

KÜRESELLEŞMENİN AFRIKA ÜZERİNDEKİ EKONOMİK VE POLİTİK ETKİLERİ

Abdirahman MUHUMAD*

Özet

Küreselleşme Afrika devletlerini ekonomik ve politik olarak önemli ölçüde etkiler. Ekonomik olarak Afrika, dezavantajlı şekilde de olsa küresel pazara dünyadaki diğer bölgelerden önce entegre olmuştur. Küreselleşme ile ortaya çıkan iş bölümü Afrika'nın, fiyatların dışardan belirlendiği hammadde üreticisi olarak rol almasına neden olmuştur. Bu, Afrika ekonomisinin marjinalleşmesine neden oldu. Bu yüzden Afrika politikası bağımsız olamamıştır ve dış yardımlar bu konuyu derinleştirmiştir. Kıtanın zayıf ekonomik durumu, politikasının dış yardım politikalarına bağlı olmasına neden olmuştur. Bu süreçler uluslararası iş bölümünde, iktisadi ve politik gücün dağılımında, Afrika'nın kaderini açlık, az gelişmişlik ve yolsuzluğa terk ederek, bir dizi krize sahne olmuştur. Bu makalede küreselleşmenin Afrika üzerindeki hem ekonomik hem de politik etkilerini incelemek amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Afrika, Küreselleşme, Gelişme, Ekonomik etki, Politik etki*

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON AFRICA

Abstract

Globalization impacts significantly on African states, particularly economically as well as politically. Economically, Africa was connected to the global market earlier than most of the other regions in our globe, but in a disadvantageous way. International division of labor that came with globalization place Africa's role as the producer of raw materials, which prices are externally determined. This led to marginalization of African economy. African politics is not independent and the foreign aid was one of the key factors that perpetuated and prolonged this issue. The poor economic conditions of the continent led their politics to be dependent on foreign aid and policies. These processes have impelled series of cumulative and conjunctural crisis in the international division of labor and global distribution of economic and political power; thereby qualifying basic African fate to be poverty, underdevelopment, corruption and among other crisis of failed state. This paper is aimed to examine both the economic and political impacts of globalization on Africa.

Keywords: *Africa, Globalization, Development, Economic impact, Political impact*

* İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Yapı ve Sosyal Değişme Programı Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi
abdiraxmaan6@gmail.com

* Masters student at the Department of Social Structure and Social Change in Istanbul University,
abdiraxmaan6@gmail.com

Introduction

Stiglitz points out that globalization's success and failure depends on the way we manage it. There is a success when it is managed by national government by embracing their characteristics of each individual country; however, for him, globalization fails when it is managed by global institutions such as IMF (Stiglitz 2002). What appears globalization to some means localization for others; signaling new freedom for some, up on many others it descends as an uninvited and cruel fate (Z. Bauman 1998: P 2).

The global institutions lack the separation of power unlike nation states. Due to this the dissenting voice of the less developed countries is not taken in to consideration. These global institutions emphasize on policies of neo liberalization, privatization as well as deregulation instead of poverty reduction and economic wellbeing of the underdeveloped countries which violates the sovereignty of these nations. In this respect, according to Stiglitz, these institutions become the spokesmen of financial institutions. As he argued the current global order is "global governance without global government" (Oct 2002: 21). These procedures that global financial institutions employ worsens the gap between developed and developing, which resulted from inequality, lack of accountability and transparency.

According to UNPAN, the term globalization has been in use since early 1990's to depict the modern times. But, of course, there were controversies resulting from the vagueness and ambiguity of the concept. Other similar debates were concerned around the issues pertaining to the emergence of globalization, which group is benefiting from it, what forces drive it and what are the consequences to particular groups. Such questions have not been or seldom discussed in Africa by the concerned groups, which puts a disadvantageous position in the global competition ravaging the way to deal with their own resources effectively in the process of globalization (UNPAN 2002).

