Review

The interconnectedness of globalisation and social conflict in Africa

Sunday E. N.Ebaye

Centre For General Studies: Peace and Conflict unit, Cross River University of Technology, Calabar, Cross River State.

sundayebaye@yahoo.com, Tel: 08027511954

Accepted 05 December, 2012

The issue of whether globalisation is simply a double-edged sword, impacting conflict escalation and de-escalation more or less evenly or whether it tends to foster more conflict than it resolves is a crucial question in the globalisation discourse. This research attempts an appraisal of the interplay between globalization and social conflict in Africa. Though globalisation promotes the belief that the interests of humanity would best be served if world markets are left unfettered by ethical, moral, social or environmental considerations (Ritchie, 1996), the paper reveals that there is an interaction between conflict and globalisation as markets provide poor groups the financial means to purchase weapons and destabilize local conditions, as factions seek to exploit natural resources. Globalisation also introduce ideological themes into local politics, and these themes such as marketisation and democratization may trigger ethnic and religious conflict as groups vie for power and influence in a changing environment. Globalisation seems to be pulling virtually all identity groups out of their various degrees of isolation, pushing them into currents of the global ecumene and thereby obligating them to redefine themselves to global trends. What we have today is a contested and undecided encounter between global cultural flows and inherited local identities which suggest a world society becoming more inter-connected physically while a consensus of fundamental values and priorities may well be torn by conflict, more intractable than the previous disputes between nations, (Waters, 1995). The paper asserts that many of the tensions of social change are largely unavoidable, and some are undoubtedly creative in their effects, suggesting that if the human needs and rights issues involves are not adequately addressed, the incidence and intensity of social conflict associated with globalisation are likely to increase steadily in the years ahead.
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INTRODUCTION

Different scholars (Dickens 1992; Ake 1995; Scholte 1997; Adedokun 2006; Giddens 1990; Nnoli 2001; Toyo 2007) have viewed the concept of globalisation from different perspectives. For Scholte (1997), it is a source of, or contributing factor to conflict, and that numerous instances of the destabilizing impact of economic and cultural forces, radiating from the West, on the national politics of most 3rd world nations exist.

According to Ake, (1995). “Economic forces are constituting the world into one economy and to a lesser extent, one political society. Nations participate in global governance according to their economic power, which is coextensive with their rights. The global order is ruled by an informal cabinet of the world’s economically most powerful countries, its law is the logic of the market, and status in this new order is a function of economic performance” (26).

Globalisation therefore refers to the growing integration of different countries of the world into a global economy and financial system. It is a concept that cut across many disciplines. From the economic perspectives, it is viewed as “… a deeper integration and increasing relations through expansion in production, trade, financial flows by banks and transnational firms in which the IMF and the World Bank have become the major actors and principal role players in the process of managing the World economy …. Even though the capitalist system has always been globalizing in previous historical epochs, the present globalisation has exhibited high intensive and extensive increase in trade, capital flows, and
technological advance than any other period before now” (Adedokun, 2006).

For the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, it is perceived as a situation where the entire world is becoming a village dominated by the forces of demand and supply and the earth one big market where exports and imports are increasing tremendously and the foreign investment are booming.

Politically, globalisation is considered as a new world order where the world is no longer separated in social, economic and political ideological lines, but one where global problems are jointly resolved by all nations in the bid to maintain world peace and order. Critically viewed, this might mean the joint effort of the advance nations to ensure uninterrupted flow of raw materials from the developing nations to the developed ones, the importation of manufactured goods by the developing countries, and the protection of strategic water-ways for the free movement of goods and services across the world.

Political globalisation is attributed to the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, the collapse of the Warsaw pact, and the eventual disintegration of the Soviet Union (USSR). All these developments boosted the unity of the Euro-American Capitalist countries and put an end to the East-West ideological and economic divide. The hitherto bipolar world system caves into a unipolar system with the US as a major player, and the incorporation of the majority of the former socialist states.

