

CHAPTER 5

THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE AROUND GLOBALIZATION AND PUBLIC INTEREST

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The development of the global economy that has been institutionalized inter-alia through the GATT and the WTO was reportedly designed to usher in an era of unprecedented prosperity for all. However, as the programmes on globalization have gone so far, this chapter will show that this objective is far from being realized. (Mander and Goldsmith, 1996:501).

Since the end of World War II, trillions of dollars have been poured into development schemes by multinational development banks, bilateral aid agencies, and private enterprises. Revolutionary new technologies have transformed the agriculture industry and service sectors alike. Tariffs have been drastically reduced and vast transnational corporations have systematically replaced vast transnational corporations that catered to the domestic economy. Similarly, the nation states have largely replaced small companies that catered to the domestic economy and governments seem to have been ignored (Goldsmith, 1996:501-2).

For example, if conventional wisdom held true then the world should have been transformed into a veritable paradise. Poverty, unemployment, malnutrition, homelessness, disease and environmental disruption should be but vague memories of an

underdeveloped past. But, to the contrary these problems have become more serious and more widespread hence the traditional nation-states service delivery and the social welfare efforts of nation states seem to be too far from being realized.

By signing the Uruguay Round of GATT, governments have further accelerated global economic growth and development by removing all constraints on trade, regardless of social, ecological and moral implications. Instead of accepting the incontrovertible empirical evidence that economic globalization will only increase many of the problems that face the world today, governments under pressure from TNC's insist on pursuing it still further (Goldsmith, 1996:502). This they did without considering the negative impacts it might have on the people.

To solve these problems, Goldsmith, further suggested that society will have to follow almost the very opposite path. Instead of seeking to create a single global economy, controlled by vast and ever less controllable transnational corporations, it should instead seek to create a diversity of loosely linked, community-based economies managed by much smaller companies and catering above all (though not exclusively) to local or regional markets. It is not economic globalization that society should aim for but the reverse "economic localization" to counter-balance today's substantially unfettered globalization (1996:502).

5.2 THE GLOBAL PUBLIC ETHICS

In a time when the world is seen as a global village, with neo-liberal capitalism as the only acceptable economic system, ethics has to be situated within relatedness and interrelatedness. Exploring the ethics of relationships reveals what kinds of relationships are being fostered in the world today. In neo-liberal capitalism, relationships are motivated by self-interest and profit.

The free market is seen as a sufficient mechanism to guarantee the well being of all society. At the same time, with the globalization of capital, the traditional concept of the state as a sovereign entity is being eroded, largely due to transnational corporations becoming dominant influences in the market to the extent that they are able to evade political and social accountability. Some economists see the present global market as an historical epoch that will bring about freedom for the individual from institutional relationships (Davidson and Rees-Mogg, 1997:42-114).

This market ideology is being advocated by neo-liberal policy analysts as the only source of salvation for African states. What needs to be considered is that African and other poor countries could well be victimized by this relationship, which is characterized by fierce and vicious competition. The success of powerful countries is often based on their ability to prey on the economic and political weaknesses of poor countries. It is their own prosperity that they are mostly concerned with rather than that of the poor countries. To ensure their own progress, for instance, European countries have mobilized their capital to form a union. The USA has responded by initiating selective

trade agreements with other Third World countries. These initiatives point to the evolution of survival in public governance.

This survival is based on the conviction that all human societies flourish through a process whereby strong countries take advantage of weak countries in pursuit of their own good. The metaphor of the survival of the fittest, of life as a Darwinian jungle, haunts much of our neo-liberal economic language (Radcliffe, 1999:13-15).

The necessary consequence of weakness and failure is extinction. As early as the 18th century a Dutch physician, Bernard de Mandeville, suggested strongly that it was greed and other “abominable vices” that enabled the flourishing of wealth. While moralists saw these as private vices, they were also considered public virtues (Mandeville, 1732:18-36).

Politically, the ideal in neo-liberal theory is that the primary function of government is to remove whatever shields protect weak and ill-adapted industries. Our global politics has been caught up with the fatalistic Laissez-Faire philosophy. Galbraith argues that the philosophy of fatalism inherent in Laissez-Faire advocates that any interference in the market will have harmful effects. We must let the market work under its principles and all will come right in the end. “Economic life has within itself the capacity to solve its own problems and for all to work out best in the end” (Galbraith, 1992:79).

