

CHAPTER 4

GLOBALIZATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION : AN OVERVIEW

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter briefly describes the general nature, the origin and forms of the debate on the subject of “globalization” and relates certain key aspects of governance and economic development to this currently controversial issue.

A general understanding of not only the conceptual nature but also of the potential dangers of globalization, is essential for guiding the inter-governmental relationships between nations, on the one hand, and the geo-political and socio-economic development among the international communities, on the other. This will also help to understand in a meaningful way, the type of developmental process that may emerge from these globalized inter-governmental relationships. It is important to note that the anti-globalization protesters who disrupted the Seattle WTO trade talks in 1999, Prague in 2000 and Quebec in 2001 were in defense of poorer countries on the one hand and against the big businesses on the other. However, they are right about two issues. The protesters are right in that the most pressing moral, political and economic issue of our time is third-world poverty, and they are right in believing that the tide of “globalization” powerful as the engine driving it may be, can be turned back or at least be counter-balanced by greater localization (The Economist, The Case for Globalization, September 23rd 2000:7). It is important to note that the key focal

point on the issue of globalization is the impact on the local people, how their living standards could improve and how poverty could be reduced or eliminated globally.

4.2 DEFINITIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF GLOBALIZATION

Many commentators, authors, private and public sector practitioners have given definitions or descriptions of the concept of globalization. The term “globalization” is essentially a product of the 1990s. Collier defines it as “the process of integration in product markets and financial markets” (Collier, 1998:1).

As the concept of a “Global Village” increasingly becomes a reality, mainly as a result of technological advancement in transportation and communications, the world faces several questions of sustenance, peace, economy, stability and survival. The globalization of tourism is indeed one of the many factors responsible for the above. It has been described as a “mega-trend” which is associated with different dimensions and consequences-both positive and negative (Adejuwon, 1996:16).

Robertson described “Globalization as a form of institutionalization of the process involving the universalization of particularism and the participation of universalism” (1999:6-10). This definition offers a bifurcated view of globalization, that is, the collaboration between the leading nations and the main agents of global involvement in the New World economic order.

Globalization may be referred to as the interplay, cooperation and integration of the various financial systems of the world via international trade, investment and the distribution of vital information aimed towards the creation of synergy in world markets, production processes and general economic development (Shabir, 1999:7-10). The above definition by Shabir tends towards unifying the new world economic order and suggests the use of international trade as a major apparatus to achieve this global objective while banks and other financial institutions will act as facilitators in developing the programs. Globalization also involves an increasing interrelationship among major policy influences on the world economic system with monetary policy affecting trade policy and feeding back into both monetary and fiscal policies (Okonkwo, and Afolabi, 2000:11-15).

It may be necessary at this point to recognize some important advice given to the global community by the Director of the Human Development Report Office of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). He says : "As long as globalization is dominated by economic aspects and by the spread of markets, it will put a squeeze on human development" (Sakiko, 1999: 3-5). This advice calls for the rewriting of several collective approaches to governance in this globalization era. It suggests a range of options from the international community, from a demand for the global (reform of the United Nations and World Trade Organization) through the regional or group of countries to international negotiations in trade and other areas such as social protection against the negative effects of globalization.

It may be necessary, at this point, to see Globalization as explained by Patricia Pitchon, a process that entails the free movement of capital,

goods, services and labour around the world. Currently, both capital and goods do move freely and services such as banking, telecommunications, media and advertising will do so increasingly. Human resources mostly move freely, either in the managerial category or sadly, at the increasingly desperate end of the scale with illegal migration (1999: 15)

In view of the above, several definitions of globalization, it can be observed that globalization has different meanings for different commentators, authors, researchers, and public and private sector practitioners. Much depends on the perspective from which the concept is viewed. Some see it as a new drive by Europe, America and the other first world countries towards a new mindset for all nations, regions, continents and economic blocks. Others look at it as a strategic vision of the developed nations. Yet others say it is a new approach to global capitalism couched in a new broader system of the indirect governance of all nations by the group of wealthy economies.