According to historian Frederick Cooper (2001, *as cited in* Pádraig Carmody, 2010), Africa has a long history of global connections earlier than the current round of global economic restructuring in the twenty-first century. But Africa was connected to the rest of the world in a disadvantageous manner. The long history of slave trade in some parts of Africa shaped the development of many African societies over long

years. Nevertheless most of African nations were unsuccessful to take advantages and opportunities invited by the global economies of the day. They are unsuccessful to produce many processed goods for export as they lack necessary industries, receive less investment and are less connected to the global world than almost any other region of the world. Thus since they were oriented in primary commodities, the entire formal economy of Sub Saharan Africa, except South Africa, was said to be equivalent to that of one European country (Belgium), or in one state in US (Texas) (Jeffery Herbst 2005: Bond 2006: Pádraig Carmody, 2010)

Evidence depicted that Africa's connection into the global economy has worsened its vulnerability to sudden fluctuations in investment flows and dwindling remittances. For example, GDP in Africa is expected to drop by 50% in 2009, compared to 2008 (2.8% only). Hence, African continent will ever be the poorest in the world, and will undergo the hardships of the outcomes, namely conflict, political crises, increased migratory flows, social conflict, middle class impoverishment, greater social instability, youth unemployment, and urban sprawl without formal planning, financing policies or investment programs in housing, infrastructure or basic services. Furthermore African population's impatience and eagerness to modernity and development and consumerism accompanies with the above mentioned situation. As a result, most African states are deprived of their economic and political sovereignty as they depend on the developed world (Mongi Basunina, 2009: 68-77)

The so called third world has shriveled to Africa. Paul wanted to depict the process of division within the developing countries. According to him, for the past four decades, our language and our concepts have divided the world into a rich minority, and a poor majority. And the world was divided in to the rich billion versus the five billion poor worlds or statistically the 20%-80% world which these 80% are poor. Africa massively over represents the poor billions. For Paul, Sub Saharan Africa partly, if not wholly, covers the bottom billion as 74% of the population was estimated to be undernourished in 2009. (Paul Collier 2003: Andrew Heywood 2011: 364)

Globalization, needless to say, has changed, positively to some extent, states in Africa. Still and all, globalization dwindle Africa's economic and

political independence. For neoliberal globalization builds the growth and development of rich part of the world by the help of poor section of the world. That is done through the idea of neo liberal market, yet we know that the most basic feature of neo liberalism is the systematic use of state power to impose market imperatives through a domestic process that is replicated internationally. Part of Africa's challenge is thus facing the intellectual trick used by international financial institutions - that globalization is for global economic improvement rather than continental economic improvement. Thus, this particular theoretical article tries to examine the impacts of globalization in Africa, particularly, by examining two important aspects of globalization (economic, political aspects) in Africa. By utilizing the available scientific documents on the area the paper will show the impact of globalization on Africa, specifically by focusing on the political and economic impacts.

Negative Impacts of Globalization

“Globalization itself is neither good nor bad...the benefits of globalization have been less than its advocate claim, the price paid has been greater, as the environment has been destroyed, as political processes have been corrupted, and the rapid pace of change has not allowed countries time for cultural adaptation. The crises that have brought in their wake massive unemployment have, in turn, been followed by longer-term problems of social dissolution”
(Joseph Stiglitz, 2002: 14)

It has been said that globalization fundamentally is not the issue (Hardt and Negri, 2004. J Stiglitz 2002), yet the way we utilize it and the neo - liberal structure that it has taken, or takes, in dominion and Empire. Therefore numerous researchers, exceptionally the Marxists, dependably view globalization as a manifestation of wide private enterprise. I most likely concur with that. In this area I will conjecture the effects of globalization and I will unequivocally rely on upon the Marxist hypotheses to relate my contention.

This doesn't imply that globalization has no favorable circumstances in Africa and African economy, rather my contention is that the impacts of globalization on Africa dependably surpasses over the profits, and

my contention is that globalization is the highest stage of capitalism. Imperialism as demonstrated by Lenin in his book *Imperialism* (Lenin, 1999) was once said to be the highest stage of Capitalism. But taking into consideration of the current situation, I argue that globalization, perhaps, is the highest stage of capitalism where economic and political orders of the affluent nations work and the less affluent one is not taken into consideration as the case of African nations.

It is constantly hard to discrete the diverse courses of globalization and it is clear that these are compared in the more extensive framework we call “globalization”. They are interrelated and blended and it can barely be talked about single part of globalization, without saying the other (Tomlinson 2005: Andrew Heywood 2011: 10). In any case again other than all that parts of globalization, my contention will be that the financial force or economic power matters in the globalization era. As I have specified, globalization is the most astounding phase of capitalism and the financially compelling or powerful states will dependably have the high ground and adventure and exploit the less developed countries through different means; increase in foreign direct investment (FDI) etc.

