International Journal for Management Science And Technology (IJMST)

"GLOBALIZATION, SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA"

Prof. Frank K. Matanga
Department of Peace and Conflict Studies,
Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology,
Kenya

Prof. Gavin J. Bradshaw
Conflict Management and Resolution
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
South Africa

Mr. Solomon P. K. Muhindi
Ph.D candidate
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
South Africa

www.ijmst.com   *December 2014*

Abstract

This paper interrogates the relationships among the concepts globalization, security and development in Africa. In particular, the authors debate on the origins and growth of globalization as a global force, the nexus between globalization, security and development, the role of globalization in Africa's development, and the consequences of globalization on conventional state sovereignty in Africa, to effectively analyze these issues the authors employ Liberal Peace as a theoretical framework. The authors relied mainly on secondary sources to generate data for this paper. Among the core findings are that in as much as some schools of thought have argued that globalization has been beneficial to Africa's security and development, there is also convincing evidence that the processes of globalization have largely favoured the Western world at the expense of Africa, especially in relation to development and the preservation of conventional state sovereignty.

1. Introduction

The origins and meanings given to globalization remains a fairly controversial debate among scholars and thinkers of globalization. However, it is generally accepted that globalization in its current form entails the global interconnectivity of the political and socio-economic sectors, and thus the common adage of "global village". Whereas the African continent may have entered global relations in the ancient times, its effective capture by the forces of globalization may have occurred with the colonization process, that at a stroke of a pen, made it part and parcel of the capitalist system. The end of colonialism only served to further entrench these relations with most of the newly independent African states remaining as mere appendages of their former colonizers. This has served to entrench the forces of neo-imperialism and its attendant consequences. It is in this context that this paper attempts a critical interrogation of issues to do with globalization, security and development in Africa.

2. The Liberal Peace Theoretical Framework

Doyle (2005:463) argues that the logic underlying the core of liberal peace theory and its three pillars includes republic representation, an ideological commitment to fundamental human rights, and transnational interdependency. Moreover, Doyle (2005: 463) notes that the logic underlying peace among liberal states rests on a simple and straight forward proposition that connects the latter three pillars of liberal peace as they operate only together but not separately. On his part, Richmond (2005:12) states that liberal peace discourse

focuses on constitutional democracy, human rights, civil peace, development, and international relations with institutions. Precisely, therefore, liberal peace theory's main components include: democratisation, the rule of law, human rights, free globalised markets, and neo-liberal development.

According to Richmond (2005:1), there appears to be four main strands of thinking within the liberal peace framework. These include the victor's peace, the institutional peace, the constitutional peace and the civil peace. First, the victor's peace has evolved from the age-old argument that a peace that rests on a military victory, and upon the hegemony or domination of that victor is more likely to survive. Second, is the institutional peace which rests upon attempts to anchor states within a normative and legal context in which states multilaterally agree how to behave and how to enforce or determine their behaviour. Third, Richmond (2005:1) states that the constitutional peace is the one that rests upon the Kantian argument that peace rests upon democracy, trade, and a set of cosmopolitan values that stem from the notion that individuals are ends in themselves, rather than means to an end. Fourth, Richmond notes that the civil peace is derived from the phenomena of direct action, of citizen advocacy and mobilisation, in the attainment or defence of basic human rights and values.

Furthermore, Richmond (2005:1) argues that the latter four aspects of the liberal peace are both contradictory and complimentary, and each brings with it a certain intellectual and empirical baggage. Richmond adds that the liberal peace is a discourse, framework and structure, with a specific ontology and methodology. Its projected reform of governance entails a communicative strategy on which depends its viability and legitimacy with its recipients. This operates both at a social and state level. It cannot be achieved without significant recourses. The allocation of those recourses, the power to do so, and their control, is often the new site of power and domination in post conflict societies.

Citing the classical liberal, Immanuel Kant, Oneal (2001:2) notes that international peace could be established on a foundation of three elements: republican constitutions, cosmopolitan law embodied in free trade and economic interdependence, and international law and organisations. In the liberal view, it is the fear that conflict will disrupt beneficial commerce that leads states to refrain from using military force against others. Thus, the relationship between interdependence and peace is expected to be reciprocal and justifying the three pillars of Kantian tripod (Oneal 2001:8). Oneal also notes that studies have found

that trade reduces the incidence of conflict. Further, in reference to Kim, Oneal (2001:11) concludes that the effect of trade on conflict is stronger than the effect of conflict on trade. Thus, trade is a powerful force for peace.