To a large extent, it means also that the functions of government should be re-assessed to fall into place within the globalization process. Therefore, governments in every nation including, Nigeria are accountable for the delivery of services to local citizens within the context of a globalized economy and governance.

Globalization as a concept should be an option that provides several developmental alternatives to nations and should not be made compulsory. All the foregoing suggests that Nigeria might well need a new approach to governance, one that utilizes the advantages offered by global markets and competition while also allowing for human,

community and environmental resources that will ensure that globalization works for the people and not just for profits.

Since 1990, the United Nations Development Programme has commissioned an annual Human Development Report by an independent team of experts to explore major issues of global concern (United Nations Human Development Report 1999:1). The Report specifically looks beyond conventional per capita income as a measure of human progress by also assessing other factors such as :

- i. average life expectancy;
- ii. literacy;
- iii. standard of living; and
- iv. overall well being.

The authors of the report also argue that human development is ultimately a process of enlarging people's choices. Therefore, every government of the day in all nations, including Nigeria, should view globalization from the local people's point of view, in terms of their benefits, and not as a battle for market and economic competition which may stifle the internal objectives of the developing countries.

It is important to note here that many countries and governments, development agencies, the United Nations and their administrative organs recognize the importance of all sectors in the globalization process. To that end, the coordinator of the report "Globalization Needs a Human Face" advised, "we must bring human development and social protection into the equation of local governance in the context of globalization" (Jolly, 1999:1). This implies that such a

program could be managed successfully through the prioritization of the particular needs, environmental and others, of different nations.

Viewed from another perspective, global efforts may refer to the coordination and integration of projects between and among nations and non-governmental organizations. Every nation and state therefore needs to have a major stake in policies and programmes that will enhance their own development and improve their own living standards. This will constitute direct and fair governance as the needs of the people can be better identified at the grassroots level than in a global context.

4.3 ORIGIN OF THE GLOBALIZATION CONCEPT

4.3.1 An exogenous process

As already indicated in the introduction, a concern of this study is whether globalization is an exogenous process with its own inexorable logic (driven by technology, economic organization and related social and cultural change) and enjoying the independence of international relations or whether it is itself a creation of international relations and the behaviour of states (Clark, 1997:1-2). What causes globalization and how did this concept come into being?

4.3.2 Pervasive westernization

Some professionals, researchers and writers agree that this global economic and social integration is no more than “pervasive westernization”. From this viewpoint, the world revolution of

westernization brought together, in inescapably intimate and virtually instant interaction, all the people of the world (Von Laue, 1987:3).

4.3.3 Modernity

For many others, globalization is simply the spread of the characteristic features of modernity. It is the spread of the nation-state system, the world capitalist economy, the world military order, and the generalized international division of labour (Robertson, 1992:141-142). Thus Robertson conceives the globalization concept as a package. Probably that was why Giddens see globalization as “an enlargement of modernity, from society to the world” (1985:263, 291).

4.3.4 Idealists views

In the view of the idealists, globalization is not only irresistible, but also to be heartily welcomed (Hurrell and Woods, 1995:3). This view does not only see globalization as an irresistible force towards reform within the global context but also contends that there is nothing any government or people could do “not” to accept the principle of globalization. This view sounds very absolutist and leaves the international community with no options or choices.

4.3.5 Liberal views

The theorists and contributors to the liberal view of globalization believe in the progressive impact of globalization within the context of the economic, political and social behaviour of states (Gill, 1995:405).

This view, however, may sound impressive but may also have some constraints since the view is based on the “positive” economic assumption, that is, markets without any distinctive ideology. It provides no restrictions or conditions for participation in any global economic activities. Therefore, there could be widespread abuse in liberal practice.

