the colonizing state is not physically present, but is invisible. Globalization is perceived as a modern concept, which represents the Western imperialist domination of the world technologically. The technology behind Western imperialism includes the television (international broadcasting stations), Internet, Telephone, and Microchips. Their presence in victim states are backed up through agencies such as the western mass media, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Health Organization (WHO) and the insistence on trade liberalization.

Globalization and Development in the Third World

Haven attempted a historical and conceptual clarification of globalization, the subsequent discourse would examine the impact of globalization on the third world development or what third world has gained or will lose from globalization. First the twin phrase, third world and development, demand some attention. In recent years globalization has been trite in various economic discourses and forums. Much of it has been looked at within the context of interconnectedness and inter-dependence. As much as this work does not intend to digress from that line of thought an attempt is being made to address the issues from an obscure dimension, especially from the hindsight of history as it concerns the benefits accruable to the so-called third world countries

A disparaging artificial division of the world into two economic spheres is the economically viable North, which is made up of the Economically Developed Countries (EDCs), and the less wealthy South, which is made up of the less developed countries (ELDCs), is implied when the term "third world" is used or when a region of the world is referred to as such. The two geographical classifications are a consequence of the fact that the majority of LDCs are located more to the south in Africa, Asia, and central and South America, while the majority of EDCs are located to the north in North America and Europe (Rourke, 1997:46)

A very brief antecedent of this status quo is necessary. The several centuries of slavery especially in Africa, which led to the evacuation of the abled bodied segment of the Africa populace cannot be glossed over. The abject poverty which the so called third world countries now found themselves can only be attributed to the history of colonialist suppression and their consistent efforts to perpetually keep the LDCs economically and politically weak as sources of cheap raw materials and labour.

In the context of the LDCs' planned poverty, organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have been established to constantly promote an unproven commitment to reducing poverty in the third world while acting hypocritically. The recommendation of structural adjustment programs, which are reflected in further market deregulation via the integration of national economies into the global economy through globalization, has always come before this false commitment. The deregulation of Nigeria's petroleum industry's downstream sector is still fresh in our minds. This kind of deregulation meant that paying back questionable loans from the IMF and World Bank was a top priority; social spending was cut by eliminating subsidies for healthcare, education, and agriculture, among other things; and employment standards were lowered by reducing the workforce, particularly in the public sector. The masses' and working class's living conditions are only becoming worse as a result of all these policies.

The large economic gap between the majority of people living in most nations and the comparatively rich lives of a tiny fraction of the world's population living in a few countries is undoubtedly a significant fact of the current state of the globe (Rourke, 1997:46). It is remarkable therefore that it was in order to bridge this economic disparity between the wealthy and the industrialized north and the less developed countries of the southern Hemisphere that terms such as privatization and globalization began to be advocated to calm the economic nerves of the Third world. Ironically, however, Hashim claimed that the success of privatization in Western nations was due to their degree of development; in contrast, the poverty and lack of infrastructure in third-world nations may have made this success an illusion (Hashim, 2000:5)

Third World Development

Development is not a new concept (Cowen & Sheton 1996:6). But after 1945, it was actively promoted as a means of bringing the rest of the third world closer to the west (or first world). The Cold War between capitalism and communism and the end of empires served as the backdrop for this development strategy (Kiely & Marfleet, 1998:6). This approach, which was based on the idea that the nation-state was a sovereign entity, focused on fostering economic development via collaboration between the public and private sectors. Thus, the nation-state's supremacy was firmly at the core of mainstream theories of development, which assumed many different shapes between the 1940s and the 1970s (Hettne, 1995:223-232).

The conventional approaches to development policy, which were either Eurocentric or Americocentric, are described above. Since underdevelopment theory explains the notion of globalization, it will be discussed in further detail in the following paragraphs. Andre Gunder Frank is the primary proponent of this strategy. Development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin, he argues, and one causes the other. Metro poles grow by taking use of the surplus (or under-developing) satellites in this global system, which has been capitalist since the sixteenth century (Frank, 1969:9). He asserts that this capitalist system must inevitably result in both underdevelopment and development at all eras and locations. Both are products of the system and are equally capitalist (Frank, 1969:240).

