THE NIGERIAN ARMY QUARTERLY

JOURNAL

Volume 20 Number 1 ISSN:0794-8204 MAR 2020

THE NIGERIAN ARMY QUARTERLY JOURNAL

Volume 20 Number 1 ISSN:0794-8204 MAR 2020

GLOBALIZATION AND CONFLICTS IN AFRICA: THE NIGERIA EXPERIENCE

BY

Idowu Johnson, Ph.D

Department of Political Science

University of Ibadan, Nigeria

And

Jelil Olawale Salau

Department of Political Science

Michael Otedola College of Primary Education,

Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper examines the nexus between globalization and conflicts in Africa with Nigeria as a case study. Globalization through neo-liberal economic policy is contradictory to the sustenance of social cohesion in developing countries. It is argued that the phenomenal growth of conflicts in Nigeria was attributed to the decay in state institutions and economic crisis of late 1980s and 1990s. With the adoption of neo-liberal economic policy, the Nigerian state was weak and incapable of providing social services to majority of its citizens. Marginalized groups with unrealized expectations became particularly hostile to the elements of

economic liberalization within the state system which they perceived to be responsible for the demolition of state welfare programmes. Alienation from the state made them ripe for participation in violent conflicts. It is observed that the contemporary conflicts in Nigeria is associated with worsening income distribution as a result of market economic reform in developing countries like Nigeria. Also, citizens who were deprived of social means of existence as a result of forces of economic globalization resulted to violent activities such as terrorism, kidnappings, armed banditry and armed robberies. Thus, there was a resentment of different social groups in Nigeria who did not benefit from social services. The study concludes that Nigeria should re-evaluate all externally induced programmes by weighing their effects on economic development and pursue redistribution of economic and social benefits among various groups with the implementation of a social welfare programmes.

Introduction

The end of the Cold War instigated a new approach into the operation of world politics, with the promotion of peace and security. This assumption is however different in the continent of Africa, because conflicts during this period have been volatile and protracted. Violent conflicts of one type or another have afflicted Africa and exacted a heavy toll on the continent's societies, politics and economies, robbing them of their developmental potential and democratic possibilities (Zeleza, 2008). In the same vein, it has been argued that the triumph of liberal democracy in most part of the world will reduce the phenomenal growth of conflicts. However, the assumption that liberal democracy will promote good governance and hence reduce violent conflicts in Africa has been challenged. Most African countries have from the 1990s transitioned from authoritarian rule to various forms of democratic government. The re-introduction of multiparty politics has not changed the nature of governance in many African countries and has therefore had little or no effect in mitigating violent conflict (Adetula, 2014: 14).

While it is true that conflicts in Africa is a by-product of internal factors among which are, inter-group politics, ethno-religious diversity, electoral contestation, resource control and elite politics. It is evident that in recent times, attention has shifted to a critical analysis of conflicts in Africa as a result of economic liberalization politics which are characterized by contemporary processes of globalization. While the expansion of globalization was expected to open up opportunities that would ameliorate the crisis of the state, it has simultaneously globalized ethnicity and localized citizenship, creating conditions for violent conflict (Kagwanja, 2003).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the nexus between globalization and conflicts in Africa with Nigeria as a case study. The paper is divided into six sections. These are introduction, conceptual and theoretical analysis, integration of Africa into global economy, an overview of globalization and conflict in Africa, globalization as sources of conflicts in Nigeria, conclusion and recommendations.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

This discourse is very important in conceptualizing conflict, globalization and the nexus between globalization and conflict. It is also crucial to analyse the theoretical approaches that explains globalization and conflicts in Africa.

Conflict

Otite (1999) sees conflict from the pursuits of divergent interests, goals and aspiration by individuals and, or groups in a defined social and physical environment. He further notes that conflict generally entails struggle, competition, rivalry for objects to which individuals and groups attach value. Also, Kesterner and Ray (2002) explains conflict as a social factual situation in which at least two parties (individuals, groups, states) are involved and strive for goals which can only be reached by one party, and or want to employ incompatible means to achieve a certain goal. It thus implies struggle over values or claims to status, power and scarce resources in which the aims of the groups or individuals involved are not only to obtain the desired values but to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals. In the same vein, Stedman (1991: 370) explains further that conflicts result from incompatible human interactions where the ability to satisfy ones needs depends on the choices, decisions and behaviour of others. The behaviour exhibited by the others may not be what the other complaining party or parties want, and indeed, may escalate the conflict.