4.3.6 The functionalists' views

The functionalist view can be seen as a deviation from other views on the grounds that their approach focuses on technical cooperation in the management of specific material problems (Jones, 1993:2). This would not only provide for technical interdependence among states but it would encourage material development and favourable technical competitiveness.

4.3.7 Historical views

The globalization concept has drawn two opposing responses namely, the orthodox views, that is, the proponents and the supporters of globalization and the critics' views, that is, the critics and opposing views against the concept of globalization.

The historians' views popularly known as “in between” views represent scholars, writers and researchers, those who are neutral about globalization. These groups hold one common view, that globalization is not a new concept but is rather a linear extension of the old global way of handling things (Waters, 1995:4). It neither supports nor opposes the globalization program.

This view encourages a focus on the multi-faceted nature of global national commitment that have existed for hundreds of years. There are, however, some interpretations that sit uneasily with the perspective set out in this group. This is the case with those who restrict globalization to the very recent historical period and specifically to the second half of the twentieth century.

Based on the historical views, one might well ask the key questions: What is globalization? What are its central dynamics? Despite one bold claim that the historical views show that the history of the last two hundred years is one of “broadening, deepening and accelerating globalization” there is fundamental disagreement about what it is and, indeed, about whether it is actually taking place at all. At the very least, there is recognition that part of the problem in any systematic treatment of globalization is the fact that it is inescapably a multi-faceted process.

In view of the foregoing, globalization can be seen as a composite of four elements :

- i. technological change;
- ii. the creation of a global economy;
- iii. political globalization; and
- iv. globalization of ideas (Bretherton and Ponton, 1996:3, 12).

The above four elements are helpful as they constitute a reasonable historical assessment of the nature of globalization.

4.4 THE ORTHODOX VIEW

The liberal versions of globalization adhere to the generic orthodox view which states that “governments are bystanders to globalization : the real driving forces are markets” (Hurrel, and Woods, 1995:448). Going by the above assertion, how then might globalization be shaped by international or domestic political forces if the states and governments are not able to influence its process?

While many writers are sympathetic to such a general perspective they often retain substantial disagreements about the precise nature of this relationship. To illustrate this diversity, we may differentiate among five interpretations of the primarily international determination of globalization, which the orthodox view is basically all about.

4.4.1 Westernization

According to the first school within the orthodox view, globalization has been shaped by the major international trend of the past several centuries, namely westernization. It was the economic and military incorporation of the world by Europe that created the precondition for an integrated global system. It was Europe that first brought about the economic and technological unification of the globe (Bull and Watson, 1984:2).

Bull and Watson added that it was the European-dominated international society of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that first expressed its political unification (1984:2). In terms of these perspectives, globalization could only develop once the territorial

integration of the world had been brought about by European power. Once that occurred it could be subjected to western technology and rationality.

4.4.2 Global balance of power

The second view usually categorized as orthodox also emphasizes the global balance of power but pursues a more general direction. A one-off historical process did not trigger globalization (e.g. westernization), but is rather fostered and hindered by general fluctuations in the distribution of international power. This is a clear assertion of the essentially dependent rather than the autonomous nature of globalization (Hirst, 1995:2-3).

Any prevailing system of international economic relations in the new millennium would have taken a long time to develop. Such systems are transformed by major changes in the politico-economic balance of power. The conjunctures that affect these shifts have been large-scale conflicts between the major powers. In this view, the worldwide international economy has been determined in its structures and the distribution of power by the major nation-states (Hirst, 1995:2). It would follow that the economic independence of all nation-states should be encouraged rather than a single global economy.

4.4.3 Hegemonic balance of power

A third view emphasizes not the balance of power in general but a specific hegemonic balance. Dominant states, if their interests are served by open international orders, create, by their own national

power, the essential preconditions and support for the activities that we recognize as constituting globalization.

Jones, gives a detailed account of the necessity of prior political determination before interdependence and globalization can occur. He gives pride of place to the central role of political purposes and processes in the generation of contemporary international interdependence and globalization (Jones, 1995:15).