This argument is intriguing because it avoids the dichotomy of modern and traditional. For example, sixteenth-century Latin America, nineteenth-century Latin America, and nineteenth-century Africa cannot be considered traditional in any way since they are an integral part of the contemporary capitalist world. (Rodney 1974). In this way, Frank thinks of modernity in terms of both time and geography (Frank, 1969:9). He argued that since the West is taking advantage of the rest, development cannot be a matter of the rest becoming more like the West. The West would literally need to colonize the Rest in order to really follow it. This is a somewhat ironic reference to a real reversal of the status quo, since post-war American conservatives would not only find it impossible, but also find it difficult to accept. Restructuring the satellite's distorted social and economic life would be a more practical approach. In due time, a detailed explanation of this stance will be presented.

Furthermore, underdevelopment theory forces us to consider space since some areas grow at the cost of others. On the other hand it interpreted space in certain ways to indicate that places had limited potential for meaningful action. To the degree that developments in local satellites of peripheries can only be explained in terms of the functional requirements of metropolitan regions, these places are regarded as exploited (Booth, 1985: 761-787). According to this puppet master view of imperialism, the all-powerful Western metro poles pull the strings of the local satellites. Space only functions in a one-way interaction with more powerful places, which is how it is seen to have been destroyed (Bernstein & Nicholas, 1983:609-24).

Given the aforementioned viewpoints, Frank and others have proposed a plan that aims to address underdevelopment in satellites. They contend that such a policy would need complete disengagement from the global economy in order to foster real progress. In other words, a perfectly independent local, endowed with inevitable progress, may take the place of a wholly meaningless local, destined for permanent stagnation (Brenner, 1977: 104; 24-92)

The point been made is not far-fetched from the fact that Africans have contributed immensely to the development of the self-styled 'first world'. Therefore, a down to earth globalization must take cognizance of these historical antecedents with a view to accepting responsibility for the social, economic, and political circumstances that have confronted African people in contemporary times.

In addition to the above, an American Nobel Prize Winner, an economic historian, has accumulated evidence, using all the normal economic tests, to show that American industrial strength was built on the backs of "black labour". It is also a known fact that all School; Colleges, Oxford, perhaps the most prestigious academic institution in the Western world, was built with profits from slave plantations in the Caribbean. So also was Marlborough House, the building which to house the Commonwealth Secretariat.

The question that arises from the above analogy is, while all these developmental efforts were on,, 'what was happening in Africa? The simple answer is total stagnation or apparent

economic lull, because the socially disenchanted remnants of the unproductive segment of the people were unable to organize themselves politically. The irony however, was that industrialization in the Western world made trafficking in Africans irrelevant and when trade on raw materials produced by them to feed their industries became expedient, slavery was abolished. This is what Aaron referred to as the first wave of globalization which occasioned the pillage of African's natural resources and accounted for the majority of African enslavement and deportation and the 'continued wrenching dislocation of normal life (Aaron, 2000:19-35)

A period of uneven economic connections between Africa and Europe, marked by unfavorable terms and balance of payments issues for Africa, was brought about by the asymmetries linked with all of these. He stated that, the structural inequalities generated by years of colonial conquest are still considered accountable for most of Africa's troubles (Aaron, 2000:21). The argument being made is that despite the fact that globalization is not a new phenomenon as has been said we are informed that it is an engine that ensures material progress and freedom for people all over the world in its current stages, particularly since the start of the Bush administration. But for it to be meaningful to the development of the erstwhile-dehumanized Africans and the 'third world', a truly globalizing concept that is developmental in nature should be enunciated by the collectivity of the first world.