Cultural globalisation also exist whit the proliferation of individualized values; originally Western, to larger parts of the world including Africa. These values are expressed in the form of human rights, identities and the adoption of Western practices. The expanse of trade and productions promote rapid interactions between cultures in the worldwide acculturation.

Globalisation is considered as an accelerator of social change and a likely catalyst for conflict, aggravating the tensions of many societies and possibly creating new ones. Our lives are increasingly influenced by forces which have transcended borders, and which, precisely because of their scope and power, are changing irreversibly, life on the global capacity.

Globalisation can therefore be seen as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happening are shaped by events occurring at distant places. Local transformation is as much a part of globalisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space (Giddens, 1990:46). The relationship between globalization and conflict is more complex and subtile in ways not hitherto discussed. For globalization is often disruptive and inequitable in its effect and posed new challenges for existing public institutions implying that it has paradoxically, opened grounds for the oppressed to come together and protest against its subordination and homogenizing force.

From another perspective, globalization is considered as the latest stage in the development of capitalism, a stage where freely mobile capital operating through multinational corporations has succeeded in imposing its priorities on Nation-states and local societies. Though the focus here is on economic, and portrayed as unidirectional, it may be difficult to limit the discussion to narrowly defined economic processes, since the same force and enabling conditions that have led to global economic changes have also facilitated changes in other areas. The intensifying inter connectedness which characterize globalization has unintended consequences for both conflict and peace processes. Thus, globalization may catalyze conflict and can also accelerate conflict resolution.

With globalization, the role of the state has been downsized thereby undermining the capacity of the state for social provisioning, even when in the African context the role of the state is defined in developmental terms. The increase in social and political unrest has exposed African states of their inadequacies and worsens their economic condition thereby degenerating into conflicts. Countries such as Nigeria, Burundi, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, Cote d’ Ivoire, Rwanda, Angola, etc have greatly experienced widespread and intense international conflicts which has opened up the myth of national solidarity, undermining the social fabric of these states and seriously affected their economy negatively (Alli, 2006).

The objective of this paper therefore is to attempt a clarification of various aspects of globalization and their potentials for generating social conflict and unrest.

**Conceptualization**

Though the concept of globalisation may appear rather vague, and the problem it seeks to describe apparently multifarious, it does express a prevailing sentiment that our lives are greatly influenced by forces which have transcended borders, and which precisely because of their scope and powers, are changing, irreversibly, life on the global capacity.

As a concept, it implies the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole and has such products as the emergence of a global division of labour and a deregulated world economy. Scholars have conceptualized globalization into two main classifications, namely the benign and the malevolent versions. While the benign thesis of globalization as scholars opine is that with the growing complexity and interdependence of the world economy, there are growing centres of consumption and productions that are no longer bounded by nation states (Friedman, 1999; Ohmae, 1990), such centres include the rampant middle range information technology
production centres that have emerged in almost all parts of the world and the humans, monetary, and intellectual capital flow freely across nation states. States have virtually lost control over the movement of capital, consequently losing the capability of regulating their economies. Scholars here conclude that globalization is a natural and inevitable process with an unintended, but positive result.

The malevolent thesis on the other hand sees technological change and free movement of capital as producing to a large extent a number of negative consequences (Castells, 1993). Scholars here cite cases where multinational corporations exploit local conditions by moving production facilities based on changing local conditions irrespective of the impact of these changes on local populations.

“Globalization continues the story in world history of West European mercantilism and expansionism... it is important to be aware that mercantilism with the expansionism connected with it is not a simple matter of trade, it is trade inspired by greed for large wealth, exploitation, inordinate grabbing, coercion as a ready resort, and the hunt for power and more power over the known world. It involves the design to dominate through trade, the design made by private circles seeking great wealth and power, with states acting in their support” (Toyo, 2007).

In Africa, the greatest consequences of globalization have been in the area of the provision of social welfare policies and programmes where the state used to play vital roles. Withdrawals of such welfare programmes and the unlimited adoption and promotion of Western market reforms, negatively affects the economy. In some instances, and based on the state capacity, such relations produce a dynamic set of forces that provoke conflict and possibly disintegration (Aina, 1997).