Similarly, in discussing the historical hegemonies of Britain and the United States, Jones, notes that frequently a sympathetic political environment is created by a dominant political and economic actors (1995:171- 2).

This view calls attention to the need for common global objectives in all aspects of hegemonic power balance, or else globalization dividends will still be dominated by the powerful nations.

4.4.4 The national policy

The view focusing on national economies is less concerned with the distribution of power internationally and more with the residual and powerful resources of states in general. Dickens, an exponent of globalization that can be classified as orthodox, nonetheless remains convinced that states, while constrained by globalized economic activities, are far from powerless in confronting them. On the contrary, globalization is itself directed by the varying fortunes of national economies and state policies, which underpin them (Dickens, 1992:149).

Such a general perspective is given specific illustration by account of integration in post-war Europe. Rather than seeing a zero-sum relationship between state power and integration, it is firmly of the view that the latter is a product of the former and that the two are mutually reinforcing processes. Integration was not the super-cession of the nation state by another form of governance as the nation state became incapable, but was the creation by the European nation states themselves for their own purposes, an act of national will (Dickens, 1992:18).

4.4.5 The emerging global policy system

This school of thought represents an account of globalization that seems initially to be predicated on the determining influence of a global economic system rather than on inter-state relations. On closer examination, however, some autonomy of international politics in shaping globalization is preserved, even if in reduced and modified form. Cox provides the best example of this approach. While devoting most of his arguments to transition in the underlying basis of economic organization, he highlights the contradiction that “the globalizing interdependence principle is strengthened as the territorial national principle is weakened” (Cox, 1996:149-150).

Following the above approach, it is important to state the significance of the fact that ultimately, the security of globalization depends upon military force with a territorial basis. Even as globalization is fostered through the instrumentality of the economic system it has to be sustained by powerful states willing to take military action to preserve it.

4.5 GLOBALIZATION : THE CRITICS' VIEW

The concept of globalization ran into criticism from the very day it was proposed. It was indicated that globalization places the transformation of the South and the renewed global organization of inequality at the heart of understanding the global order. The world is faced with a worrying trend in the gap between the rich and poor countries, which continues to widen. Even more worrying than the trend itself is the domination of a neo-liberal understanding of the problem in the world's major economic institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and the group of seven countries that defines the discussion of appropriate remedial action (Thomas, 1997:10, 15).

The above assertion typified globalization as nothing else but "global capitalism". It is from this premise that the views of critics originated and different views against globalization became eminent. Many international historians have given prominence to globalization as a theme. This can be described as a "fault line" between the "forces of integration" and the "forces of fragmentation" back to the eighteenth century. It relates this fault line to the Cold War and its aftermath, suggesting that the Cold War was a powerful source of integration (Gaddis, 1992:174). This could be analyzed as highlighting the centrality of integration to the dynamic of international history and also because it poses a central question about the likely post-Cold War experience worldwide.

Similarly, it is possible to view crises of unexpected, unpleasant and unfriendly economic environments as opportunities for adaptation in

the wake of the globalization process. Indeed, many countries and governments will find it impossible to overcome inefficiencies and redirect resources to more productive uses without a major shock to entrenched interests and established policy wisdom. It was basically from the above economic points of view that the critics of globalization originated their arguments. The critics' views do not support globalization as a solution to the world's entire set of policy problems. However, certain perspectives can be used to categorize their arguments.

4.5.1 Idealists' critics

Following the events in the global history over the years, most commentators are content to present globalization as a long-term process, however much of it may have intensified in the last few decades. Typically, it is asserted that the "linear extension of globalization" that we are currently experiencing began in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Waters, 1994: 4).

This view restricts globalization to history and therefore, does not allow enough room for a better interpretation of the concepts therein. Therefore, it does not give any government or state any options or choices to decide on the issue of globalization as it affects them. However, any policy of global concern should be democratic in nature and leave the states and governments with several alternatives. This is seriously lacking in this view.