According to Bassey (2007) 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 developmental programmes which have exacerbated ethnic or religious differences. On the other hand Albert (2010) opines that competition for scarce resources can be held responsible for the spate of conflict. This may be in form of human possessions such as land, money, power and influence that are often limited in supply. However, Zartman (1991) has observed that conflict is the result of interaction and contact among people; an unavoidable concomitant of choices and decisions and expression of the basic fact of human interdependence.

Globalization

The term globalization covers a wide range of distinct political, economic, and cultural trends. Wallerstein (2000) observed that globalization is a misleading concept, since what is described as globalization has been happening for 500 years. Rather what is new is that we are entering an age of transition. Robertson (1992) argues that globalization refers to intensified compression of the world and our increasing consciousness of the world. That is, the ever increasing abundance of global connections and our understanding of them. For Robertson, therefore, globalization, a long, uneven and complicated process spanning societal, political and economic spheres, consists of four main dimensions: the nation-state, the world capitalist economy, the world military order and the international division of labour (Robertson, 1992: 8). For Obi (2001) globalization is neither uniform in its reach nor impact, nor addresses the inequalities in the international political economy, but its implication is that there are winners and losers and the increased exploitation and marginalization of the developing world. On the other hand Alli (2006) contended that globalization is a process that intensifies the integration of the world economy and the people through technological advancement in several areas, particularly in the area of information technology. In the same vein, Held (1995) conceived globalization as an extension of liberal democratic institutions (including the rule of law and elected representative institutions) to the transnational level. What this implies is that 'local' or 'national' matters should remain under the auspices of existing liberal democratic institutions.

While globalization has various facets (political, cultural and economic) the economic facet of globalization is the most noted. In this context Prakash and Hart (1999) sees globalization as a set of processes leading to the integration of economic activity which involves goods and services market across geographical boundaries, and the increased salience of cross-border value chains in international economic flows. Thus, economic globalization according to Khor (2001: 2):

> *Is the breaking down of national economic barriers; the international spread of trade, financial and production activities, and the growing power of transnational corporations and international financial institutions.*

For this paper, economic globalization expresses the domination by multinational corporations of poorer nations' economies through international financial instructions – inspired programmes such as Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), privatization, deregulation and unsubsidized economic practice, which are seriously weakening states' performance and ability to discharge their responsibilities towards their populace. In this regard, economic globalization is nothing but an instrument of hegemonic control by the West of market forces globally.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis of globalization and conflicts in Africa is largely situated within the framework of the rational choice and dependency theories. The basic principles of rational choice theory are derived from the neo-classical economics of Adam Smith and David Richardo. This theory postulates that a social phenomenon is a concern for the unintended consequences of human action. Coleman (1990:13) argued that "persons act purposively toward a goal, with the goal (and thus the actions) shaped by values or preferences" Coleman further argued that for most theoretical purposes, individual will need a more precise conceptualization of the rational actor derived from economics, one that sees the actors choosing those actions that will maximize utility, or the satisfaction of their needs and wants (Coleman, 1990: 14). In relation to this paper, the assumption of rationality as observed by Mbaku (2002) is that, individuals engaging in conflict do so after determining this to be the least cost alternative to mobilize and maximize their values. Rational choice theory is, in essence, what you get if you seek to model political behaviour on the simplifying assumption that political actors are instrumental, self-serving utility maximers (Hay, 2002: 8). To be sure, rational choice theory conceives society in the form of exploitation, in the sense that those exploitation arises from the unequal distribution of property can join social movements designed to redistribute property more equally. The very concept of rationality celebrates what is said to be historically and culturally specific to capitalist societies.