As a complex social phenomenon, globalization conflict with diverse elements of social life and goes with uncertainties and incompatibilities, its main task being the expansion of capitalism across states (Nnoli, 2000: 173). The value of globalization transmitted through satellite television and the distribution of worldwide publications, permeate every body’s life. No nation is protected by topography, tradition or indifference. No one is out of reach of the extended arm of globalization (Steingard and Fitzgibbons, 1997). Thus, this concept both enlightens and pacifies, both widens horizons and narrows vision, and its Utopian concept of prosperity is subverted by images of deprivation and marginalization by an increasing tide of insecurity and anxiety. It has particularly landed the 3rd world nations on a slippery ground because the principles of democracy has been hard for them to accept and practice (Lar, 2001).

Contemporaneously, globalization is the transmitter of values, essentially Western and liberal in form but is aggressively promoted internationally as universal values. This is the perspective behind such notions as the standard package of liberal economic reforms prescribed for all developing nations by IMF. “Globalization means that developing countries should substitute outward looking (i.e. export-oriented) for inward looking (import substitution) neocolonialism” (Toyo, 2007).

On the other hand, conflict is a state of opposition or hostility, a fight or struggle, the clashing of opposed principles. The opposition of incompatible wishes or needs in a person, or the distress arising from this (Hornby et al., 1988). The concept implies a situation of interaction involving two or more parties in which actions in pursuit of incompatible objectives or interest result in varying degrees of discord.

… conflict is very often, the result of the interaction of political, economic and social instability, frequently stemming from bad governance, failed economic policies and inappropriate development programmes which have exacerbated ethnic or religious difference” (Ec 1996; Bassey, 2007).

In all human societies, there exists conflict as a result of many factors. The nature of man, his class status, ambitions, etc all combined to produce conflict in different degrees and scopes (Tamuno, 1999). It has been observed that conflict is the result of interaction and contact among people “an unavoidable concomitant of choices and decisions and an expression of the basic fact of human interdependence” (Zartman, 1991). It is also the result of frustration in a relationship or interaction. The occurrence of aggressive behaviour always suggests the existence of frustration which always leads to some form of conflict (Stagner, 1995). Conflicts have increasingly become thematic in process of African political development. It occurs in different forms with some fundamental impacts on nation building and economic development. This is partly due to the fact that, like the state, the economy is equally dependent and does not reproduce itself. This creates sharp contradictions in the competition by elites to control the limited resources available in the state. Those that are unable to have access to the control of state power and the economy would employ whatever means at their disposal to accomplish their ambition.

Dating back to the 1920s, there were subsisting anti-colonial conflicts, wars of national liberation and anti-apartheid wars between Africans and their colonial masters, such as the liberation wars in Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Angola, Mozambique etc, and up to the 1990s. However, the nature of conflict today has change and can be categorized as follows, conflicts as a result of the struggle for political participation, conflicts as a result of the contest for access to resources, and conflicts as a result of the struggle over identity (Ibeanu, 2003). While this conflict may not be accompanied by bloodshed, most of the recent post cold war conflicts in Africa degenerate into violence leading to destruction of lives and property. Violence, provoked by conflicts, has often turned the
people’s attention from creative production to creative destruction (Nnoli, 2003). Coser, however explained that conflict emerges whenever one party perceive that one or more goals or purpose or means of achieving a goal or preference is being threatened or hindered by the activities of one or more parties who may be seeking to expand into same field or physical sphere, or more abstractly, into the same field of influence or behaviour (Coser, 1956).

There has been a proliferation of groups of various kinds with a collective sense of belonging, self realization, and self affirmation all over Africa with the sole aim of protecting and promoting the interest of their groups. Such groups include the Niger Delta Force, the South-South Movement, Odu’a People Congress (OPC), Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP), Movement for the Actualisation of the Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB), Arewa Consultative Forum (ACF) all in Nigeria. The Oromo People Liberation front in Ethiopia, the Sudan Peoples’ Liberation Army (SPLA), the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone, the Lord’s Resistance Army in Uganda, and many others.