In order to achieve this, a well-articulated developmental programme for the third world must be worked out in such a way to right the wrong of many years of subjugation and servitude. We must therefore, go back into history to try to reach an equilibrium, if the third world must be truly integrated into the globalizing mainstream. To equilibrate in this sense, means that the opulent North should do everything humanly possible to extricate the least developed countries of the South from poverty not only through debt forgiveness/cancellation, but also through reparation. Reparation and debt cancellation are a few of the many ways to reach equilibrium because globalization cannot be attained in the face of inequality. On the part of the third world, efforts must be made to shake off the manipulating grip of the imperialist by formulating and embarking on industrializing programmes, which are environmentally propelled and independent of any external manipulations.

Ihonvbere supports this view by arguing that the growing underdevelopment crisis is preventing full and effective participation in the new global order, which is made impossible by the legacy of colonial and neo-colonial exploitation and mismanagement, the state and social crisis, poverty, foreign dominance, instability and institutional and infrastructure decay and dislocation (Ihonvbere, 2002:6). He cited the World Bank as an example, which believes that Africa's future in the more competitive and complicated global system is, at best, pessimistic and unclear.

Based on realistic forecasts of existing policies and Africa's present low per capita income level, Sub-Saharan Africa will continue to lag behind the rest of the globe, whereas other high-income and emerging nations will have their average income levels triple by 2030. The average per capita income in Sub-Saharan Africa will likely only expected to reach US\$400, with developing nations likely to reach US\$2,500 (Ihonvbere, 2002:6). By posing several important questions about Africa's post-cold war connections with other parts of the globe as well as its future, he reinforced this stance. What kind of internal reorganization is required to enable the area to capitalize on present and future shifts in the global order? Is the international system set up in a manner that allows an area beset by debt, crises, and poverty to financially and successfully become involved in the new system? How can participation in the new globalization be facilitated or mediated by the ongoing execution of traditional, excruciating stabilization and

structural adjustment packages, as well as challenging political liberalization programs, in the face of growing crises and global marginalization? Will the fortunes of third-world societies change as a result of contemporary democratization initiatives?

All these questions have been above in the context of reaching equilibrium through a well-thought-out development programme for Africa and all peoples of African descent. Such developmental programmes could be in the form of monetary compensation, 'call it reparation', debt forgiveness or cancellations that we can build on those gains and carries on with the West from a level plain field. After all, the concept of acceptance of historic guilt and compensation is not a new one. The international community has dealt with such cases in the past. We can still recall the compensation paid by Germany through the victors in the World 1 and 11 to the Jewish people. Japanese government, after apologizing to the Korean and Filipino 'comfort women' offered them financial compensation for the hardship and humiliation the women suffered in the hands of the Japanese Army during the occupation of the countries.

Similarly, also, the recommendation by the truce and reconciliation committee in South Africa to "pay 4,000 US dollars to the people and organizations affected by the Apartheid regime. To the end, Daddrian (1997) concluded that 'the idea of compensation neither new nor unacceptable to society; so if it worked in Europe and in the Far East, why should it not be so in Africa and the Caribbean. This is why the return of looted treasures and artifacts, the cancellation of debt the institution of an international development fund etc. would go a long way to appease the mind of the socially backward and economically disadvantaged African peoples. It is only then that the new wave of globalization and privatization sweeping cross the glob can impact on the third world development.

Unfortunately, in order to address the fall in their economies, the IMF and the World Bank are aware that the West and third world nations have quite different levels of development. We still remember the failure of many economic initiatives, such as the Green Revolution, Operation Feed the Nation, and the IMF's Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), to improve Nigeria's struggling economy in the 1970s and 1980s.

In addition, the IMF and World Bank are under the supervision of the G7 nations. The amount of a country's financial contributions determines its voting power at those institutions, and the G7, which owns 45% of all financial institutions, now uses them to impose economic policies that would destroy the economies of third-world nations and render them economically and politically subservient. As previously mentioned, the majority of the World Bank's and IMF's economic recommendations for third-world nations have traditionally included devaluation, labor and salary freezes, and reductions in subsidies.

The majority of the time, developing nations were forced to accept these prescriptions wholeheartedly, which undermined the impact they would have on their workforces and citizens. There have been repercussions, particularly when the military ruled the majority of these third-world nations. Because these uprisings have brought political and economic activity to a complete standstill, the governments of these third-world nations turn to the developed nations for assistance, which keeps them and their people in a state of eternal subordination.