George Ritzer made it clear that, in globalization, those who involve super-ordinate positions in these pecking orders have a tendency to erect structures that stop or moderate different streams. These limitations are intended to work further bolstering their good fortune and to the drawback of others. Great cases include the operations of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO), and World Bank, which, for instance, can serve to confine streams of severely required trusts into southern countries unless, for instance, those countries participate in rebuilding and starkness programs that are intended to ease off their economies (at any rate in the short run). Such projects frequently include requirement that welfare projects be decreased or wiped out and the outcome is that the most burdened individuals from southern nations – racial and ethnic minorities, women, those in the lower classes are harmed the most by these projects (George Ritzer, 2011: 32-33)

Guillermo De La Dahesa (2006: 177-78), in his book *Winners and Losers in Globalization*, expresses that unfortunately, globalization is broadly seen as expanding the hole in the middle of rich and poor, actually bankrupting

the individuals who are now poor, in spite of the fact that the observational proof demonstrates that since the 1980s globalization has quickened, world neediness has diminished generously, that world disparity has fallen marginally, that future has enhanced speedier than anticipated from increments in pay alone, chiefly among poor people. Accordingly, on the substance of it, the tirelessness of neediness and imbalance is by all accounts because of deficient globalization instead of excessively. However it is not a mischance that a few nations have been forgotten, nor recently the aftereffect of a confused inability to size the chances of joining into the world economy. Rather, it is by all accounts because of their absence of certain fundamental institutional gimmicks: gifted works compel, an intelligible and agent government, a created common society, which are all important to make globalization work.

The same was the contention of Joseph Stiglitz in his book *Globalization and Its Discontent*. Stiglitz contends current techniques for globalization is “Global governance without global government” (Oct 2002: 21). Not at all like states, which separation of power exists, global institutions like IMF, WTO, and World Bank, fail to possess any vital governing rules. Those global institutions are disconnected and sole deciders of budgetary arrangements and authorize without listening to any contradicting assessments, for the most part of developing nations.

Neglectful liberalization, privatization, and deregulation policies improperly and unequally treat developing nations’ powers and sovereignty (which Africa over represents). These systems broaden widely the gap between the developed and the underdeveloped. In 1980’s African economies transcended those of East Asian countries, but after two decades, the East Asian economies surpassed over the African economies as we will see in the coming sections.

Theorizing the Impact of Globalization on Africa

Many are critical of development theory on a variety of grounds. For example, Paul Collier (2007) criticizes those interested in development for focusing on those nations that have a good chance of succeeding, as the economically powerful states who can cope and manipulate the system, while ignoring the poorest nations (and failed nation states), in which

Africa contains the largest proportion indeed, that are at the bottom of the global hierarchy on various dimensions (life expectancy, infant mortality, long - term malnutrition, poverty, etc). Below are the two main theories pertaining how development and globalization (in our case) impartially and unfairly treats the less affluent nations. These Marxist theories will be used to elaborate the main argument of the article. The less affluent countries, particularly Africa is facing the challenges of the global economic and political order. If the system continues the same in the future, it will be hopeless for African states, looking eagerly forward to develop, as the developed nations will grow and their economies will surge to a higher levels. Still and all, the African economy will not grow proportionally, rather meagerly.

Dependency Theory

Pertinent to the main argument of the article, there is collection of work critical of development theory known as dependence theory, which stresses on the way that the sorts of development projects brought less to the improvement of the conditions of the countries of the South (less developed countries), however more to a decrease in their freedom and to an increment in their reliance on the nations of the North, particularly the US. Underdevelopment is not a variant condition, or one brought on by the less developed countries themselves, however it is incorporated with the development projects [which globalization is part of it]. It, likewise, includes the idea that, instead of bringing economic change and improvement, brings more noteworthy impoverishment.