One can say that the spiral of conflicts are either the result of political failures within the African States or the diminishing role of National Governments and the collapse of the developmental state in Africa (Stremlau, 1998). Most of the conflicts in Africa are intra state conflicts but for the exceptional cases of inter state conflict between Tanzania and Uganda in the 1970s and between Ethiopia and Eritrea in the 1990’s over territory and to an extent, with economic under tone. Despite globalization, there appears to be no borderless world (Kahler, 2002). Social conflict therefore as posited by Lederach, emerges and developed based on the meaning and interpretation people involved attach to actions and events, “…as social meaning is lodged in the accumulated knowledge ….” (Lederach, 1995).

**METHODOLOGY**

This research is conducted using the descriptive / qualitative research method which is the reliance on already published/online materials to describe the tred of globalization and social conflict with a view to making deductive generalization and predictions.

**Theoretical framework**

One conceptual analysis to the study of social conflict is in the human needs theory as opined by John Burton. According to him, a proper study of conflict must first make a distinction between needs, values and interest. In conflict resolution, one must note that only the interests are negotiable in the short run while the values can be only changed over the long run in an environment of security and non-discrimination. The needs cannot be negotiated away under any circumstances (Burton, 1990). This implies that

“There are limits to the extent to which the human person, acting separately or within a wider ethnic or national community can be socialized or manipulated…” and “… that there are human development needs that must be satisfied and catered for only by institutions, if these institutions are to be stable, and if societies are to be significantly free from conflict” (1990:23).

Even though there appears to be some agreement here, Burton presents a plausible list of needs. These include a sense of security and of identity, a consistent response from the environment to complement our generic drive to learn, a recognition and valued relationship, and control over their environment in order to ensure that their needs are fulfilled (1990: 47 and 95).

This approach has vital consequences for social institutions. If the needs are being met, the institution receives support and is consolidated and perpetuated, but if the needs are not met, the institution loses support and legitimacy and faces serious opposition. The authorities may react with repression and coercion, which is likely to lead to more conflict. Burton argued that human needs are seriously frustrated in the modern societies, and that the more the enforcement of law and order to control these frustrations, the more the frustration. The legitimacy of even the most seemingly legitimized authorities is shaky as members of revolutionary groups in different societies, and the terrorists who spring from relatively privileged classes, are demonstrating that there are features of societies, of different political forms, unacceptable to many members of such societies. This might lead to one extreme form of reaction or another (1990).

The theoretical conceptualization here elucidate many areas of globalization and social conflicts as the three basic attributes of conflicts namely, Needs, Values and Interest are involved.

**Globalization and conflicts**

In any given conflict, the general deprivation of basic needs such as recognition, valued relationships, and control would have to be properly managed if further disruptions are to be avoided. If the means to the fulfillment of basic needs are seen to be eroded by the process of globalization, then conflict and social unrest must be expected.

"... the point is that as a result of material deprivations and the consequent desperation of the people under the regime of globalisation, the struggle for access to material resources has become more intense... while absolute poverty may lead to apathy and inactivity, comparisons with those in the same society who do better may inspire radical actions and even violence"
(Hegre et al., 2002)

The conceptually interesting area in the study of globalization and conflict is the global-local forces interaction. Global forces may bring a new set of actors to bear on a local situation, by facilitating the expression of a local conflict, contributing to its resolution or even changing its features and outcome in other unpredictable ways. The interplay between the forces of globalization and conflict are apparent. For instance democratization and marketisation, two prominent reforms promoted worldwide by several leading economic and military power, interacts with local conflicts dynamics. These reforms create the basis for provoking and heightening ethnic conflict as some group benefits from these reforms more than others.