In the same vein, Mousseau, Hegre and Oneal (2003:277) maintain that over the past decade of the liberal peace, the finding that democracy and economic interdependence contribute to peace among nations has emerged as one of the strongest and most important results in the scientific study of international relations, conflict management and consequently peace building. The conflict-reducing effect of democracy depends on the level of economic development. Consequently, if the less developed state in a dyad has a per capita GDP below 1400 USD, joint democracy is not a significant force for peace. Research findings; argue that the strength of the democratic peace is conditional on economic development. However, it is important to note that having developed economies in Africa alone will not secure peace; other factors also do contribute.

From the above arguments by Doyle (2005), Richmond (2005), Oneal (2001) and Mousseau, Hegre and Oneal (2003) we can observe that the core thesis of Liberal Peace theory revolves around the construction and strengthening of democratic institutions and processes that may enhance economic growth and development, and therefore, promote peace and development in the societies concerned. It is in this context that this theory has been adopted in an attempt to analyse the connectivity between the concepts globalisation (that flourishes on the ethos of democracy and liberalism) on the one hand, and security and development on the other in relation to the African state. The question that, therefore, emerges is, has globalisation enhanced Africa's security and development?

3. Origins and Growth of Globalization

Globalization has been described as a historical process that has resulted into human innovation and technological progress. It refers to the increasing integration of economies around the world, particularly through the movement of goods, services, and capital across borders. The term sometimes also refers to the movement of people (labour) and knowledge (technology) across international borders (Akindele, Gidado and Olaop, 2002:3; the International Monetary Fund (IMF), 2008:2; and Kasongo, 2010). There are also broader cultural, political, and environmental dimensions of globalization (IMF, 2008:2). The term "globalization" began to be used more commonly in the 1980s, reflecting technological

advances that made it easier and quicker to complete international transactions both trade and financial flows. It refers to an extension beyond national borders of the same market forces that have operated for centuries at all levels of human economic activity-village markets, urban industries, or financial centres.

Kasongo (2010:310) says that for most social theorists, globalisation is the spread of worldwide practices, relations, consciousness, and organisation of social life that transforms people around the world with some transformation being dramatic. Conversi (2010:36) concludes that many scholars agree that globalisation is the process of international integration that arises from the interchange of world views, products, ideas, and other aspects of culture. Advances in transportation and telecommunications, infrastructure, including the rise of the telegraph and its posterity, the Internet, are major factors in globalization, generating further interdependence of economic and cultural activities. The term globalization has increasingly been used since the mid-1980s and especially in the mid-1990s. In 2000, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified four basic aspects of globalization: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people, and the dissemination of knowledge. Further, environmental challenges such as climate change, cross-boundary water, over-fishing of the ocean and air pollution, are linked with` globalization.

The historical origins of globalization are the subject of on-going debate. Though several scholars situate the origins of globalization in the modern era, others regard it as a phenomenon with a long history. Corversi (2010:26) argues that stretching the beginning of globalization far back in time renders the concept wholly inoperative and useless for political analysis.

O'Rourke and Williamson (2002:2) responding to the question 'when did globalisation start?' note that some world historians attach globalisation 'big bang' significance to 1492 and 1498. Such scholars are on the side of Adam Smith who believed that these were the two most important events in recorded history. O'Rourke and Williamsom also note that other world historians insist that globalisation stretches back even earlier. And that there is a third view which argues that the world economy was fragmented and completely de-globalised before the early nineteenth century. However, O'Rourke and Williamson (2002:2) observe that none of these three competing views distinguish explicitly between trade expansion driven by

booming import demand or export supply, and trade expansion driven by the integration of markets between trading economies. O'Rourke and Williamson maintain there is no evidence supporting the view that the world economy was globally integrated prior to the 1490s. Moreover, they state that there is also no evidence supporting the view that the 1400 decade had the trading impact that world historians assign to it; though, there is abundant evidence supporting the view that a very big globalisation bang took place in the 1820s. O'Rourke and Williamson (2002:2) in reference to William H. McNeill (1999: 295) further note that 'The year 1500 marked an important turning point in world history when the European discoveries made the oceans of the earth into highways for their commerce …'

The growth of contemporary globalisation may be traced to the immediate post World War two period. The founding of the Bretton Woods institutions conference lay down the framework for international commerce and finance, and several other international institutions provided a framework to oversee the processes of globalization. Globalization was also driven by the global expansion of multinational corporations based in the United States and Europe, and worldwide exchange of new developments in science, technology and products, with most significant inventions of this time having their origins in the Western world. Worldwide export of western culture went through the new mass media: film, radio and television and recorded music. Development and growth of international transport and telecommunication equally played a decisive role in modern globalization.