Andre Gunder Frank (1969) contends that behind the entire thought of advancement is the idea that the present of less developed nations looks like the past of the developed nations. Subsequently, if the less developed nations just take after the same way taken by developed nations, they will be developed. Nonetheless, for him, the developed nations were never similarly situated as less developed nations today; the developed nations were undeveloped while the less created nations were (and are) immature or underdeveloped. The outcome is that the way taken after by is not so much the best one for the recently underdeveloped world. Frank Gunder likewise rejects the thought that the underdevelopment of a nation is traceable to sources inward to that nation as the modernization

theories contended. Rather, he contends that it is a result of the capitalist system [here globalization is referred as highest stage of capitalism in this article] and of the relationship in the middle of developed and immature or underdeveloped nations inside that framework (capitalist system). Further, he rejects the thought that the answer for underdevelopment lies in the dispersion of capital, institutions, values, from the developed world.

In addition to that, I agree and argue that the less developed nations can only develop the off chance that they are autonomous of a large portion of these capitalist connections which, after all, are truly the reason for their underdevelopment. It is capitalism that is the reason for advancement in the affluent countries and of underdevelopment in the less developed and underdeveloped countries. If support is needed to this argument, better example cannot come to my mind than the relentless resistance of South Korea and Malaysia on IMF conditions and China's decline of any IMF money whatsoever.

World Systems Theory

Dependency theory has had a tendency to wind down, yet it has been supplanted by, and to some degree fused in, a more extensive theory known as world system theory (Wallerstein 1974). This theory assumes a world partitioned primarily between the core (which he refers to the west, or developed nations) and the periphery (which he mean to be the south, or less developed nations) with the country – states associated with the latter being subject to, and abused by, the core nation - states or the developed countries.

The so called development project was essentially a disappointment since the world plainly remained, and stays, portrayed by extraordinary disparities, particularly economic inequalities, between the North and the South or in a sense, between the core and periphery. For him, distinctly, most countries connected with the South did not improve to any calculable degree. For sure, it could be contended that they fell further behind, as opposed to gaining on, the developed nations. Moreover, the entire development project came to be seen as hostile since it had a tendency to lift the North, and everything about it, particularly its economic framework, while belittling everything connected with the South (Ibid).

In its commencement, the globalization project, sounded more impartial since it was intrinsically multilateral and multi-directional while development was one-sided and unidirectional, with money and other support spilling out of the North to the South. Needless to say that globalization project has not worked out uniquely in contrast to the development project as far as contrasts between the North and South is concerned (G. Ritzer, 2011: 34; Stiglitz, 2006: 7-12). Moreover, a considerable lot of the institutions made during time of dependency (those connected with the UN) keep on functioning and play a focal part in globalization. This brings up the issue of whether globalization is just development with an alternate, less hostile, name. This perspective is taken by the individuals who stand against the neo-liberalism, which under girds quite a bit of contemporary economic globalization.

Impact of Globalization on African Development

Africa is in fact a continent. Speculations are hence stupid, and they are surely so when considering the evenness of globalization. Africa is the world's second greatest mainland, covering more than 20 percent of the planet's landmass. It is likewise the second most crowded, with a populace of more than 900 million – 14 percent of the world's population.

This is not to argue that globalization negatively affected African development solely and my argument is not to trace African underdevelopment to globalization only and alone, rather my argument is that globalization negatively affects the important sources of African development. Globalization negatively affects on both economies and politics of Africa as they depend on the global system in which the powerful states are seeking and searching a way to be more powerful and were the less powerful states are and will be less involved and less powerful in the system. As I already mentioned in earlier sections that globalization is the highest form of capitalism, where the powerful states manipulate the system for their own benefits. The less powerful and capable states, like African states, will not benefit the system that much.

For instance Stiglitz (2006: 4) contends that economic globalization can be a positive force and can advance everybody on the planet, including poor people. Then again, this has not been the situation as a result of the

way globalization, and particularly international trade agreements, have been overseen, including their imposition on less developed countries. Accordingly, Stiglitz sees an increment in worldwide poverty and additionally a growing the gap between the rich and the poor. Along these lines globalization has not satisfied its guarantee. Moreover, globalization has not given the worldwide financial stability that many thought it guaranteed.

Impacts on Economy

The general African economic situation shows that the continental performance has been poor: Africa by and large has, for the most part, not by any means, came back to the financial top of the late 1970's the point at which all common asset costs were generally high. While the continent was encountering the "lost decades" of the 1980's and 1990's, other regions were, obviously, making breathtaking increases. According to Jeffery H. (2005), in 1960, the Africa's average per capita income was around three times to that of the East Asian (\$425 versus \$135 in constant 2000 US dollars) while in 2004, Asia's per capita income salary was twice as high as the African normal (\$536 versus \$1,140 using the same measure).