This philosophy encourages us to think only in the short term, for, as Keynes noted, in Singer “In the long run we are all dead”. Karl Marx, in turn, in Singer notes the element of Greek tragedy embedded in the

Laissez-Faire market economy “Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world which he has called up by his spells” (Singer, 1995:33).

The assumption here is that the market is a given tragedy of our existence. Ethics can be seen in the globalization process as a tool to cushion the ugly effects of selfishness among people, businesses and governments. The implication is that the market system is an inevitable tragedy of our existence. The conviction that has emerged among neo-liberal public policy analysts is that since the market is a phenomenon of tragedy, it also follows that the welfare of society can only be achieved through self-interest. It may be necessary that self-interest and altruism need to be held in balance, with self-interest being the dominant value. This implies that if altruism is given too prominent a role, the likelihood is a political backlash that endangers the very operation of altruism within public welfare (Field, 1999:461-2).

The tragedy is that self-interest is incompatible with altruism. This contradiction becomes an unresolved moral conflict in the sense that one who sacrifices his or her interests for the good of others will end up being seen as acting primarily for his or her own self-interest. But there exist some moral conflicts. To caricature this kind of reasoning, one can say that people should be grateful to the selfish and the greedy individuals of the society. It is their selfishness that sustains altruism. This is clearly a mockery of our moral sentiment and reveals that the doctrine of self-interest is actually built on seriously fallacious

grounds. For good governance to be secured, the interest of the people should be given the first priority in a democratic state in this globalization process.

It should be noted that many scholars believe that globalization entails the universalization of self-interest in international relations. Recently, wars have been fought in pursuit of a certain self-interest. Realists argue that the conduct of international relations is not a matter of applying moral principles to the affairs of nations but pursuing one's national self-interest. Technically, one can argue that there is no ethical principle that guides international relations among states. The idea that nations relate to one another in terms of self-interest is unethical because national self-interest cannot bring about solidarity at the global level.

Gordon Graham argues that the economic policies of a particular country are not concerned with the well being of another country but with its economic self-interest. According to Graham, a politician who goes about promoting the interests of another country will be abusing power in the sense that he / she is not bound to promote these interests. In other words national interest in economic relations is morally neutral – it has nothing to do with ethical considerations (Graham, 1997:26-30).

However, in this form of argument, it becomes difficult to argue for common interest at the global level in the sense that the present reality of globalization seems to go against an ethical theory, which espouses the idea that national interest is neutral. Africa and other Third World countries as having a negative impact on global

relationships have experienced the pursuit of national self-interest by the economically advanced countries. If we see globalization as implying that we are related and interrelated, it becomes nonsensical to talk of national interest apart from the global implications of this interest. Taking into consideration the fact that the world has become a giant market, responsible governments have to realize that their national interests are intertwined. Instead of talking of national interest we should perhaps talk of global interest so that we might be able to come up with global ethics (Kung, (ed.), 1996:12-15).

Furthermore, these global ethics have to arise from a conscious realization of the fact that our existence depends on the well being of the whole. In such a global consciousness there is an ethical attempt to transcend national self-interest and patriotism. Most ethicists tend to see patriotism as the same as altruism but perhaps the two are best distinguished. In patriotism we tend to identify with a group and see its fortunes to some degree as our fortunes. Socially, patriotism becomes an expression of the group's self-interest against the interest(s) of those who are classified as not belonging. Patriotism thus implies seeing one's country or race as possessing some superiority over any other race. The ethical implication is that one feels less obliged to help people of other countries than one's own fellow citizens. The bias in our ethics in respect of loyalty to the group as a whole shows itself in the high praise accorded to patriotism. We disapprove of selfish behavior but encourage group selfishness when it is called patriotism. In contrast, ancient thinkers such as the Stoic philosophers saw their loyalty as belonging to the world community instead of the state they were born into (Singer, 1987:51-52).

However, our contemporary understanding of patriotism is that it rests on the survival instinct. If we take globalization to imply that no one exists outside of relationships, we are also prone to see patriotism as a misplaced sentiment. A world where no one is “outside” becomes one where a patriot cannot avoid communicating with others in many alternative cultural ways of life. To a patriot the dialogic relation established is one that presumes the separateness of the “alien” (Beck, Giddens and Lash, 1997:96).

Thus, to foster a global ethic on the paradigm of relatedness and interrelatedness we need to go beyond patriotism. We need to see ourselves as belonging to a larger reality beyond that which is contextual. We need to learn to think of those people who stay in lands far away from our own as our relatives regardless of language, colour and culture. This can only be possible when globalization is essentially “action at a distance” (Beck, Giddens and Lash, 1997:96).