Globalization has been facilitated by advances in technology which have reduced the costs of trade, and trade negotiation rounds, originally under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which led to a series of agreements to remove restrictions on free trade. Since World War Two, barriers to international trade have been considerably lowered through international agreements such as GATT. Particular initiatives carried out as a result of GATT and the World Trade Organization (WTO), for which GATT is the foundation included: Promotion of free trade through elimination of tariffs; creation of free trade zones with small or no tariffs, reduced transportation costs, especially resulting from development of containerization for ocean shipping, reduction or elimination of capital controls, reduction, elimination, or harmonization of subsidies for local businesses, creation of subsidies for global corporations, harmonization of intellectual property laws across the majority of states, with more restrictions, and supranational recognition of intellectual property restrictions.

4. The Nexus between Globalization, Security and Development in Africa

Globalisation, security and development are interrelated concepts; they influence one another and are inter-dependent (Grimm 2004:14). Negative consequences of globalisation could trigger conflict, which might lead to insecurity and underdevelopment. What follows is a discussion of the nexus between globalisation, security and development in Africa.

4.1 Is Globalisation contributing to the Development of the African state?

According to the IMF (2008:5), some countries have embraced globalisation, and experienced significant income increases, other countries that have rejected globalisation, or embraced it only tepidly, have fallen behind. Ukeje (2005:5) states that those who celebrate globalisation point to the phenomenal increase in the movement of peoples, coupled with unprecedented flows of goods, services and capital around the world. In this regard, globalisation has developed Africa. IMF (2008:1-2) notes that proponents of globalisation argue that African economic shrinkage is not because of too much globalisation, but rather too little. Furthermore, it is argued that the biggest threat to the continuing rise in living standards through the world is not that globalisation will succeed but that if globalisation will fail. The IMF (2008) accentuates the fact that it is the people of the developing economies like Africa who have the greatest need for globalisation, as it provides them with the opportunities that come with being part of the world economy. There is substantial evidence from countries of different sizes and different regions, that as countries globalise, their citizens benefit in the form of access to a wider variety of goods and services, low prices, more and better paying jobs, improved health, and higher overall living standards. Besides, the growth in global markets have helped to promote efficiency through competition and the division of labour (IMF, 2008).

Shaka (2013:1) observes that Africa has been globalising and interacting with the rest of the world. And, through the interactions, cultures are fusing in a new paradigm that can only be referred to as multicultural. On the positive side, Shaka notes that as a result of globalisation griping Africa, there has been a rise in democracy through multiparty elections in countries like Kenya, Ghana and South Africa. Through globalisation, finally, people have had the power to elect leaders they wanted through the ballot without fear of reprisals; other African countries have moved from military dictatorships to civilian rule like Nigeria. Through global politics and liberalisation policies, Sudan had a referendum to decide its destiny and

the vote was final, South Sudan a new state was born. As well, Kenya had a referendum and a new constitution was enacted.

Shaka (2013:1) further notes that many countries in Africa finally have constitutions that are progressive in terms of the laws created. Human rights have been recognised and protected in these constitutions. For instance, Shaka observes that Kenya remains the most progressive with its 2010 constitution as compared to Uganda, Sudan and Zimbabwe among other countries in Africa that have undergone a slug in globalisation. Shaka (2013:2-3) also argues that on the brighter side, the peace engagements around Africa are as a result of globalisation. Majority of world leaders want peace and do not want to see nations fall to the abyss like Somalia, Libya, Syria and Egypt. Thus, the Universal Peer Review mechanism of the United Nations Human Rights Council exists to keep states in check in terms of human rights. The United Nations and other international bodies also monitor what is happening around the world through special mechanisms that are created specifically to handle salient issues touching on torture and child labour among others (Shaka 2013:3).

