EXAMINATION OF THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM AS AN EXPLANATION OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT OF THIRD WORLD NATIONS

BY

DR. ALFRED ABHULIMHEN – IYOHA

CHIEF MAGISTRATE, EDO STATE JUDICIARY, BENIN CITY, NIGERIA.

PhD LAW, PhD INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (STRATEGIC STUDIES), MSC INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, MPA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, LLM LAW, PGDE EDUCATION, BL, LLB HONS LAW, DIPLOMA CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY,+2348055968440

2021

INTRODUCTION

Imperialism is a state policy, practice, or advocacy of extending power and dominion, especially by direct territorial acquisition or by gaining political and economic control of other areas. Because it always involves the use of power, whether military force or some subtler form, imperialism has often been considered morally reprehensible, and the term is frequently employed in international propaganda to denounce and discredit an opponent's foreign policy.

It is different from new imperialism, as the term *imperialism* is usually applied to the colonization of the Americas between the 15th and 19th centuries, as opposed to the expansion of Western Powers and Japan during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. However, both are examples of imperialism.

The term "imperialism" is often conflated with "colonialism"; however, many scholars have argued that each have their own distinct definition. Imperialism and colonialism have been used in order to describe one's perceived superiority, domination and influence upon a person or group of people. Robert Young writes that while imperialism operates from the center, is a state policy and is developed for ideological as well as financial reasons, colonialism is simply the development for settlement or commercial intentions. However, colonialism still includes invasion. Colonialism in modern usage also tends to imply a degree of geographic separation between the colony and the imperial power. Particularly, Edward Said distinguishes the difference between imperialism and colonialism by stating; "imperialism involved 'the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory', while colonialism refers to the 'implanting of settlements on a distant territory. Contiguous land empires such as the Russian or Ottoman have traditionally been excluded from discussions of colonialism, though this is beginning to change, since it is accepted that they also sent

populations into the territories they ruled. Thus it can be said that imperialism includes some form of colonialism, but colonialism itself does not automatically imply imperialism, as it lacks a political focus.

Imperialism and colonialism both dictate the political and economic advantage over a land and the indigenous populations they control, yet scholars sometimes find it difficult to illustrate the difference between the two. Although imperialism and colonialism focus on the suppression of *another*, if colonialism refers to the process of a country taking physical control of another, imperialism refers to the political and monetary dominance, either formally or informally. Colonialism is seen to be the architect deciding how to start dominating areas and then imperialism can be seen as creating the idea behind conquest cooperating with colonialism. Colonialism is when the imperial nation begins a conquest over an area and then eventually is able to rule over the areas the previous nation had controlled. Colonialism's core meaning is the exploitation of the valuable assets and supplies of the nation that was conquered and the conquering nation then gaining the benefits from the spoils of the war. The meaning of imperialism is to create an empire, by conquering the other state's lands and therefore increasing its own dominance. Colonialism is the builder and preserver of the colonial possessions in an area by a population coming from a foreign region. Colonialism can completely change the existing social structure, physical structure and economics of an area; it is not unusual that the characteristics of the conquering peoples are inherited by the conquered indigenous populations. Few colonies remain remote from their mother country. Thus, most will eventually establish a separate nationality or remain under complete control of their mother colony.

Types of imperialism theories are Political Theories (Morgenthau, Cohen), Conservative Theories (Disraeli, Rhodes, Kipling), Liberal Theories (Hobson, Angell), Marxist Theories (Lenin) and Social-Psychological Theories (Schumpeter)

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Imperialism: **Imperialism** is a state policy, practice, or advocacy of extending power and dominion, especially by direct territorial acquisition or by gaining political and economic control of other areas. Because it always involves the use of power, whether military force or some subtler form, imperialism has often been considered morally reprehensible, and the term is frequently employed in international propaganda to denounce and discredit an opponent's foreign policy

Underdevelopment: The term **underdevelopment** refers to that state of an economy where levels of living of masses are extremely low due to very low levels of per capita income resulting from low levels of productivity and high growth rates of population

Third World Nations: The term "third world country" refers to countries with high mortality rates, especially infant mortality rates. They also have an unstable and inconsistent economy. These are countries that contain massive amounts of poverty and in some cases have fewer natural resources than other nations throughout the world. These countries often have to rely on more industrialized countries to aid them and help stabilize their economy.