The dependency theory blames underdevelopment on external factors; especially on imperialism and neo-colonialism. The dependency theory, like all other structural frameworks in international economic relations, seeks to explore the process of integration of the periphery into the world capitalist system and to assess the developmental implications of this integration. In the views of dependency theorists, the relationship between the northern core and the southern periphery far from being a relationship of mutual interest and cooperation connotes both the subordination of the latter by the former (Frank, 1972, Wallerstein, 1979). The dependency theorists seek to explain the reasons for development and underdevelopment, and why the developing countries are not developing. They situate their analysis within the world capitalist system and accuse the system of being structurally exploitative, retarding development of the poorer states. Furthermore, the dependency theorists argue that the poor countries do not lack capital and lag behind the rich because they lie outside or on the edge of the capitalist world, as claimed by the modernization theorists but rather because they have been integrated into the international class structure of the capitalist system.

However, both rational choice theory and dependency theory of conflict are mutually reinforcing, because rational choice theory has been used as a tool by dependency theorists (Marxists) who are openly critical of capitalist society. Thus, it can be argued that rational choice theory focuses on the actors themselves, while the dependency theory of conflict focuses on how the structural organization of the society shapes action. Within the context of rational choice and dependency theoretical framework, conflict (ethnic, religious, communal etc.) emerged from the conditions of uneven development among various ethnic nationalities, which lead to inequality, domination and oppression. In fact, the current wave of globalization, which coincides with the expansion of liberal capitalism, helped by international financial institutions, has caused social exclusion, alienation, exploitation and commodification of human life and nature (Gill, 2003). It is in this context that this paper analyzes globalization and conflicts in Africa.

Integration of Africa into the Global Economy

The position of Africa in the international system can be understood within the context of international division of labour, occasioned by the spread of capitalism, and engendered by the advanced industrialized countries of the world. Indeed, European colonialism has been the source of African domination by the Western political economy. This is because, Africa, with its own internal structures and dynamics, became linked with a set of global interactions and institutions with a dynamic of its own. This process of integration is what Wallerstein (1974) referred to as political economy of capitalism which created, dominates and operates the modern world system. This forceful integration of Africa into the global economy has been responsible for its massive exploitation, subsequent underdevelopment and marginalization (Onimode, 2000: 69). For most of the period from 1885 to 1960, seven European countries-Great Britain, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Germany, and Italy made a concerted effort to conquer, administer, and hold on to Africa. Although, Africans were developing at their own pace, their forceful integration into the global economy, with primitive accumulation of wealth, resulted in African exploitation and domination. (Michalopous and Papaioannou, 2015; African Union Commission/OECD, 2018).

It is instructive to note that imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism played significant role in integrating Africa into the global economy. Imperialism as a theory derives its concepts from Marxist sources. It is a situation in which the wealth and poverty of nations result from the global process of exploitation. Thus, the problem of the poor countries is not the lack of technological know-how, cultural traits conducive to development, or modern institutions, but they have been subjected to the exploitation of international capitalist system and its special imperialist agents, both domestic and alien (Offiong, 1980). It was a period that allowed external forces to penetrate African economy. However, in order to realize their imperialistic objectives, the advanced capitalist countries of Europe conquered and dominated the nations of Africa for decades.

Similarly, colonialism gave the capitalists monopoly control of labour, raw materials and markets over vast territories. It is the most complete and the most direct form of Western domination. Colonialism created contradictions, which threatened the continued existence and growth of capitalism. Also, colonialism created a dual economy; in that Africa produced some varieties of groundnut, peanuts and cotton before the coming of Europeans, but the demands of the European market led to the introduction of new crops. In view of this, coffee, cocoa, bananas, oranges, palm products etc., were introduced and Africans were forced or attracted to their production. One goal of the Europeans was to introduce what they called rational production of industrial crops for export and for taxes in place of the mere collection of wild products like rubber. This situation elevated European factories above the production of food crops for the domestic population in the colonies. In essence, colonial regimes erected a global system of unequal capitalist development between the centre and the periphery of world capitalism (Amin, 1984). Therefore, the ultimate basis of colonialism is conquest and domination, but its principle motive is economic. In addition, capitalist domination in Africa was followed by neo-colonialism. While independence was granted to the colonies, the colonial powers still retained essential colonial economic relationships. These retained colonial relationships were import-export trade, domination of major sectors of the post-colonial economy by European transnational corporations, foreign investment and technology transfer (Onimode, 2000:74). In neo-colonialism, the imperialist exercised power without responsibility and the masses suffered exploitation without redress. Neo-colonialism also ensured that the post-colonial economies remained trapped essentially in the colonial-type regime of international capitalist division of labour, in which they continued to specialize in the production of primary products for the reproductive requirements of the economy of the industrialized countries. Thus, during neo-colonialism, the former masters still dominate the independent nations of Africa in economic terms.