In the third world nations, ethnically distinct groups are often characterized by one gaining politically, possibly through majority rule, while the others gain economically. The result is often that the political and economic powers are controlled by distinct ethnic groups thereby rigidifying ethnic boundaries and creating competitive relationships. Democratization, marketisation and ethnic divisions combined to create potentially explosive social conditions (Chua, 1998). However, marketisation and democratization appear to have redistributed wealth and political influence in ways that widened the gap and increased the polarization between groups.

All level of society are being reshaped by globalization: the individual livelihood is threatened or identity thrown into question, localities are forced to recreate themselves or die in the face of new economic forces, and nations are experiencing steadily decreasing freedom of action. The contemporary form of globalization, driven by economic power clearly promotes the hegemony of Western culture and corporations, puts jobs and communities at risks in the rich countries and exploits cheap labour in the poorer countries, increase threats to the environment, and undermines the basis of democracy and social stability by subjecting national political institutions to forces of economic change beyond their control.

“...ungoverned markets have the potentials to unleash seismic waves of severe economic disruption, while unbridled globalization will pose major technological risks to countries seeking to evolve domestic technological capabilities... Globalization of Africa through the privatisation of its public sector services is merely a euphemism for organised spoliation (Timamy, 2007: xvi and xviii).

Traditional identity groups in the 3rd world nations are prominent in the conflict of cultural reactions as their societies were already put on the defensive during this modernization process as Western institutions and values were introduced. They feel even more threatened now as their national institutions are undermined by the pressures of globalization. Both the pace and direction of change in these societies accelerates the search for a single, mythologized truth that can reference all social mores and practices (Waters 1995).

It is uneven, both in its process and in its effects, as it produces concentrations and deprivations which, in its totality, constitute an increasingly well defined global power structure. By this, it implies “a qualitative shift towards a global economic system that is no longer based on autonomous national economics but on a consolidated global market place for production, distribution, and consumption (Holm and George, 1995) where distinct national economics are subsumed and rearticulated into the system by essentially international processes and transactions (Hirst and Grahame, 1992).

The great divide between those benefiting from globalization and those hurting from it accentuates the possibilities for conflict. Globalization is considered as a major factor responsible for conflict as it has disarticulated the fragile governmental system in Africa and seriously undermined the developmental state. Most importantly, it is within the nation state that democratic intensity is greatest. (Nnoli, 2000).

As a result of globalization, the world has become more polarized and the gap between the poor and the rich more widened, thereby creating a high risk of civil war or armed conflict due to unemployment and leaving the rebels with no alternative. Sorokin observed that social strife and unrest were at their highest during periods when a society was undergoing a great change of world view. For instance, from a religious outlook to a more secular and materialist perspective, such periods of transformation are transitional, and are characterized by conflicts of values and interest, which have become widespread and violent (1937).

Due to greatly increased access to information and declining effectiveness of public institutions, citizens have lost their habit of obeying. If leaders cannot find a more effective way to gather support, the citizens will begin to consider diverting their loyalty and legitimacy. Furthermore, because of the interdependence of the world, a crisis network has evolved. To the extent, that information about a crisis in one area flows immediately to other areas. Due to information flow and the interaction engendered by refugees, traders, terrorists and other boundary-spanning individuals and groups, authority crisis overlap and cascade across collectivities, forming linkages among them on an issue (Rosenau, 1990).

Another consequence of globalization is that though it intends to homogenize, it exposes the social heterogeneity that exist. Groups that have racial, ethnic or religious differences have been very vocal and have used the global media to express their discontent. This ethnic revival was to some extent made more aggressive by the end of the cold war. The states weakened by globalization became less effective in their coercing compliance or integrating national society, and the minorities became more effective in reasserting their identity in reaction to hegemonic cultural forces, as they
no longer see the state as a promoter and protector of domestic interest, but a collaborator with external forces (Scholte, 1997). Therefore the conflicts within the 1990s were no longer found between and among states, but between the state and sub national groups (Gurr, 1994). Consequently, Huntington has proposed the inter - civilizational conflict as the new changer to the major powers in international affairs, arguing that..."the efforts of the west to promote its values of democracy and liberalism as universal value, to maintain its military predominance and to advance its economic interests engender countering responses from other civilizations" and therefore concluded that "the next world war, if there is one, will be a war between civilization" (Huntington, 1993).