4.5.2 The liberals' critics

The liberal interpretation makes a number of judgments about the beneficial consequences of globalization. It fosters economic efficiency and encourages international institutions and problem solving. Moreover, for those who see democratic capitalism as the end of history, globalization is to be welcomed for the effect it has in promoting "social convergence built around common recognition of the benefits of markets and liberal democracy" (Hurrell and Woods, 1995:449).

In this sense, globalization is not irresistible, but to be welcomed. This view could also be seen merely as an economic assumption that may prove negative when observed for a reasonable period of time. It is this set of beneficent assumptions that have sought to question this view by emphasizing the association between globalization and the perpetuation of inequalities among developed and developing countries, and inequalities among the rich and the poor even within the individual states.

4.5.3 The functionalists' critics

As the idealists' views sounded too absolute, the functionalist approach argued that technical cooperation in the management of specific material problems would eventually yield a superstructure of political behaviour in which the sovereignty of the nation-state would be steadily eroded and circumvented. It is important, at this juncture, to further echo some of the 1970s literature on the ameliorative impact of interdependence (Jones, 1995:3).

The critics of this school of thought simply say that the functionalists did not look at the technological background of each state, which could give rise to a serious structural problem in the technical aspects of the globalization process.

4.5.4 The contemporary critics and the case against the global economy

In the fall of 1994, just prior to the vote by the United States Congress on the Uruguay Round of GATT, the vote that would establish the World Trade Organization (WTO), the US government offered a \$10,000 donation to the charity of choice of any congressman who could do the following :

- i. sign an affidavit stating that he or she had read the 500 pages of the agreement; and
- ii. successfully answer ten simple questions about its contents.

Not one single member accepted that offer. That was the beginning of a corrosive effect on the supremacy of domestic procedures including the rights of the Federal, state and local governments to establish US laws (Nader and Wallach, in Amander and Goldsmith et al, 1996:92-93).

It was also reported that on 1st December 1994, Congress approved the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in the House by 235 to 300 votes and in the Senate by 68 to 32 votes without knowing what was in it. Before the NAFTA, which is a US-Canadian alliance, was fully operational, apparently they were sidelined (Nader, and

Wallace, 1996:93). It became obvious that the governments of both countries did not possess the capacity to protect their citizens in the light of the new development. Every government was put in a difficult situation by the approval of that singular agreement which led to global financial and commercial systems run by empowered corporations.

Under the new system local and national governments can no longer take decisions that affect their people without direct or indirect control of the WTO office. The new economic model establishes supranational limitations on any nations' legal and practical ability to subordinate commercial activity to the nations own goals (Nader and Wallace, 1996:97).

It is important to point out here that when serious national and local issues are meant to be decided at a global level before implementation, it may become more of a centralized corporate entity instead of decentralized local governance. If governance is seen at the global level as management of corporate organizations, then the diversity that is a blessing of democracy in itself will become a major barrier. This is because it will be impossible to carry every nation, culture, race and needs along in a single global economic system.

According to Nader and Wallach in Amander and Goldsmith et al, the popular Uruguay conference in 1994 that set the pace for the current debate on globalization contains the following :

- i. institutionalization of global economic and political power;

- ii. institutionalization of global financial and commercial systems;
and
- iii. corporate globalization, a situation where the whole world is seen as a common market (1996:93).

The implication of the contents of this meeting as was assessed by same Nader and Wallach is that governments must get out of the way so that companies can cross jurisdictional and national boundaries with relative ease. Governments might be too slow for them in terms of economic control and management of trade (1996:95).

This prospect of global commerce without democratic controls suggests impending disaster for every nation. The philosophy behind globalization includes among others :

- i. maximization of global economic liberalization;
- ii. a broad based economic system; and
- iii. broad based social benefits.