From here we can see that Asian nations figured out how to build their genuine per capita income nine fold, while African nations saw an approximately 25% increase in per capita income more than forty years, with the majority of these increases coming in the initial or two decades of independence. As is obvious, Malaysia and South Korea had per capita income that were lower than numerous African nations in 1960 however today, those nations contrast themselves with the industrialized world instead of to the nations south of the Sahara. The main logic here, as I pointed it out in an earlier section, is that those countries (South Korea, Malaysia and China) persistently resisted the IMF policies and money that would hurdle their economic growth and development. Sadly, African nations followed the structural policies of the global institutions which left their position as the lowest, even lower than their fellow East Asian underdeveloped nations of 1980's.

The poor general economic performance inescapably influences how Africa incorporates into the global economy. Generally, the continent stays

a maker of moderately natural unprocessed materials, which the prices are externally decided. This, in turn, fortified economic marginalization of the continents economy. In fact, it is dispiriting to hear that even in examples of successful nations like Ghana, the same level headed discussions about how to better process unprocessed materials happen today that were regular prior to four decades. Meanwhile, Asian nations have completely changed their industrial production (Jeffery H. 2005: 3, UNPAN 2002)

James Ferguson (2006) has criticized economic impact of globalization on Africa. Economically, he argues that it has led to inequality, marginalization, and the lowest economic growth rates ever recorded and, in some cases, even negative growth. Needless to point out the lowest economies in the world makes up the whole continent of Africa. And the role given by the international division of labor that came with globalization for the past couple of decades placed Africa as the producers of raw materials, though prices are determined externally.

Alhaji Ahmadu (2013) argued that economically, globalization brought the development of anti-developmentalism in Africa. Globalization presents hostile to developmentalism by announcing the state insignificant or peripheral to the development. Neoliberal policies that emphasize on stabilization and privatization, instead of development, improvement and reduction of poverty, are pushed by outside or external donors, prompting more noteworthy destitution and disparity and undermining the capacity of the individuals to partake viably in the political and social processes in their nations. Welfare and different projects planned to meet the essential needs of most of the populace are transferred from governments to non-governmental organizations that start to supplant governments making them to lose the little authority they have

Poor development figures imply that millennium development objectives fall well behind in Sub-Saharan Africa. The extent of the populace that has lived below the poverty line throughout the previous twenty years is 45 every percent; the target for 2015 is 22 percent. Indeed, even in oil producing nations, development is not interpreted into reduction of poverty. As the Economic Commission for Africa's 2008 flagship report notes, recovery - whatever that means and for whomever it reaches - is not being translated into 'meaningful development', and 'has not benefited vulnerable groups'(Ray Bush, 2004).

For instance, Nigeria produced 52 billion USD of oil in 2005, which covers 95% of its trade income, but the Nigerian people cannot enjoy the wealth properly. In the oil-producing southern area of Nigeria, people suffer from devastating environmental pollution, and the government does not maintain the infrastructure of the area. There is no water supply nor is there a sewage system. There is also poor electricity and bad roads. There is no investment in the area because of a lack of infrastructure, which hinders the development of the area. Globalization takes oil out of the country without any reward for the people (Jinichi Matsumoto, 2009).

According to Joseph Stiglitz, Africa is a region most exploited by globalization. He mentions that during colonialism and imperialism the west took natural resources that were necessary for their industries but gave in return for nothing to Africa. That is evident in the history. Stiglitz also says as follows:

The worst failure is Africa, where the percentage of the population living in extreme poverty has increased from 41.6 percent in 1981 to 46.9 percent in 2001. Given its increasing population, this means that the number of people living in extreme poverty has almost doubled, from 164 million to 316 million (J. Stiglitz 2006: 11)

Furthermore, Africa has been incorporated in to the global system fully and earlier than any other region. Estimates demonstrate that in 1990 approximately 40% of African private wealth was held outside the continent, a far higher proportion of private wealth than any other developing region (Collier, Hoeffler and Pattillo, 2001). Unambiguously, in an autarkic world, Africa would now have a larger capital stock, and especially a larger private capital stock.