This idea of “action at a distance” is contradicted by those scholars who postulate the survival of one’s culture as the goal of all living. In this form of reasoning one’s culture is being seen as in a state of competition with other cultures. Its survival is premised on its ability to outsmart other cultures. This is the impression one gets from Skinner: “Our culture has produced the science and technology it needs to save itself. But if it continues to take freedom and dignity rather than its own survival as its principle value, then it is possible that some other culture will make a greater contribution in the future” (Skinner, 1988:181).

The salient feature of Skinner's argument is that of cultural competitiveness as important for national survival. Instead of seeing globalization in terms of cultural competitiveness we should attempt to see globalization in terms of multi-culturalism based on the ethos of dialogic engagement. In this dialogic engagement, we should cultivate an outlook based on the idea that no culture has the monopoly on truth but that each culture is nourished and invigorated by constant dialogue with other cultures.

In practice, this implies a global effort to build a common ethical point of view around the idea of our common belonging – that humankind belong to each other and to the environment. However, any attempt to campaign for a global ethics remains utopian to the arch-advocates of self-interest. Their argument is that the demise of socialism and the resultant globalization of capitalism justify their intuition that self-interest has a survival value in the long run but certainly not in this new globalization era. Self-interest may seem as selfishness in this globalization age while issues of global common interests and objectives will be given priority in the new public policy initiatives.

5.3 GLOBALIZATION, THE THEORY OF PUBLIC SELF-INTEREST

Various post-modernists argue that those countries that are economically successful have a strong moral basis and operate within a strong moral public administrative framework. Their notion of "a strong morality" is actually based on the Darwinian concept of "the survival of the fittest" namely "for human beings it is the struggle rather than the achievement that matters; we are made for action,

and the achievement can prove to be a great disappointment. The ambition, whatever it may be, sets the struggle in motion, but the struggle is more enjoyable than its own result, even when the objective is fully achieved" (Davidson, and Rees-Mogg, 1997:354).

For this reason, the struggle for survival and competition is seen as the primary characteristic of our global relationships. The question is, however, whether there can be an alternative to this global Darwinian jungle? Yes, certainly. Humans need to organize their actions for their own benefits.

Similarly, Neo-liberalists see self-interest as a mechanism of natural selection. They see "Origin of Species". What this means is that, as those individuals who control the rules of the global economy, its language and logic, its resource allocation, its markets, will survive in the long run. It logically follows that poor countries are an endangered species. Indeed it is their perishing which gives progress to the rich countries. Darwin insinuated the undesirability of the existence of the poor when he said that : "With savages, the weak in body may soon be eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibited a vigorous state of health" (Lux, 1990:12).

According to Darwin as cited in Lux (1990, our humanitarian efforts to build a compassionate and sympathetic society are the very causes for the propagation of endless misery. The ideal would be that poor people should be left for nature to take its course. When bodies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank advise governments to cut spending on social welfare are they motivated by a

lack of morality, the Darwinian theory of natural selection, or instead by a morality of our common belonging? (Lux, 1990: 15).

According to Lux, global neo-liberal relations an ethic of common belonging remain illusory for the following reasons :

- i. firstly, global relationships are still dichotomized between the G7's affluent "gangsters" and the rest of the world;
- ii. secondly, most Third World countries have been kept in the captivity of perpetual debt; and
- iii. thirdly, the current neo-liberal theory does not concur with the new science and the new biology, which seem to advance the idea that all life is held together with a thread of interconnectedness (1990:15-20).

If reality is related and interrelated to everything else, it would follow that the present dualistic economic and political system should be substituted with another, more holistic model. From denying relationships among people, neo-liberal theory, modeled on the Darwinian paradigm, denies relatedness between people and the environment. The present global socio-economic and political structure encourages the externalizing and objectifying of human beings and the environment. It accentuates the competitive element and equates self-interest with the common good. This juxtaposition also distorts the capacity of objective thinking so that even much of what passes for science is tainted by ideology (Cobb, 1980:448).

In other words, it was self-interest that gave rise to parliamentary politics. The political participation of citizens in policy formulation is

motivated by the need to safeguard and advance one's own self-interest. The role of the government becomes that of protecting the individual's self-interest. Those who see the government, as they're to promulgate laws of its own are misguided in the sense that they simply do not understand this basic feature of human nature. Moreover, any attempt by government to come up with rules to organize society is actually illusory, for the reason that 'man of system' as Smith called him seems to imagine that he can arrange the different members of a great society with as much ease as the hand arranges different pieces upon a chess-board (Smith, 1969:456).