Global liberalisation of economies all over Africa has led to state corporations being privatised for efficiency and better service provision. As a result, for instance, Kenya privatised entities it owned in telecommunication, water, and railway as it sought better service delivery to Kenyans. The privatisation process came with fresh capital and leadership that steered companies to greater heights. They moved from being loss-making entities though some are still struggling at the moment. In Kenya, globalisation has led to a digital awakening. Kenya is now an IT hub in Africa with some of the greatest innovations being born as a result. For example, mobile money transfer and mobile banking services have been revolutionised in Kenya. This is because Kenya has embraced globalisation (Shaka 2013:3). Diplomatic relations with other countries has also been made much easier through the use of technological changes that have accompanied globalisation. As a result, majority of African countries are now connected and have bilateral relations.

Global markets also offer greater opportunity for people to tap into more diversified and larger markets around the world. In this view, African countries can have access to more capital, technology, cheaper imports, and larger export markets. The broad reach of globalisation in Africa extends to daily choices of personal, economic, and political life. For instance, in the world of communications, globalisation in Africa facilitates commerce and

education and allows access to independent media (IMF, 2008:1-2). Globalisation also creates a framework for cooperation among African and Western nations on a range of non-economic issues that have cross-border implications such as immigration, the environment, and legal issues. Information and knowledge get dispersed and shared.

However, critics of globalisation observe that globalisation is more of a curse than a blessing to Africa. For instance, Ukeje (2005:5) notes that those critical of globalisation insist that the agency of globalisation has become too destructive and consuming as it widens social disconnections, and causes violent conflicts. Ukeje (2005) is of the opinion that for Africa, globalisation provokes a "return to familiar conditions of subordination"- much like those which marked the insertion of the continent into the global capitalist system fully around 19th century by European colonialism. In addition, Ukeje (2005:5) argues that some scholars describe the current phase of globalisation and the neo-liberal ideology as simply a "continuation of the war that began with colonialism and never ended.

IMF (2008:2) also concurs that globalisation opportunities are not without risks such as those arising from volatile capital movements. The spread of technological advances and increased financial globalisation and foreign direct investment in particular have instead contributed more to the recent rise in inequality by raising the demand for skilled labour and increasing the returns to skills in both developed and developing countries. Hence, while everyone benefits from globalisation, those with skills and in developed countries benefit more (IMF, 2008:5).

Kasongo (2010:309) notes that global culture, a part of globalization has not only transported the good side of the economic and social development across the globe but has also changed the culture of host communities. Some changes include the mode of production and the way things are done, while others include the symbolic interaction or the appreciation of how social facts are to be seen and appreciated. For example, the change from collectivism social structure that characterises African society to individualism structure that characterises the market-oriented culture of Western society. Bruce Hall and Biersteker (2003:3) argue that the traditional notions about authority in the international system derive from the Weberian conceptions of the state and of the domain of international politics. There is a presumption within much of international relations theory, consistent with Weber, that the domain of the domestic is fundamentally different from the domain of the international.

Whereas we appreciate some of the arguments that suggest globalization has been beneficial to Africa and the Third World as a whole, it is our considered view that a cost-benefit analysis would reveal more of losses than benefits. In particular, this relates to the balance sheet operations that are spearheaded by lead agents of globalisation such as International Finance Institutions (IMF and the World Bank), the World Trade Organization (WTO) and Multinational Corporations (MNCs). A disappointing telling story is the recent imposition of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) on African States by the IMF and the World Bank. Rather than promote the anticipated socio-economic and political development, the SAPs ended up further undermining the little progress that the African State had somehow achieved in the earlier decades. This has since been widely acknowledged by many scholars and practitioners (See for instance, Sundaram, J. K., Schwank, O., & Arnim, R. 2011; Irogbe, K, 2005; Adejumobi, S., 2003) . The same story is hardly any different when the activities of MNCs and WTO are put under close scrutiny. In particular, one such glaring area relates to the influence of globalization on the conception of state sovereignty in Africa

4.2 Globalisation and State Sovereignty in Africa

Citing Weber, Bruce Hall and Biersteker (2003:3) observe that the essence of the state is its ability to claim 'the monopoly of legitimate use of physical force within a given territory'. As a result, they argue that international politics takes place in a realm where anarchy allegedly reigns. States act in their own interests and sometimes employ force to achieve their objectives. Thus, the absence of a global state has led many observers to deny the very existence of authority, defined as legitimised power, operating within the international arena. States are both the source, and the exclusive location of legitimate, public authority. This applies to the operations of states both in the realm of domestic affairs, and in the international arena.