Finally, the last stage of capitalist domination in Africa was the dependency period. Most African countries entered this phase of dependency domination from about the 1970s, a decade after their political independence. As a matter of fact, historical situations of dependency have conditioned contemporary underdevelopment in Africa. While neo-colonialism was the period when the former colonial masters exercised influence over the affairs of the newly independent nations, dependency is the period of real international domination of Africa. In the dependency era, Africa's integration into the global economy has been completed and it has been very difficult for Africa to extricate itself. However, this integration was established within the context of an externally dominated international division of labour, which consigned the African states to an inferior status, and constrained their ability to reorganize their economy in ways they deem fit, including the establishment of lateral relations with the other African countries, the other Third World States and the socialist bloc (Nnoli, 1978: 61).

More importantly, this dependent status resulted in which African economies were programmed for prostrate external dependence on the North; for markets for the exports of primary products, for imports of manufactured goods, for the import of technology, for capital or foreign aid, and for services like shipping, insurance, travel and similar visible imports. Therefore, changes in the African economies were forced to conform to changes in the terms of this externally imposed international division of labour. Evidence shows that Africa's gradual integration into the global economy has heightened its vulnerability to sudden swings in investment flows and declining remittances. Therefore, African continent remain the poorest in the world and still suffer the consequences of conflict, political crises, increased migratory flows, social conflict and unemployment. This has been accompanied by the "threatening impatience" of population increasingly thirsty for modernity, progress and consumerism (Bousnina, 2009). The triumph of economic globalization with liberalization policies further aggravated most of the conflicts in Africa.

Brief Overview of Globalization and Conflicts in Africa

The most important and unique form of Africa's marginalization in world affairs has been the dilemma of Africa in the face of globalization. In Africa, the crisis of the post-colony and the contradictions of global capitalism led to the triumph of neoliberalism and the challenges that globalization left in its wake. For most African countries the tools for proactive participation in the global politico-economic arena are solely lacking. The process of globalization manifests in the areas of economic reforms also termed economic openness. These reforms were initiated and promoted by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank through the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). To be specific, it is the global application and implementation of the SAP that is now more appropriately referred to as economic globalization. Imposed by the World Bank and IMF, and sanctioned by major industrial powers, economic globalization did away with local import substitution industries, privitazed public assets, and massively defunded essential goods and services, especially subsidies on food, education, housing, health care, and transportation (Vaughan, 2012:20). Many African countries i.e. Ghana, Zambia, and Nigeria, adopted SAP and other economic stabilization reform programmes in the mid 1980s. The consequences in that by adopting SAP, the African states have had to withdraw from their developmental roles and this has hampered the recovery of many countries and led to further deterioration in social services.

Consequently, the adoption and promotion of neoliberal economic reforms weakens the capacity of the state in providing social and welfare services. As the state scales down its social responsibilities or withdraws completely from social provisioning and with the state itself being reconfigured, and trying to embrace and practice democracy, its role is being taken over by non-state bodies, multinational corporations and other private non-governmental organizations. The people are thus exposed to the ravages of forces both traditional and new further undermining the stability of African societies and creating conditions for conflict (Alli, 2006; Chisadza and Bittencourt, 2016). Indeed, Africa has been placed in a weak position to take on the challenges of economic globalization, as the conditions for success in liberalization were not present. It is not surprising, therefore that, in the 21st century, the living conditions in Africa has been impoverishment and underdevelopment. Attempts by the people to seek greater access to economic resources have led to many social upheavals, including industrial disputes and strikes across the continent and, also in several cases, conflicts between the people and the government and sometimes between the different ethnic groups fighting for political position or influence, a critical instrument and platform for accumulation in Africa (Alli, 2006).