After enduring the painful experience of privatization, the developed nations' attention has turned to how to use globalization to enslave the world's poor nations through the use of G7-dominated international financial institutions such as the World Bank, IMF, and the recently established WTO (Vanguard: December 5, 2002). By using the World Trade Organization (W.T.O.) to help developing countries improve the climate for private investment rather than dumping their products on developing countries' soil, the G7 member countries believed that

open trade and investment would drive global growth and reduce poverty, despite the West's hypocrisy. Many industries in these nations have closed as a result of this. This is due to the fact that the goods manufactured in the G7 nations are of higher quality than those made domestically. The informal quartet, which consists of the US, Canada, Japan, and the EU, has the actual authority in the WTO. Therefore, the G8 or G7 (apart from Russia) has used the aforementioned institution's tool to transform poor nations into places to dump their commodities under the guise of globalization, which aims to make the globe a better place to live.

The Breton Wood Institution, several Western national governments, and even some academics firmly believe that the growth of the global economy is equivalent to universal prosperity, notwithstanding the aforementioned sense of pessimism. Since trade liberalization creates comparative advantage and the division of labor, which hold out the possibility of increased productivity and efficiency, it is seen as a desirable objective that should be eagerly embraced by all countries. By reducing obstacles to investment and trade, the government may promote markets' unrelenting growth rather than control them (Ghai & Alcantara, 1994).

Therefore, according to the World Bank, nations that have been more integrated into the global economy throughout the decades leading up to the 1990s and the early 2000s have seen faster economic growth, longer life expectancies, and higher-quality education. However, Uganda is highlighted as an example of an African nation that has had advances in development and poverty reduction, as well as quick integration into the global economy. (World Bank, News release No2002\140\AFR) When he listed the benefits to poor countries in a speech to anti-globalization activists, the president of the European Union reaffirmed this opinion of the World Bank. He believes that increased liberalization of global commerce is necessary. The overall revenue of poor nations would increase by \$700 billion (\$477 billion) year if all global markets were completely opened, which would be 14 times the entire amount of development assistance they now get.

The irony in the aforementioned remark may be seen in Museveni's appeal for African nations to resist globalization, which he claims is the same old system with new tools for oppression, marginalization, and domination. In keeping with the same ominous tone, Mahatir, note that it is a glaring misunderstanding of the reality surrounding international commerce to link globalization with a guarantee of economic development (Mahatir, 2002:1). Aaron summarizes it by pointing out that the new globalization should not be seen as a win-win situation, citing Western-inspired market fundamentalist initiatives like SAP that attempted to revive developing nations' economy but failed. (Aaron, 2001:22).

Trade with third-world nations has not improved as a result of globalization. For example, Nigeria became a founding member of the World Trade Organization in January 1995 after just recently ratifying the organization's treaties. Nigeria's industrial sector has just lately voiced its concerns about the detrimental effects that the WTO accords on globalization would have on her economy. The uneven representation of Africa in the negotiations that resulted in the body is one way in which this is represented. Nigerian textile markets serve as a landfill for textile products from developed nations, severely harming the country's own textile businesses.

The National Union of Textile Garment and Tailoring Workers of Nigeria said in a statement released during a four-day educational conference in Abuja that thousands of jobs had been lost and several textile companies have shutdown in recent years, leaving many more in despair. According to the Union, this is caused by the government's widespread adoption of trade liberalization policies as a result of the WTO. In light of this, globalization is typically viewed as a growth engine in development circles is once again causing a growing disadvantage in its

trading relations with the third world, primarily because of the asymmetries and mendaciousness that define these kinds of relationships. The third world is once again escaping the hold of globalization, which is supposed to be the remedy for global inequality. Aaron made this argument because the African economy has been deconstructed and reshaped to work as a market for European-made goods and a supply of raw materials for European companies (Aaron, 2001:23). This explains why Africa has never really profited materially from trade with the West. Even while Africa's performance has always been poor, it is reasonable to say that it is becoming worse under the new globalization.