After all the above mentioned findings, I argue that Africa's integration and dependency have devastated African economy. Africa's economy was better in the years after colonial rule, but in the beginning of intensification of interconnectedness of the global nations, 1980s and onwards, African economy was not growing as expected. In 1960's Africa was twice better than that of East Asian countries, but in 2004, East Asian countries were far away to be compared with that of African economy. Thus we can see the growth of global connections in the later years has negatively affected African development and African economic growth.

The dependency theory of development posits the same point. Dependency to western countries is the source of underdevelopment of Africa. The theory also reminds us that the way west developed doesn't work for everyone, since the fundamental difference in here is that, the west was undeveloped, but African countries are under developed, not undeveloped (Gunder 1969). Thus Africa's integration to the global market has been dysfunctional, depending of the primary resources that are locally produced, but internationally controlled. As well as the help outside per se as a way of Africa's integration and dependency to the outside has been dysfunctional to African government trusts. People started trusting more on the non governmental organizations rather than their own governments.

Lastly but not the least, the economic role given to Africa is not leading to development and will not lead them to. The role of primary raw material producers where the prices are not under their control will always benefit only the powerful capitalist economies that are looking raw materials for their industries, as it has always been in history.

Impact on Politics

There are many reasons for Africa's poverty indeed. For Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, an extractive political institutions empowered by an extractive economic institutions is the reason for poverty and destitution of many countries including African nations (D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson 2013). For Jeffery Herbert, the poor colonial inheritance, dependence on raw materials, difficult geography, and natural disasters are the reason for Africa's backwardness. However, the most imperative hindrance to Africa's participation in global economy is the problem of governance. Unless considerable measures are done on that issue, Africa won't have the capacity to bring to an end of the challenges that keep it from developing (Jeffery Herbst, 2005). Thus in this section I will elaborate the impact of globalization on the African politics. It is obvious that we should expect both positive and negative impacts, but rather I feel that the negative impacts supplant the positive ones, as it sometimes serves as one of the main logics behind the existence of extractive political institutions to survive and continue today.

The impact of cold war on African politics is worth mentioning. The world was between US and USSR. African nations were not exceptional to this.

In 1960's and 70's there emerged authoritarian and dictatorships in many African nations (*particularly those linked to USSR*). But after the end of cold war, since support was withdrawn from these nations as they were considered to have no more strategic significance, it resulted the increase of so called "failed states" in the last few decades (*Somalia is a perfect example to that which still continues today*). This has greatly been inimical to the emergence of good democracy and governance that was open for development in Africa. In general, the cold war and its end has conflicted with democratic system and economic development in Africa. The issue subsequently lies in Africa's position in the global framework and not in the particular form taken by globalization (UNPAN, 2002: 5 *Italics added*).

For James Ferguson Politically, globalization's structural adjustment policies has led to the decline of the state, "whose presence barely extends beyond the boundaries of their capital cities. Vast areas of Africa have been effectively abandoned by their national states" (2006: 13). Corruption is [highly] widespread and, in many cases, functions that were once state - based have been privatized.

In the political sphere, the most important consequence is the erosion of sovereignty, especially on economic and financial matters, as a result of the imposition of models, strategies and policies of development on African countries by the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (Stiglitz 2011: 11-14).

On the other hand, globalization has promoted greater respect for human rights and contributed to the development of an African press. This has opened African countries to far greater scrutiny ever before, making it somewhat more difficult for African governments to get away with blatant and excessive abuses of democratic governance and transparency. Those politicians who do not take the orders and plans of the powerful western capitalist nations are continuously under threat of couple of policies that West established for them. ICC (International criminal court) is one of these plans to chase African leaders.

The point in here is that globalization is not in favor of African good governance, since the system is imposed from the top by global institutions. African Union recently complained about the ICC as a court designed and

established only for the African leaders, and not others. In response to this, Robert Mugabe, the president of Zimbabwe and AU, claimed the AU to have their own court to chase the western leaders in response to the African leaders who are under the threat of ICC.

There are many ways to measure governance issue. World Bank has developed The World Bank has developed a measure of government effectiveness that combines responses on the quality of public service provision, the quality of the bureaucracy, the competence of civil servants, the independence of the civil service from political pressures, and the credibility of the government's commitment to policies. The Bank has estimated government effectiveness for most countries in the world and centered the estimate around "zero" That is, the average country has a government effectiveness rating of zero.