Ukeje (2005:4) argues that globalisation did not cause African contemporary predicaments; even though it, in many ways, exacerbated them. Furthermore, Ukeje contends that the logic driving Africa's developmental problems could be traced to variety of external and internal factors, mostly relating to the manner and processes through which the continent was absorbed, forcefully, into the global capitalist order around the mid-1500. Thus, colonial adventure continues to implicate Africa's development. Moreover, Ukeje (2005:4) observes, that some of the highlights of Africa's experiences during that historical moment have been

identified by Ihonvbere (2003:3-4) as including the experience of slavery, the termination of endogenously driven patterns of state and class formation; the imposition of colonial rule; the balkanization of the continent and imposition of alien values, tastes, and institutions; the creation of a highly fractionalised, dependent, corrupt, and weak elite; the domination of the African economy by profit-and-hegemony-seeking transnational corporations dedicated to making profits at all cost; the total denigration of local cultures, values, and institutions, and the introduction and promotion of primordial differences and suspicions; and finally, the structured incorporation of the African economy into the periphery of the global division of labour and power as vulnerable, dependent, underdeveloped, weak, and largely raw material-producing region, to mention a few. Focusing on the issue of state and power, Bruce Hall and Biersteker (2002:3) note that traditional notions about authority in the international system derive from Weberian conceptions of the state and of the domain of international politics. There is a presumption within much of international relations theory, consistent with Weber, that the domain of the domestic is fundamentally different from the domain of the international. Consequently, globalisation, and internationalism influences Africa's political decisions and policy making.

Akindele, Gidado and Olaop (2002:1) are of the view that given the historic relationship between Africa and the West, it is ironic that the latter is today preaching the virtues of freedom to Africans. Former colonisers and ex-slave-owners have made a virtue of championing political and economic liberalisation in Africa. Yesterdays oppressors appear to be today's liberators, fighting for democracy, human rights and free market economics through the world including Africa. As a result, Akindele, Gidado and Olaop (2002:3) argue that globalisation was created by the dominant social forces in the world today to serve themselves a new ideological name the- 'international community'- to go with the idea of globalisation. In view of that, globalisation has largely been driven by the interests and needs of the developed world. Moreover, the process of globalisation is impelled by the series of cumulative and conjectural crises in the international division of labour and the global distribution of economic and political power in global finance, in the functioning of national states, in the decline of the Keynesian welfare state and the established social contract between labour and government.

Globalisation is mainly a phenomenon of capital mobility, its two prongs are: Foreign direct investment and international portfolio flow (Akindele, Gidado and Olaop 2002:3). Thus, a

global economy is one, which is dominated by transnational firms and financial institutions, operating independently of national boundaries and domestic economic considerations. According to Akindele, Gidado and Olaop (2002), the implication of de-territorialisation for African countries is that world goods, factors of production and financial assets would be almost perfect substitutes everywhere in the world. Hence, it could be difficult to identify a national economy and consider national states as distinct economic identities with autonomous decision making power in the pursuit of national objectives. African states especially, are disadvantaged.

Ukeje (2005:3) notes that globalisation has been shown to be undermining and destroying the capability of many developing countries especially in managing their affairs. What is coming out boldly for Africa in particular, is that globalisation is also further deepening its security and developmental problems. Globalization is expanding the divisions, frictions and fault lines among different ethnic, religious, political, class, demographic and social groups and causing unprecedented civil strife, political instability and state collapse.

Buzan (1991:433) argues that during the Cold War, international security was dominated by the highly militarized and highly polarized ideological confrontation between the superpowers. This confrontation divided the industrialized North into the First World (the West) and the Second World (the Soviet bloc). Because their rivalry was intense, the danger of war was real, and political/military concerns dominated the security agenda. This political and military emphasis was transmitted into the periphery by the use of arms transfers by both superpowers as a means of exploiting already existing hostilities within the Third World (Africa included) as a vehicle for pursuing their own rivalry. In the opening years of the twenty-first century there are already strong signs that the security agenda among the great powers will be much less dominated, perhaps not dominated at all, by political/military issues. The Second World has disintegrated, and as the armed confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union is wound down, economic, societal and environmental issues are pushing their way into the top ranks of the international security agenda. One major question for the states in the periphery is how their own security agenda will be affected by the new patterns of relations among the major powers.