Smith went further to analyze the individual interest in the society, as "the great chess-board of human society, every single piece has a principle of motion of its own, altogether different from that which the legislator might choose to impress upon it" (1969:381).

Smith implies that the wealth of nations is not based on governmental planning but on the freedom of individuals to exchange, specialize and extend their markets. While engaging in the pursuit of their self-interests, individuals or nations end up promoting the common good. This moral paradigm was that of participants in a system that moralized self-interest within a free market system without government intervention (1969:381).

In view of the fore going it may be important to deduce that :

The global market is an expression of relationships in which individuals make political and economic decisions that produce economic and political consequences. When the USA was considering the African

Growth Opportunity Act aimed at creating investment funds and developing a free trade agreement with Africa, President Clinton expressed the spirit of the legislation as follows “we are going to pay more attention to those who are making the right political and economic reforms. We want to help the magnets of change. Sub-Saharan Africa is still a largely untapped market of 600 to 700 million people” (Scholz, 1995:25). Scholz also pointed out that Lawrence Summers is reported to have said to the US Congress that “leaves one with a sense of tremendous opportunity and potential” (1995:28).

In my own opinion, this example shows that economically powerful countries do give shape to the political and economic design of poor countries – be it for good or bad. Therefore, Nigeria and other developing countries should begin to initiate positive local economic initiatives for good governance in the face of this globalization process. Secondly, it is important to point out that there exists two mechanisms, which are used by economically powerful countries to bring about effective change, namely, aid and investment. With these two mechanisms, powerful countries pronounce damnation or blessings on poor countries. Their intention may not be to promote the well being of poor countries, but to persuade them to embrace the liberal market system. The market, being driven by self-interest, cannot accommodate the interests of the majority of people who have no access to a basic livelihood.

In fact “the market depends on a society’s readiness to sacrifice its citizens”. This has been a crucial issue in IMF and World Bank lending policies. At the micro-economic level, these financial institutions insist that African governments should cut welfare spending and not

interfere with the market. At the macro-economic level, governments should allow the mobility of capital. It is only upon the fulfillment of these policies that loans are given, depending on the economic performance of the country in question (Mosley, 1991:70).

The aim of these lending policies is to advance the liberalization of the economy and the mobility of capital – the lending policies are basically modeled on the needs of the liberal economies of the North. The economic dominance of the developed countries thus did not come about as a result of a spontaneous order but through an extensive exploitation of natural resources, guided by the assumption that these resources would never end. However, resources are finite which implies that scarcity of resources will eventually lead to the collapse of the global free market system. An economic system based on self-interest, for this reason, cannot bring about the global common good. Such an economic system will in the long run ultimately militate against itself.

Finally, it will be of help to recognize that an alternative ethical paradigm that is able to address the concerns of globalization has to emerge from a world-view based on relatedness and interrelatedness. Nigeria's economic and political well being in its quests for good public leadership and governance does not lie in subsuming the neo-liberal economic system under the ambit of globalization, rather the government needs to encourage local economic initiatives as an approach to safeguard the general economic interests of all Nigerians.

5.4 GLOBALIZATION : EVIDENCE OF GLOBAL PUBLIC CULTURAL CLONING

What makes globalization worthy of discussion, despite the vagueness of the term, is its cultural magic. After a long history of extraordinary destruction, we are now told that all societies can become a single society. This contribution raises an important question : from where does the discourse of globalization derive its objectives? The world will quickly discover the close link between the modernization project and the globalization project.

The underlining perception in this study so far has shown that the expected dividends from the globalization process may be more beneficial to developed economies than their developing counterparts. For example, Globalization : the early Case of USA and China discussed in 4.6 of this study is a pointer to this view. The main conclusion is that globalization may neither produce useful results nor help to advance the cause of mankind unless mankind begins to look inwards for local self-sustainable empowerment. But as custodians of people culture and policies that drive every societal change, governments may need to have a re-think in their policy conceptions and formulation aimed at protecting the citizens. The role of governments at all levels in this era of global change cannot be undermined.

The modernization project has failed to westernize the culture of the world. The discourse of modernization – laden with ideological distortions, instrumental policies and strange concepts – has been powerless to assist. In addition, development has been a minefield of

corruption embracing those who do not mind losing their intellectual probity. The discourse of globalization takes its inspiration from such ruins and some professionals believe that the end of history has arrived with the inception of the globalization process.