In 2005 according to data Derived from World Bank Governance Indicators, 1996-2002. While a few rankings like Botswana were impressive, the average African performance is still unimpressive by global standards Only five countries Botswana, Mauritius, South Africa, Namibia, Ghana, and Seychelles have measures of government effectiveness that are at or above the world average of "0.". All the rest African countries were below the line and especially notable is that four (DRC, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Sudan) large African countries [were] in the bottom quartile of the African distribution for governance (Jeffery Herbst, 2005: 8-9)

The statements above clearly demonstrate that the African performance in terms of good governance was the lowest and it is not a big surprise to insist that the governance is still the worst at the world level. It is also worth noting that according to the corruption index of Transparency International (Dec, 2014), indicates that most of African countries were below 50%. Only four countries scored above 50%: Mauritius 54%, Seychelles 55%, Cape Verde 57%, Botswana 63%, and this demonstrate how political problems are issue of the day yet in Africa. Significant to mention is that the least countries on the corruption index were African states, were Somalia was the least scoring 8% which is heart breaking result even to the world (Transparency International, 2014).

Globalization can affect the development of good governance and democracy both negatively as well as in a positive manner. The point we need to be clear in here is that before democracy emerges, among the important issues that one country has to solve is the economy and literacy of that specific country. When these basics pillars of democracy are standing on the legs, then democracy is possible to emerge. As long as the economy of the country as well as literacy rates are lagging behind, less is the probability for a good governance to be in practice rather on the documents as in almost all African nations today. But when the African leaders seek a help from the global institutions or the donors, as a precondition, they have to accept those structural policies imposed by the global institutions, which may not be in the benefit of African nations' good governance and economic growth to blossom.

Thus globalization has helped to make the rich countries more rich and democratic where as for the poor countries the opposite is true.

Globalization on the whole impacts negatively on the development and consolidation of democratic governance [in Africa]. One form of this is the reduction of the capacity of governments to determine and control events in their countries, and thus their accountability and responsiveness to their people, given the fact that the context, institutions and processes by which these decisions are taken are far from democratic. In addition, the fragmentation of national economies, politics, societies and cultures that are triggered by globalization weaken national consciousness and cohesion, leading to social divisiveness and instability, which in turn facilitate the emergence of authoritarian rule. Strong countries are, however, in a better position to fend off these negative consequences and may even see their democracies strengthened (UNPAN 2002: 8)

Decisions for change and development were supposed to come from the demand of underdeveloped nations of Africa. Unfortunately things work on the opposite way and goes on from the powerful nations side, no matter of the benefit of burden it will have up on many underdeveloped nations like African nations. For instance according to UNPAN, globalization imposed the leaders of African countries to adopt and implement policies and measures that are against the needs and sentiments of the vast majority

of their people. As a consequence, authoritarian regimes who do not consider the voice of the people and who are puppets of western countries emerged. A good recent example of this is the pressure on many African governments to take certain measures in the fight against terrorism at the command of external powers, particularly the west that leads the game.

The rules that govern globalization are not fair. These rules make the rich countries richer than ever and the poor countries poorer than ever (J. Stiglitz 2006). Overall as long as Africa is to receive an aid from the West or China (recently), the continent's politics is under the threat of those who lead the game. African leaders are and will be a puppets and there is less probability for a democracy, as long as Africa is getting the aid from the western countries or china (recent years). This aid leads African leaders and their people to be ruled by invisible rulers. The low economic position and of Africa made them their voice not to be heard and taken in to account by the global institutions. Therefore globalization negatively affects the African politics, but this doesn't let me ignore the possible positive results that can emerge if we have to make the globalization work. Indeed as Joseph Stiglitz mentioned in his book making the globalization work, "those who benefit from current system will resist that change, and they are powerful" (2006: 13). Needless no repeat that globalization today is used as a tool for blood sucking and controlling the rest, not different from capitalism, perhaps it's efficacy reaches far beyond capitalism.

Conclusion

Globalization has been an alarming issue, especially for the past couple of decade, a fade word spoken in everywhere and among the social science scholars. Globalization is increasing interconnectedness of the world countries, at the same time it is removal of the trade barriers and closer integration of national economies.