Globalization and Sources of Conflicts in Nigeria

Nigeria emerged out of the experience of colonial rule as a dependent neo-colonial economy, with a low level of social and political integration. Also, the country inherited institutions and conditions which potentially made for the perpetuation and intensification of economic, social, political and geographic inequalities and a receptive disposition towards the use of force or violence as a means of securing one's group interests (Abdulrahman, 2004).

However, the Nigerian state which was forcefully incorporated into western capitalist economy, functioned to preserve the social order in which the interests of the foreign bourgeoisie and the locally dominant classes were embedded. With the foreign bourgeoisie determining the nature and direction of the economy and with this class, therefore, appropriating a higher percentage of the surplus products than the governing class, the governing class in Nigeria is forced to rely even more directly on the state. Therefore, the international developments in respect of industrial development in the capitalist system created serious problems for the Nigerian state. This is because the ideology of capitalist development was accepted by the new ruling class. Thus, the subservient role of the Nigerian economy within the imperialist framework was accepted as given, beneficial and irrevocable (Bonat, 1989).

Basically, oil has been the main source of Nigerian income. From the 1970s, oil took a central position in the accumulation process in Nigeria. The dependency on oil by the Nigerian state made it necessary for the Nigerian government to become directly involved in the oil industry. The importance of oil in the global economy cannot be underestimated, and this was why Nigeria joined the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) in 1971 and, a year later, established the Nigerian National Oil Company (NNOC) to engage in the oil industry. The intervention of the Nigerian state in the oil industry is a reflection of the importance of the product to national development. More so, expanding oil production as well as oil price rises stimulated by OPEC, particularly in the period 1973-74, and in 1979, rendered Nigeria almost entirely dependent on oil. While oil has sustained Nigerian government budgets since the 1970s, the agricultural sector has been totally displaced.

Evidently, dependence on oil also allows the Nigerian state to become independent of all social classes, and more flexible in its disbursements. In fact, it is through state spending that the main impact of oil on the political economy emerged. Unfortunately, the channeling of the oil wealth into unproductive sectors and the neglect of other sectors have turned the Nigerian state to a mono-product economy whose fortunes are being determined externally since the actual production of oil remained in the hands of foreigners. Even more pertinent was the crash in oil prices in 1978, in which oil production fell from 2.1million to 1.5 million barrels a day and budget and balance of payment deficits rose sharply from N259.3million in 1976 to N656.5million in 1977 (Osaghae, 2002: 98). Thus, the decrease in Nigeria's oil revenue brought economic decline. Also, global economic recession led to economic and external debt crisis in Nigeria in the 1980s, as the Nigerian government tried to restructure its national economy in order to adapt to changes in the international economic environment. With entrenched patron-client network of oil power, the huge wealth that accrued to the nation during the oil-boom years had been unscrupulously mismanaged, with little or nothing to show in terms of real development except a few white elephant or prestige projects. The majority of Nigerians who had believed that the oil wealth would trickle down, lead to developmental and welfare benefits and give them the good life, were gravely disappointed when government declared austerity measures, and increasingly undermined the welfare gains the people had made immediately after the end of the Nigerian civil war in the

1970s (Obi and Okwechime, 2004: 344).

In order to address the economic crisis, the Babangida regime adopted Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986. SAP, as features of the neo-liberal agenda, was a prescription of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF). Both the World Bank and IMF were of the opinion that the major causes of the crises of the Nigerian economy was the over-bloated direct presence of the Nigerian state in its economy. That such state intervention in the economy is the fundamental cause of market failure and the resultant distortion of the process of economic development. In view of this, the international finance institutions prescribed the adoption of a neo-liberal economic policy under SAP. The following are some of the objectives of SAP:

1. Strengthen demand and management through monetary, fiscal, and wage policies.
2. Stimulate domestic production by encouraging non-oil exports and by reducing dependence on imported goods through changes in relative prices (notably a lower exchange rate) tariff rationalization, and export incentives.
3. Reduce public regulation and administrative control by the reduction of subsidies, price control, deregulation of the financial sector, and trade payments liberalization.
4. Rationalize the bureaucracy and public sector projects, and commercialize and privatize public corporations and companies.
5. Reschedule the external debt so as to shift the main burden of debt serving to 1991 and beyond (Forrest, 1995: 213).