Overall, most analyses therefore, seem to point towards globalization undermining the conventional conception of state sovereignty in Africa. This is both in terms of internal and

external dimensions of state sovereignty. Internally, for instance, the recent United Nations dictum on the right of intervention by the International Community in order to protect citizens whose state is unable to guarantee their human security needs is prone to abuses by major powers in relation to smaller states in the developing countries. Whether or not to morally justify such blanket interventions in the affairs of African states remains an extremely controversial matter in relation to their sovereignty. Externally, the process of globalization and its attendant institutions has had a delimiting effect on the process of foreign policy making by African states. Their abilities and capacities as autonomous actors in the international system has been severely circumscribed and thus impacting on their sovereignty.

5. Conclusion

This article has attempted to analyse and contextualize the linkages between the concepts globalization on the one hand and security and development on the other. This has been examined in the context of Africa. To do so, the authors began by situating the discussion in the context of Liberal Peace theory. Further, the authors proceeded to analyze the origins and growth of globalization. Finally, the authors attempted to establish the relationships among the processes of globalization, security and development in Africa. It is our contention that in as much as globalization may seem to be aiding in securing and developing Africa, a closer critical look reveals the undermining of African economies and their political sovereignty. Overall, therefore, globalization seems to favour the interests of the developed world at the expense of developing states.

References

➢ Adejumobi, S. (2003). "Globalization and Africa's Development Agenda From the WTO to NEPAD". DPMF Occasional Paper No. 12. Development Policy Management Forum, Addis Ababa.

➢ Akindele, S. T; Gidado, T. O. And Olaop, O. R. (2002). "Globalisation, its Implications and Consequences for Africa". http://globalisation.icaap.org/content/v2.1/01 akindele etal.html

➢ Buzan, B. (1991). "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century".

➢ International Affairs, Vol. 69, No 3 pp 431-451.

➢ Bruce Hall, B and Biersteker (2002). The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

➢ Conversi, D. (2010). 'The Limits of cultural globalisation ?' Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies, 3, pp36-59

➢ Doyle, M. W. (2005). "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace". American Political Science Review. Vol. 99, No 3.

➢ Grimm, S. 2004. Civilian perspective or Security policy – Which role for development policy? Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

➢ Ihonvbere, J. O. (2000) Africa and the New World Order. New York

➢ International Monetary Fund (IMF) (2008). "Globalisation: A Brief Overview". Issue 02/08. http://www.imf.org Washington D.C

➢ Irogbe, K. (2005). "Globalization and the Development of Underdevelopment of the Third World". Journal of Third World Studies, Vol. XXII, No. 1.

➢ Kasongo, A. (2010). "Impact of Globalisation on African Religion and Cultural Conflict". Journal of Alternative Perspective in the Social Sciences Vol. 2, No 1 pp 3009-322.

➢ Mousseau, M; Hegre, H and Oneal, J. R. (2003). "How the Wealth of Nations Conditions the Liberal Peace". European Journal of International Relations. Vol. 9 (2):277 – 314

➢ Oneal, J. R. (2001). Empirical Support for the Liberal Peace Paper at the University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 - 0213

➢ O'Rourke, K. H and Williamson, J. G. (2002). When Did Globalisation Begin? Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Richmond, O. P. (2005). Understanding the Liberal Peace 'To remember Hiroshima is to commit oneself to peace' A paper at St Andrews University, Department of International Relations UK

- Shaka, J. (2013). Africa: Impact of Globalisation in Africa. http://www.the-star.co.ke/news/article-133289/imp-globalisation-africa Accessed on Saturday, July 19th 2014

- Sundaram, J. K., Schwank, O., & Arnim, R. (2011). "Globalization and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa". DESA Working Paper No. 102. ST/ESA/2011/DWP/102.

- Ukeje, C. (2005). "Rethinking Africa's Security in the Age of Uncertain Globalisation: NEPAD and Human Security in the 21st Century". Paper submitted to the 11th CODESRIA General Assembly, Maputo, Mozambique, 6th -10th December 2005 on the theme Rethinking African Development: Beyond Impasse, Towards Alternatives