CONCLUSION

The fact that no one state could operate in a vacuum inside the international system of ostensibly mutual reliance has been widely acknowledged. Therefore, the idea of globalization depicts a world where economics, civilizations, cultures, and politics have all somewhat converged, seemingly causing the so-called third world to erode. Ironically, nevertheless, the situation that the third-world countries found themselves is amounted to the escalation of unequal growth. The World Trade Organization [WATO] agreement and the post-war agreement at Breton Wood, which largely excluded the developing world and created a world that primarily reflected the interests of the developed Western countries and their allies, are to blame for this unequal development, which dates back to the early 14th century.

Ever since the globe started to integrate, the third world has faced an environment that is not conducive to progress. In this sense, we sympathize with those who oppose globalization, who contend that it is merely a liberal or abbreviated term for imperialism, dominance, exploitation, and marginalization, with the overall goal of reproducing the injustices, inequality, and poverty that defined international and domestic relations. Its position in the digital divide is a generally unfavorable environment for investment, lack of economic integration, and technological backwardness in a world economy driven by technology as well as the debt overhang and failed infrastructure, which were made possible by official corruption and market fundamentalist policies of the Breton Woods institution, only served to reinforce the structural imbalance that characterized Africa's relations with the West (Aaron, 2001:26). A path forward should be considered in this seemingly hopeless circumstance. That and others have suggested a method for satellite nations to overcome underdevelopment in this area. They contend that in order to foster true growth, this entails a total detachment from the global economy (Frank et al. quoted in Kiley, 1998:8).

Aaron did not agree with the aforementioned viewpoint. He asserts that despite the globalizing concept's inherent flaws, delinking from it may not be practical or logical. In order to encourage investment, diversify exports, and start a true continent-wide economic integration, the leadership should invest a significant amount of public funds in social and physical infrastructure. This will not only increase intra-African trade but also give them leverage in trade negotiations.

In addition to the aforementioned, the developed world may work together to cancel or erase debt since, ultimately, the resources of third-world and African nations were necessary for the growth of developed civilizations. Third-world nations can only completely and successfully engage in what the World Bank described as a genuinely global golden era in the twenty-first century in these ways.

It's also important to convince the West that a thriving and stable third world would result in fewer conflicts, refugees, terrorists, and immigrants entering North America and Europe, which overstretch social and other services. In conclusion, before a new global order can have significance for their innovative, resilient, and industrious citizens, Third World countries must first establish new national socioeconomic and political structures (Ihonvbere, 2002:25).

REFERENCES

- Aaron, K. K. (2002). Playing without the kits: Towards a beneficial participation of Africa in a globalized world. *The Annals of the Social Academy of Nigeria, No. 13*.
- Asobie, H. A. (2002). Globalization: a view from the South. *Annals of the Social Science Academy of Nigeria, No. 13*.
- Booth, D. (1985). Marxism and Development Sociology: Interpreting the impasse. *World Development, 13*, 76
- Brenner, R. (1977). The origin of capitalist development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review, 104*, 25-92.
- Daddrian, E. (1997). The African Holocaust, *West Africa News*, October, 27-November 9.
- Friedman, T. L. (1999). "Duelling Globalization", *Foreign Policy Fall 1999*, Website version, p.1.
- Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. In R. Kiely & P. Marfleet, (Ed.) *Globalization and the Third World*. Routledge.
- Frank, G. A. (1996), *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.
- Hashim, T. (2002). Globalization and the Nigerian Workers". *Vanguard*: December 5. Lagos.
- Hettne, B. (1995). Introduction towards an International Political Economy of Development. *European Journal Development Research, 7(2)*, 223-32.
- Ihonvbere, J. O. (2002). How is globalization doing? *The Constitution: A Journal of Constitutional Development, 2(4)*.
- Kiely, R., & Marfleet, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Globalization and the Third World Development*. Routledge.
- Mahatir (2002). The Prime Minister of Malaysia expressing his observation in the globalization game. *The News*, 24, August 23, 2000.p.1.