It became apparent that SAP recorded more negative than positive impacts. In the first place, SAP highlighted contradictions between international capital and national interests. The emphasis on foreign finance and investment in SAP runs counter to a viable path of national accumulation. In addition, the policies that were pursued under SAP resulted in increased external debt and increased dependence on flows of foreign finance (Forrest, 1995). Similarly, the imposition and implementation of SAP from 1986 led to severe economic decline and contraction of economic activities.

Since the institutionalization of neo-liberal economic policies in Nigeria, the assumed benefits derivable from the policy have continued to elude the country as it has failed to satisfactorily address many problematic issues of growing poverty, unemployment, putrefied infrastructural facilities, inadequate health facilities, lopsided income distribution and social inequality. For instance, the total debt profile of Nigeria rose from \$3.1billion in 2007 to \$5.3billion in 2014 while the inflation rate has increased to 11.98% in December of 2019 from 11.85% in the prior month, remaining at the highest level since April 2018 (http://tradingeconomics.com). Also, in 2019, the estimated youth unemployment rate in Nigeria was at almost 20% (Plecher, 2020), while about 90 million Nigerians are estimated to be living in abject poverty (CBN, 2015). In the same vein, rural households were poorer than their urban counterparts. To be sure, the socio-economic consequences of SAP greatly manifested in the collapse of social services.

There is no doubt that globalization, through reliance on liberalization policies, has led to the weakening of the Nigerian state. SAP, with harsh conditionality's, dramatically compromised the position of the Nigerian state as the bastion of national sovereignty and also revealed the state's weakness and dependent character vis-à-vis foreign powers and institutions. Apart from the economic decline generated by SAP policies, the acceptance and imposition of the programme also gave the multilateral imperialist agencies (the World Bank and IMF) the opportunity to intervene directly in Nigeria's domestic affairs and policy making environment, portray national policies as inadequate and conceptually wrong-headed and to attempt largely successfully to take over the country's economic decision making process (Iweriebor, 2007).

However, the direct consequences of this economic globalization within the context of neo-liberal economic reform is that the Nigerian masses perceived the state as a weak entity that has failed to translate its natural oil wealth into social and economic development. Thus, various ethnic identities in Nigeria started to struggle for all kinds of space in order to dominate the central sectors of the economy and the state. As Ake (1996,:133-134) rightly put it:

> *... the rigors of the ... crisis, especially SAP, have forced the masses ... to turn away from states that seem helpless in the face of a persistent and deepening crisis, states whose ability to maintain social services and infrastructure are visibly declining or nonexistent. For their part, people are turning to community organizations, special interest groups, self-help projects to survive and to arrest the erosion of the social infrastructure. Even as the state often remains powerful and meddlesome, it is increasingly perceived by its citizens as irrelevant at best, and a nuisance at worst.*

From the foregoing, neo-liberal economic policy arising from forces of globalization deepened Nigeria's economic crisis. Thus, a combination of the widened gap in income inequalities, poor socio-economic conditions and group marginalization, among others, in a liberalized atmosphere, resulted in the aggravation of conflicts all over the country over the last three decades. In fact, most of these globalization-induced conflicts are communal conflicts in which the people wage war on themselves, their neighbors, their communities, destroying life, their meager livelihood, their homes and other properties (Albert, 2012; Alimba, 2014). These conflicts are caused by globalization because as a result of the implementation of the policy prescriptions of globalization, the state began to withdraw from social provisioning claiming requirements of structural adjustment and economic deregulation which prescribe curtailment of the state's distributive powers. All these measures impose unbelievable pressure on the people, causing deprivations and desperation which leads to violent intrastate conflicts (Alli, 2006: 344).