Chaos, turmoil, and violence in different nations have serious effects that will certainly affect other parts of the globe. Wars, radical ideologies, embargoes, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, refugees, and sanctions, all emanated from the crucible of the failing state order. The West cannot quarantine the 3rd World Nations and their problems indefinitely, any more than states can indefinitely quarantine the dispossessed, within their own societies (Fuller, 1995). Fuller further traced the dynamics of cultural conflicts, explaining how non-western peoples are confronted with convincing evidence that their societies are being reshaped by someone else's values.

"... systems of international marketing and communications create freeways for the mass import of foreign cultural materials... food, drugs, clothing, music, films, books, television programs, even values... with the concomitant loss of control over societies symbols and myths. Such cultural anxieties are welcome fuel to more radical political groups that call for cultural authenticity, preservation of traditional and religious values, and rejection of the alien cultural antigens... (1995: 152)

Even the west cannot be left out in the secondary effects of these conflicts.

On his part, Barber expatiated on how neither globalization, commercialism nor parochial solidarity bodes well for democracy, and trenchantly critiques the role of religion as a contributing cause to the conflict, characterizing most modern groups. "... parochial rather than cosmopolitan, angry rather than loving, proselytizing rather than ecumenical, zealous rather than rationalist, sectarian rather than deistic, ethnocentric rather than universalizing... fractions and pulverizing, never integrating" (Barber, 1995)

"This is the explanation that may be given for the many conflicts that have ravaged Africa for some time now. From Somalia to Liberia, from the genocidal conflict of Rwanda to the diamond conflict of Sierra Leone, DRC and several other countries, the conflicts are traceable to serious economic dislocation caused by the impact of globalization and made worst by the high level of unemployment and widespread poverty. Economic crisis which manifest in lay offs, retrenchments, lack of jobs for young school leavers and graduates always intensity distributional conflicts and economic contestations. But this is usually obfuscated by vested political interest and reactionary element... thus giving such conflicts in different colour" (Alli, 2006).

Globalisation has radically shifted the balance of economic power in favor of capital, which is highly mobile and thus able to move where profits are to be gain, and against labour, which is less mobile. This is capitalism, and capitalism inevitably involves competition, and a process of creative destruction. Competition encourages firms to innovate, in order to do better than their rivals. This may lead to the destruction or marginalization of some industries/regions as more innovative competitors takes the lead in a given sector thereby creating a loser and winner situation. This could be seen from the displacement of the horse and carts by the automobiles.

In the real world situation, losers and winners are not just impersonal or abstract firms but people, workers, or societies. Creative destruction amounts to the unemployment of real workers, the destitution of real societies, devastation of the environment, and the disempowerment of the populace (MacEwan, 1994). The forces acting on today's workers in the structure of today's global economy with its open and increasingly fierce competition, growing income inequality, job insecurity and unemployment are seen as the flip side of globalization (Kapstein, 1996)

The situation of the poor nations that can not find a place in the new world economy is even worst. With the absolute cost of labour becoming less important as a competitive factor, considering the low labour costs relative to a certain level of technological sophistication and economic integration in the world economy, many states face a process of rapid deterioration that could lead to destructive reactions. Within the frame work of a new informational economy a major part of the world population is shifting from a structural position of exploitation to a structural position of irrelevance which is rapidly developing the rise of ideological/ religious fundamentalism, easily associated with terrorism and/or semi religious wars. There is the fear that the excluded may never become true partners in a system that is so extraordinarily inclusive of economics and somewhat exclusive of societies (Castells, 1993). What has been the reality across the 3rd world nations for sometime is now becoming glaring. Declining incomes, growing inequalities, job insecurity, crime, etc. These are forces that are tearing the social fabric of the 3rd world nations.