Globalization had the promise that it will equally prosper regions of the globe, unfortunately it greeted with discontents to many parties of the world, which Africa over represents. Of course globalization can benefit all the regions, but the way it has been managed was different.

Africa was connected to the global market earlier than other regions as it was an important target for westerners for its rich natural resource. Unfortunately Africa was connected to the world in a disadvantageous manner that led to marginalization of African economy. This in turn affected and reduced Africa's political and economic independence. That disadvantageous position of Africa in global economy perpetuated Africa's underdevelopment paving the way to corruption, squalor, diseases and above all, failed states.

Furthermore, the global institutions like IMF, WB or or else institutions, provide money and the assistance needed by African countries via nongovernmental organizations (NGO), which in turn caused lack of trust of African people on their governments rather they trust on the nongovernmental organizations that are owned outside their countries. Thus, economic specialization imposed on Africa make rapid and sustainable growth impossible

African politics lost its independence after Africa's position in global economy. Directly or indirectly, African politics have always been influenced by the west. African politicians and nations in general, suffer from the top down policy (structural adjustment programs) directly or indirectly for the reason that most aid offered to Africa comes from these WB and IMF which demands African nations seeking aid to adopt these policies which may negatively impact up on African nations. Corruption and lack of good governance is the issue of the day in Africa yet. This can be seen from the latest data of Transparency International's corruption index which almost all African states with exception of few, scores less than 45%.

REFERENCES

- Aborisade Olasunkanmi, (2011), "Economic Globalization and its Effect on Community in Africa", **J Sociology Soc Anth**, 2 (1), pp. 61-64.
- Alhaji Ahmadu Ibrahim, (2014), "The Impact of Globalization on Africa", **International Journal of Humanities and Social Science**, 3 (15), pp. 85-93.
- Andrew Heywood, (2011), **Global Politics**, Palgrave Macmillan, United Kingdom.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. (1998), **Globalization: The Human Consequences**, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Acemoglu, Daron. & Robinson, James (2012), **Why Nations Fail: The Origins Of Power, Prosperity And Poverty**, London, Crown Publishers.
- Economic Commission for Africa (2 April 2008), "Economic Report on Africa 2008", (Çevrimiçi): www.uneca.org/eca_resources/Press_Releases/2008_press_releases
- Frank, Andre Gunder, (1969), "The Development of Underdevelopment." **Monthly Review**, 18 (4).
- Ritzer, George (2011), **Globalization: The essentials**, Wiley-Blackwell.
- De La Dahesa, Guillermo (2006), **Winners and Losers in Globalization**, Blackwell Publishing.
- Herbst, Jeffrey (2005), "Africa and the challenges of Globalization", **Conference on Globalization and Economic Success: Policy Options for Africa**, Singapore.
- Ferguson, James (2006), **Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World**, Durham, Duke University Press.
- Jinichi Matsumoto (2009), "Globalization Exploits Africa", **International Conference on Africa & Globalization: Learning from the Past, Enabling a Better Future**, Tokyo.
- Tomlinson, John (1999), **Globalization and Culture**, Cambridge, Polity.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2002), **Globalization and Its Discontents**, New York, W.W. Norton and Co.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2006), **Making the Globalization Work**, New York, W.W. Norton and Co.
- Bousnina, Mongi (2009) "Africa and challenges to globalization: Need for substantial human development", **International Conference on Africa & Globalization: Learning from the Past, Enabling a Better Future**, Tokyo.

Carmody, Pádraig (2010), **Globalization in Africa; recolonization or renaissance**, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Collier, Paul (2003), “Africa and Globalization”, **Centre for the Study of African Economies**, Oxford University.

Collier, Paul (2007). **The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It**, New York, Oxford University Press.

Bush, Ray (2008), “Africa and Globalization: The rhetoric of neoliberal modernization”, (Çevrimiçi): <http://www.rosalux.sn/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Africa-and-Globalisation.pdf>

UNESCO (2009), **International Conference on Africa & Globalization: Learning from the Past, Enabling a Better Future**, Tokyo.

United Nations Public Administration Network (2002), “The Challenges of Globalization in Africa. What Role for Civil Society and Other Stakeholders?”, Addis Ababa.