In illustrating the above argument Obi and Okwechime (2004) observed that the recurrent conflicts in the Warri region of Nigeria's Delta State are not merely inter-ethnic or inter-communal conflicts involving the Urhobo, Itsekiri and the Ijaw ethnic minority groups. Rather, they reflect a state of cultural and social breakdown, and tensions within, and between dispossessed and disillusioned peasant communities and hegemonic trans global-capitalist forces. These groups perceived the Nigerian state as an alien predatory social force, hence they retreat into their small ethnic shells, from where they wage conflict within, and against each other for the control of oil and power. In a fundamental sense, it demonstrates the fact that inter-ethnic or inter-communal conflicts are intimately connected to the political economy of oil, the character and politics of the Nigerian state, and ways in which globalization processes increase the rate of extraction and environmental degradation, thereby provoking increase struggles over shrinking resources (Obi and Okwechime, 2004: 358). Indeed, the current phase of conflicts in Nigeria over the last thirty years can be traced to the forces of globalization.

As economic globalization goes hand in hand with neo-liberalism, market becomes a causal factor of an order based on inequalities and social marginalization. In other words, violence and insecurity actually appear as the outcome of the social differentiation generated by economic globalization. In response to the harsh socio-economic condition arising from the withdrawal of the state from performing its contractual and statutory responsibility, the citizens who felt deprived of social means of existence resorted to violent and unlawful activities such as kidnapping, terrorism, militia movements, armed robbery, and child trafficking to register their grievances against the state (Okolie and Elijah, 2015). In other words, economic globalization have aggravated conflicts in Nigeria because it shrank the welfare role of the state and intensified competition for scarce resources under economic crisis.

Conclusion and Recommendations

There has been so much emphasis on recurrent conflicts in Africa. Much of this emphasis however borders on internal causation. This paper however, examined the external causation of conflicts in Africa within the context of globalization processes. The critical catalyst for the aggravation of conflict in contemporary Africa can be traced to the forces of globalization. Economic globalization has become the major source of conflict in Africa because it has undermined the capacity of the state in providing social services. For Nigeria, the implementation of neo- liberal economic policy led to the collapse of state's economic institutions. This has decreased Nigeria's income and weakened Nigerian state in the global economic order. Therefore, marginalized groups with unrealized expectations became particularly hostile to some of the state's economic liberalization policies, which they perceived to be responsible for the erosion of welfare programmes. The direct consequence of economic globalization is the phenomenal growth of conflicts in all regions of Nigeria. To this end, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Nigeria cannot totally discarded globalization because of its negative effects on the poorer people. Rather, the positive aspects of it should be utilized for economic development.
2. Enlightenment programmes on the negative effects of conflicts should be taken to the grassroots people; especially the youth.
3. In order to end poverty, Nigeria must harness the demographic dividends through investments in health, education and livelihoods.
4. Nigeria must invest in human capital potential by increasing financial access and opportunities to the marginalized groups.
5. Local, State and Federal governments should institute entrepreneurial programmes that will address the issue of unemployment among the youths.
6. The implementation of a welfare programme through the provision of social services to the majority of the populace will be antidote for the management of conflicts in Nigeria.

References

Abdulraham, D.A. 2004. "Colonialism, Development Paths, Globalization and Social Inequality: The Sources of Social Conflict in Nigeria", in Oni, D. et al (eds), *Nigeria and Globalization: Discourses on Identity Politics and Social Conflict*. Lagos: Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilization (CBAAC).

Adetula, V.A.O. 2015. *African Conflicts, Development and Regional Organizations in the Post-Cold War International System*. Uppsala: Nordiska Africainstitutet.

African Union Commission/OECD, 2018. "Africa's Integration into the Global Economy" in Africa's Development Dynamics 2018. Growth, Jobs and Inequality. OECD Publicly Addis Ababa

Ake, C. 1996. *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Albert, I.O. 2010. *Building Peace, Advancing Democracy: Experience with Third-Party Interventions in Nigeria's Conflict*. Ibadan: John Archers.

Albert, I.O. 2012. *A History of Social Conflict and Conflict Management in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers.

Alimba, N.C. 2014. "Probing the Dynamic of Communal Conflict in Northern Nigeria", *African Research Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1.

Alli, W.O. 2006. The Impact of Globalization on Conflicts in Africa, in S.G. Best (ed.), *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Spectrum Books.

Amin, S. 1984. *Unequal Development.* London: Zed Books.