GATT obviously promoted the elimination of restrictions that protects people from the “wild corporate interest” while the WTO as its development initiative was tailored to be a global policy enforcer. Terms of reference were agreed upon in 1986 by the WTO to provide the global executive branch office to enforce its rules with sanctions against any erring state.

Accordingly Nader and Wallach the rules include :

- i. small countries must accept trade or forfeit participation in world trade;
- ii. each member shall ensure the conformity of laws;
- iii. laws of member nations can be challenged; and
- iv. WTO tribunal judgement is final (1996:101-3).

4.6 GLOBALIZATION : THE EARLY CASE OF USA-CHINA

Economist Herman Daly warned, in his January 1994 "Farewell Lecture to the World Bank", that the push to eliminate the nation-state's capacity to regulate commerce "is to wound fatally the major unit of community capable of carrying out any policy for the common good ... cosmopolitan globalism weakens national boundaries and the power of national and sub-national communities, while strengthening the relative power of transnational corporations" (Nader and Wallach, 1996:95).

The philosophy behind the globalization initiative is obviously the thinking that maximizing global economic liberalization will result in broadly based economic and social benefits. This belief brought negative implications to the case of US-China economic relations. It was also reported that in 1994, the Clinton administration ended the historical linkages between favorable trade status and countries' human-rights records. However, early in 1995 when there was a threat to property rights including the lease of the US fast-food chain, McDonald's and the royalties of Mickey Mouse, China was threatened with a billion dollars of trade restrictions. This threat resulted in Chinese government policy changes to enforce intellectual property rights (Nader and Wallach, in Amander and Goldsmith et al., 1996:97-8).

This singular case is an eye-opener to states and governments that would want to consider globalization. Nigerian and other developing nations should begin to initiate programs and policies that will encourage building up truly sustainable economies and begin to shift away from economies that subjugate local initiatives to global pressures.

4.7 SUMMARY

The implications of these trends on the World, as discussed above, are enormous. If adequate consultation and reformation are not carried out, globalization will continue as a wild dream of its exponents. Since its inception the WTO has become a global enforcer with terms of agreement aimed at providing a global executive branch to enforce these rules with sanctions. It is also important to note here that the WTO provided no mechanism for non-governmental organizations and non-profit making bodies to participate, while permanent organizational structure was given to GATT. This implies that the WTO could have direct contact with the UN.

The role of the WTO in global governance is, however, recognized. But all its harsh rules and un-democratic operational procedures should be removed while governments and states in developing nations including Nigeria are given a chance to make contributions in every policy that affects their people and governments. In fact, issues of development, poverty alleviation and other related matters should not be discussed in the absence and participation of the people concerned.

This is where the WTO and their collaborators are lacking. Anti-globalization demonstrators have on several occasions disrupted WTO meetings, for example, Seattle 1999; Prague 2000; and Quebec 2001. These are testimonies that should prove to the whole world that unless certain drastic but positive measures are taken, globalization will remain an unacceptable global economic policy. It is important to reiterate that in the current globalization agenda, the WTO must begin to advance a reformed policy aimed at accommodating all global stakeholders. These reforms could include :

- i. complete democratization;
- ii. participation of all stakeholders;
- iii. poverty alleviation programs;
- iv. financial aid and grants for local development; and
- v. soft loans at non-commercial rates of interest and strict conditions.

These and other alternatives should be available for both Nigeria and developing nations, and for the enforcer of the global economy to consider a better future for all.

4.8 CONCLUSION

It seems clear that at least, facile value judgments on globalization should be avoided. Proponents, theorists and writers do not represent a contest between good and evil and neither monopolize moral and political wisdom.

To be sure, certain forms of global divisions such as the unilateralism of the 1930s as discussed in the historical views about globalization, have had highly destructive effects upon human values. However, one should not make blithe assumptions about globalization's role in general: it is itself a politicized process based on specific conditions that creates winners as well as losers. Moreover, globalization may itself induce some professional reactions and should not be regarded as a straightforwardly stabilizing force or otherwise in the international economy and in domestic governance.