"Globalization (is seen) as widespread diffusion of norms, institutional structures, investments, or technical innovations to many countries abroad, which get absorbed temporarily, spontaneously, or coercively by significant segments of these societies and... that are destructive and potentially adverse to societies that assimilate the changes (Timamy, 2007).
However, conflict resolution or de-escalation also appears to be impacted by globalization. Globalization can help spark interest in bringing about a peaceful resolution of conflict. The global diffusion of information technology can promote greater coordination among people by linking those interested in conflict prevention in ever broader action network. Conflict resolution processes such as negotiation, mediation, or other third party intervention processes may also be impacted by globalization. This explains why international economic relations are characterized by an institutional structure that is very comprehensive.

In this regard, the IMF and the World Bank have been joined by an even more supra national organization-the World Trade Organization which has a well developed dispute settlement mechanism and the authority to impose substantial penalties on those member states that flout its decisions. These developments demonstrate that with regard to a wide range of economic matters, many of the world’s political and economic elites have concluded that the benefits of submitting to these organizations outweighs the benefits of a more independent policy, implying the approval of globalization.

CONCLUSION

This research considers the interplay between globalization, conflict and social unrest, arguing that the interaction between globalization and conflict is complex. One cannot simply state that globalization either escalate or de-escalate conflict. Rather the manner in which the global and local forces interact must be considered on a case by case basis with the analyst teasing out the various interactions between them. For instance, the relationship between marketisation and democratization appears to be far more complex than anticipated. While both are promoted as means to empower local populations, on the ground, they may produce distinctly negative consequences. In this regard, the problematic area is not democratization or marketisation parse, but rather their interactions with local circumstances.

“… the spate of conflict would continue unless African countries can provide appropriate remedies for the devastating consequences of the globalization in process, such... (as) improvement in the level of social provisioning for the people as well as introduction of other measures that would reduce the level of unemployment and poverty (Alli, 2006).

Rodrik was even more emphatic when he stressed that “it is not whether you globalize or not that matters, but how you globalize (1997).”

Currently, there is contradiction between the fact that globalization is in full swing and the fact that existing processes of global governance lack sufficient power, authority and scope to regulate and direct this process towards beneficial ends. Consequently globalization is often disruptive and inequitable in its effects. It has also posed new challenges for existing public institutions while at the same time, weakening their autonomy and support; and paradoxically provide the means for those it exclude culturally or economically to organize against its subordinating and homogenizing forces.

According to MacEwan, greater income inequality is not the only social failure generated by the success of globalization; environmental destruction is surely exacerbated with the success of globalization. The greater mobility of capital makes it more and more difficult for citizens or any one political unit to organize and use their government to impose regulations on polluting firms. He further argued that there is a decline of democratic control and that globalization has a negative impact on the quality of politics and public life by placing restriction on government’s powers to intervene in their own economies and thereby limiting people’s power to exercise political control over their economic lives (MacEwan, 1994). This conveys a sense of alarm that the nation-state as an institutional structure cannot cope effectively with these new developments, and find its own priorities and polices heavily influenced, if not dictated by them.

The findings from the work reveals that the acceleration of globalization is generating change on an unprecedented scale and that the process of globalization is inherently disruptive and an increasing incidence of conflict is an inevitable bi-product of it.

Though globalisation promotes the belief that the interests of humanity would best be served if world markets are left unfettered by ethical, moral, social or environmental considerations, the paper reveals that there is an interaction between conflict and globalisation as markets provide poor groups the financial means to purchase weapons and destabilize local conditions, as factions seek to exploit natural resources.

Globalization has resulted in communal conflicts, destroying life, homes, and property. It has undermined and limited the capacity of the state to provide social welfare packages to the people. Though, globalization may speed resolution of conflicts and may facilitate conflict prevention coordination, there appears to be “a kernel of truth” in the negative feature of globalization, and this judgement becomes more plausible when globalization is evaluated as an engine of social conflict.
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