This contribution aims to question globalization. Criticizing scholarly Western relations with the world is unlikely to please contemporary conservative thinking. It may be important to draw on Roland Robertson's work quite prominently for a number of reasons :

- i. first, on account of its currency in academic institutions;
- ii. second, his analysis is made credible by its balanced tone and unstated creed of the superior West; and
- iii. third, certain values and principles espoused by Robertson as "shared" invite further inquiry into values. As will be seen, a society in which individuals are formed and influenced by the values of the Industrial Revolution appears to be culturally disconnecting in the global field (Robertson, 1992:38).

Thus, this implies that the concept of globalization could not be revived if many ideological patterns exist. Some see the world systems in which the world is conceived as a consequence of the capitalist system of exchange. Similarly, globalization should be centered on such a conception that involves the attempts to take the notion of globality very seriously. Much of the thrust of this thinking centers on attempts to depict the main general contour of the world as a whole. But if one employs the concept of culture more fluidly and adventurously, culture indicates a particular way of sociological specifics and not vice versa.(Robertson.1992:38).

Therefore in this globalization process, culture should be seen as a social representation of the global field that stresses and processes diversity, which have implications for socialization in the contemporary world. From this standpoint every culture will be seen as equal and only to blend with that of others in the globalization process.

Social change is now proceeding so rapidly that if a social scientist had proposed as recently as ten years ago to write a book about globalization he / she would have had to overcome a wall of stony and bemused incomprehension. But now, just as post-modernism was the concept of the 1980s; globalization may be the concept of the 1990s, a key idea by which we understand the transition of human society into the third millennium (Waters, 1995:125–6).

If societies do not think in terms of divergence, globalization becomes “a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (Waters, 1995:3).

This process may be conceived to be the fruit of modernity. But there must be something after modernity. Therefore “globalization cannot be comprehensively considered simply as an aspect of the outcome of the Western project of modernity. It may also be argued that globalization is intimately related to modernity as well as post-modernity and post-modernization. Globalization concepts have had so many critics in wider perspectives just as the previous worlds concepts such as modernity, anti-modernity and post-modernity and its impact on the world.

The Public sector, globally, may be seen as agents of the globalization process hence leaders and governments create all legal and environmental friendly atmospheres in which big businesses thrive. Therefore, further world integration within the globalization process either for profit or for social change, cannot succeed without government inputs.

Globalization may represent the final stage of the World's societal integration. However, in order to simplify complex arguments Westernization may present a minimal model of globalization. Therefore, Nigerians and other developing nations should endeavor to assume a moderate stand towards globalization by thinking towards self-reliance, local economic initiatives or else westernization, imperialism and capitalism will be repeated in the globalization process.

Globalization, as has been established in this study involves the possible integration of the economy, polity and culture of one sphere into another. If this is so, the human endeavour to influence or dominate has been evidenced throughout the ages. Therefore, the globalization process should be embraced with a holistic approach in which there is more concern to create a socio-cultural system in which culture; polity and economy play dominant roles in the world system. Economy and polity are not excluded from the world system, but help to energize it *"negatively or positively"*.

In such a world system, individuals, societies, the system of societies and humankind, are to be treated in terms of one coherent analytical

framework; hence there is a need for better leadership and governance to administer these changes.

In the light of the above, if adequate care is not taken, it may be necessary to predict a surprising result where, in a globalized world, there will be a single society and culture occupying the planet. This society and culture will probably not be harmoniously integrated although it might conceivably be. Rather, it will probably tend towards high levels of differentiation, multi-centricity and chaos. There will be no central organizing government and no tight set of cultural preferences and prescriptions.

In so far as culture is unified it will be extremely abstract, expressing tolerance for diversity and individual choice and more importantly, territoriality will disappear as an organizing principle for social and cultural life, it will be a society without borders and spatial boundaries, and if care is not taken, without policies that will be relevant to the needs of the people. In view of these, it is worthwhile for governments all over the world to be more protective of their local culture than making them more vulnerable to others in the name of global integration.