Whatever the merits of the specific claims and counter-claims that both the proponents and the critics are making on the subject of globalization, it is unhelpful to analyze the economic dimensions of globalization in isolation. Realistically, not all versions of globalization concentrate exclusively on developments in the international economy. Some theorists emphasize evidence from political change and from the development of a global society. This offers a wider understanding of globalization, not confined to economic activity, but affecting the nature of human understanding, types of identity, and the development of the social system as a whole.

Political globalization may refer to a growing tendency for issues to be perceived as global in scope, and hence requiring global solutions, and to the development of international organizations and global institutions, which attempts to address such issues. More tentatively, the concept also suggests the development of a global civil society in which local groups and grassroots organizations from all parts of the world interact. (Robertson, 1992: 8, 59).

This tends to separate out a “political” realm from wider social and cultural change. Other accounts of globalization see it as a “social process” and thus emphasize the all-encompassing forms of such change. To some, this social change is driven above all by the geographical extension of the impact of industrialization and has the virtue of moving away from the restrictive viewpoint of the narrow post 1945 development.

Central to many of the sociological interpretations of globalization is the notion of culture. Indeed, much of the original theorizing about globalization developed in this area. Roland Robertson asserts that “globalization involves the development of something like a global culture” (Robertson, 1992: 8, 59). His perspectives here emphasize a newfound global “consciousness”, as well as physical compression of the world. This does not necessarily mean a uniform and homogenous culture worldwide, as any such claim would be impossible to sustain. What it implies in a more modest version is that cultures become “relativized” to each other, but are not “unified” or “centralized”.

Culture, in this widest sense, then becomes a potent political force as it may grow to threaten the basis of the current individualistic state. This view potentially challenges statism because culture avoids being located and tied down to any definable physical space. At the same time, and paradoxically, nationalism is one of the components of culture that has been transmitted around the globe that is both a globalized and globalizing phenomenon hence that supports the notion that culture needs to be seen as the sum-total of the way we live.

Such notions are problematic. Many would doubt the viability of the notion of culture without an identifiable community base. In giving a generic conclusion to the concept of globalization within the context of governance, it thus becomes apparent that while globalization features prominently as a concept in many disciplines, its manifestations are described in strikingly different terms, as are the bodies of empirical evidence adduced in support. The same diversity can be found in the analysis of its origins and the level of acceptance in all countries that form the global community.

Nevertheless, the views of Hirst which give globalization a distinctive economic dimension as a qualitative change from an economy which is simply international to one which is globalized, would probably be the most useful for this study, to provide a feel for how globalization could be viewed without political or ideological prejudice (Hirst, 1995:7). Hirst went further to explain internationalized economy as one in which, though there is wide-spread activity among states, the separate national economics continue to predominate, while in a globalized economy distinct national economies are subsumed and re-articulated into the system by international processes and transactions.(1995: 7)

The above concepts do not only portray globalization as an international partnership geared towards local general development but also portray the concept as a system of total global change where no nation or state is globally forced to deal with others on any issue that gives an unfavourable economic advantage.

Certainly, every government and state would have to be very careful on the issues of globalization and what and where these can perform

favourably. We cannot pretend that the vast changes that globalization would bring to the world economy will claim no victims at all, both in developed and developing countries. It will naturally always be hard for governments to persuade workers to trade their immediate job security for a vague promise of future opportunities.

Finally, it is important to note that all views put forward by critics in this chapter ranging from major anti-globalization critics, to the case of China and the United States of America, and the summary given in (3.7) contain both old and new philosophical discourse on globalization with a view to developing a culture of appropriate public policy for good governance in this globalization era. These views lean towards a defense against the widening gap between the poorer nations and the richer ones. Therefore, globalization is seen as a major economic threat to developing nations such as Nigeria. Some of this modern-day globalization philosophy will form the major focus of the next chapter.