Bassey, C.O. 2007. "The Nexus of Conflict and Development Crises in Africa", in C. Bassey and O. Oshita (eds), *Conflict Resolution, Identity Crisis and Development in Africa.* Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Bonat, Z.A. 1989. "Agriculture", in M.O. Kayode and Y.B. Usman (eds), *Nigeria Since Independence: The First Twenty Five Years*, Vol. II. Economy. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

Bousnina, M. 2009. "Charting the Future of Africa: Putting Vision into Practice", in *Africa and Globalization: Learning from the Past and Enabling a Better Future.* UNESCO Publication.

Central Bank of Nigeria. 2015. *Quarterly Statistical Bulletin.*

Chisadza, C. and Bittencourt, M. 2018. *Globalization and Conflicts: Evidence from Sub-Sahara Africa.* International Development Policy. The Graduate Institute. Geneva.

Coleman, J.S. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Forrest, T. 1995. *Politics and Economic Development in Nigeria.* Boulder, Colorado; Westview Press.

Frank, A.G. 1976. *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment in Latin America.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gill, S. 2003. "The Constitution of Global Capitalism", Paper presented at the 41st Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, available online, www.claonet.org/isa

Hay, C. 2002. *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Publishing.

Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Standford: Standford University Press.

Iweriebor, E.E.G. 2007. *Economic Crisis and Transformation in Nigeria: The Emergency of New Economic Sectors and Sub-Sectors Since the 1980s*. Lagos: Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos Distinguished Lecture.

Kagwanja, P. 2003. "Globalizing Ethnicity, Localizing Citizenship: Globalization, Identity Politics and Violence in Kenya's Tana River Region", *Africa Development*, Vol. 28, No 1 & 2, pp. 112-152.

Kesterner, B.P and L. Ray, 2002. *The Conflict Resolution Training Programme Leader's Manual*. USA: Josey-Bass.

Kohr, M. 2001. *Globalization and the South: Some Critical Issues*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Mbaku, J.M. 2001. "Ethnicity, Constitutionalism and Governance in Africa", in Mbaku, J. Agbese, P. and Mwangi, K. (eds), *Ethnicity and Governance in The Third World*. Aldershoot: Ashgate Publishing.

Michalopoulos, S. and Papaioannou, E. 2015. "The Long-Run Effects of the Scramble for Africa", *The American Economic Review*.

Nnoli, O. 1978. "External Constraints on Pan-African Economic

Integration", *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 4, Nos 1 & 2.

Obi, C. 2001. "Globalized Images of Environmental Security in Africa", in Akindele, R. and Ate, B. (eds), *Beyond Conflict Resolution: Managing African Security in the 21st Century*. Lagos: NLIA

Offiong, D. 1980. *Imperialism and Dependency: Obstacles to African Development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Okolie, A. and Nnamani, K.E. 2015. "Neoliberal Economic Policies and Boko Haram Insurgence in Nigeria", *Studies in Politics and Society*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 38-66.

Onimode, B. 2000. *Africa in the World of the 21st Century*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Osaghae, E. 2002. *Cripple Giant: Nigeria Since Independence.* Ibadan: John Archers.

Otite, O. 1999. "Aspects of Conflicts on Theory and Practice in Nigeria", in Otite, O and Albert, I.O. (eds.), *Community Conflicts in Nigeria: Management, Resolution and Transformation*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Plecher, H. 2020. "*Youth Unemployment Rate in Nigeria in 2019*" http://www.statista.com.

Prakash, A. and J.A. Hart, 1999. (ed), *Globalization and Governance*. London: Routhledge.

Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage Publication.

Stedman, S.J. 1991. "Conflict and Conflict Resolution in Africa: A Consequential Framework", in F. Deng and W.I. Zartman (eds), *Conflict Resolution in Africa*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.

Vaughan, O. 2012. Africa, "Transnationalism, and Globalization: An Overview", in Okome, M.O and Vaughan, O. (eds), *Transnational Africa and Globalization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallerstein, I. 1974. *The Modern World System*. New York: Academic Press 1979. *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2000. "Globalization or the Age of Transition?", *International Sociology*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 251-267.

Zartman, W.I. 1991. *Conflict Resolution in Africa*. Washington DC: Brookings Institute.

Zeleza, T. 2008. *The Roots of African Conflicts: The Causes and Costs*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.