If our world turns into something little short of a nightmare, our research will not be worth the paper it is written on unless it is an outstanding and visible benefit accrued to the people and governments in the developing world. There must be well-articulated models in good governance that will show how economy, polity and culture work together in the new world system and particularly diffuse the idea that culture is superior to everything else. The emphasis should be that, in

all political systems of the world much of good leadership and governance aimed at local people centered development, is the only hope for global economic survival. This implies that culture will inevitably dovetail with economics and governance because culture has always been politicized, such as in Japan-US relations where the US culture is seen to be superior to that of Japan even in their trade agreements. Therefore, if economic aspects and profits should only drive the globalization process, the world has proceeded without "cultural guidance" and that economy and politics have not been strong enough to globalize existing reality.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The views expressed above give a picture of globalization from both a political and religious point of view. Each view tends towards cultural cloning of the entire world in the name of change and modernization. For example, if Islamic ideas and values should press Muslims to attack the world system, we need more than a single set of alternatives to prevent the world system from being victimized; an alternative, which would please, major actors. That is so because it is difficult to agree that Islamic ideas and values are the best for all or vice versa. Therefore, societies must go further in dynamizing a societal order in relation to a global order, which almost automatically means that political-ideological and religious movements arise in deference to the issue of defining societies in relationship to the rest of the world and global circumstances as a whole.

Furthermore, to be in the business of globalization is to be in the business of culture and vice versa. For example, in terms of culture

the process implies that Arabs and Jews must discuss their differences and adopt alternatives that bring them closer to a single global order. Islam, Confucianism and Western liberal democracy contest one another for dominance at the contemporary world socio-political scene. In terms of polity and economy the process also involves international organizations and transnational movements whose aim is to have the upper hand rather than the advancement of humankind. Consequently, under the Western umbrella where organizations and multinationals play a dominant role, globalization will be no more than the disorganization of non-Western cultures and structures.

There still exist some schools of thought whose assumptions are that all real knowledge rests only with the West. The globalization process should seek to stress multiculturalism rather than xenophobia and race-oriented nationalism, the interdependence of various histories and denounce, in practical terms the idea of Western superiority.

Indeed, it is now evidenced that globalization originated from Western thought in the same way as the discourse of modernization, and this can be better termed as global cultural cloning. Western intellectuals still see themselves as the best in the field despite the West's diminished capacity for spinning intellectual stories about non-Western places. Indeed, it shows that the North is more conscious about the globe than the South. This raises the question of whose influence will shape the present and future welfare of the earth's inhabitants. Freedom and equal justice should be an overriding factor.

It is also understandable at this point, that the process of advocating change appears endless. For the last two hundred years, countries

that pride themselves on having reached an advanced stage of development, of being post-industrial, of being “developed”, still constantly require accelerating change from their privileged population but now this apocalyptic scheme seems to be the apogee of all changes since Adam. In a globalized world, the world should accept change in order to become a united society with a high level of inter-relatedness in culture, religion and commerce but not to impose them on the disadvantaged third world countries in any manner or fashion. The strong should become global players and the rest should learn to adjust to these players' performance according to availability of resources at their disposal.

The new version of change is also about competition, in which the rich alone will be rewarded and esteemed, provided it is done with openness and clear developmental intentions. Therefore, if globalization is not a form of cultural dominance by the West then every nation, including Nigeria, should be left to dictate the pace and limits of its own involvement. However, globalization is not a self-operating machine but requires a great deal of co-operation from those involved, especially when the problem relates to cultural identity. Therefore, the entire project demands a hegemonic organization capable of diffusing, enforcing and protecting the harmonious interaction of economic, political and cultural processes. The problem is that good hegemonic power (whose goal is co-operation and liberation rather than colonization and domination) is hard to define in the modern world, given that international relations can be easily abused and subverted for national interests.

Similarly, as national governments and their leaders have the traditional role of serving the interest of their people, it will not be out of place for them to protect the same interests in matters of global concern and at the same time have good global relations with other sovereign states. However, the existing international policy prescriptions are not universal in application and even if they were, leadership and governance scenarios are not the same all over the world and this poses a serious administrative threat in the globalization process.

Thus, the concept of powerful global actors must be organizational, for example, the body of the United Nations (UN) and its agencies is in a position to making sure that every global decision must be in the interest of the people and not for a few economically privileged countries or/and individuals. It is important to note that policies and programs of developing nations need to be focused on public service delivery in aspects that pose serious threats to the society namely :

- i. primary health-care in dealing with deadly diseases such as
- ii. Acquired Immuned Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), Tuberculoses (TB) and Malaria;
- iii. education, which gives a boost to people's empowerment, training and development; and
- iv. poverty alleviation programs.

These and many other issues may not be priorities for developed countries at this stage, but they are serious realities that impede several developmental efforts in developing countries. Unless these issues are viewed in proper perspective, the survival chances of

Nigeria and other developing countries in the proposed cultural, socio-economic cloning in the name of globalization, may be slim. The next chapter will provide a study of Nigeria's democratization and state building mechanism in this globalization era.