EXAMPLES OF THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

Burma (Myanmar), Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Somalia, Sudan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. The report also includes nine more countries near the bottom of Freedom House's list of the most repressive countries: Belarus, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Laos, Saudi Arabia, Syria,Nigeria and Zimbabwe.

SELECTED THREE THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM

MARXIST THEORIES

The Marxist theory of imperialism tries to explain the characteristics displayed by the capitalist mode of production in its latest, most advanced stage as a working out of its 'laws of motion' discovered by Marx. The Marxist theory, thus, uses the term 'imperialism' to describe a special stage of capitalist development. In 'Capital', Marx tried to show that the capitalist mode of production was governed not by the satisfaction of human needs but by the drive to extract surplus value from a class of wage-labourers. To realise this surplus value it was necessary to find a market for the commodities in which it was embodied and to capitalise this surplus value in new means of production. The Marxist theory of imperialism deals with the special phenomenal from which this process takes at a particular stage in the development of the capitalist mode of production.

The parts of Capital which are most relevant to explaining the new stage of the capitalist mode of production, i.e., imperialism, are the following:

1. **The production schemas** in volume ii which deals with the problem of how the surplus value extracted from the working class is realised. 'The realisation problem', as it is known, is concerned with the varying degrees of the means of production and the means of consumption.
2. **The tendency for the rate of profit to fall** which follows from the changes in the forces of production which increases the proportion of constant to variable capital, bringing a rise in what Marx called the organic composition of capital.

3. **The concentration and centralization of capital** as an inevitable outcome of the competitive struggle among the capitalist forces. This would give way to the rise of monopoly capitalism.

The productive forces released by the capitalist mode of production could not be contained within the geographically confined areas of Europe. The rise of capitalism, and the industrialization of the advanced countries to which it led, brought into being a world market and an international division of labour. Through their relationship with the world market, the capitalist states assumed a position of dominance while the less developed areas assumed a position of dependence upon the former. By the end of the nineteenth century most of the world had been divided into empires and spheres of influence of the dominant powers.

At the same time, the capitalist ruling class established itself politically through the national state and thus there grew up a system of states which embodied different national interests. There was, therefore, a contradiction between the international unifying tendencies of the new technologies and the constricting influence of the national state. This expressed itself in rivalries and tensions between the main powers, in colonial expansion, in alliances and preparations for war and finally in war itself. By the end of nineteenth century, Marxism claims, the epoch of imperialism had begun.

In Marx's Capital, it is explained that-

1. Capitalist enterprises in the advanced countries sought to expand their markets and keep up profits by pushing into the world market. They did so, with state support and/or by using their own superior bargaining power in trade with weaker partners, in obtaining concessions and so on.

2. Other areas of the world were linked economically to the centres of advanced industry and managed to counteract the tendency for the rate of profit to fall.
3. This required the export of capital to undeveloped areas to build infrastructures, bringing sections of their economies into dependence on the world market.
4. These developments of the international division of labour, determined by the needs of the advanced capitalist countries, were accompanied by-notably the growth of monopolies. And, this has become the dominant forms of the capitalist mode of production in its highest stage.

Monopoly Capitalism and Imperialism

The briefest possible definition of imperialism was given by Lenin. In Lenin's words, 'imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism'. By monopoly Marxists do not mean literally the occupation of each industry or branch of enterprise by a single firm. They use 'monopoly capitalism' to indicate the passage of capitalism from its earlier stage of more or less free competition to one in which giant corporations dominate the market.

Marx and Engels recognized that the laws of market themselves tended to make competition between producers inherently unstable. As Marx put it, 'One capitalist kills many'. Through the process of centralization of capital, Marx says, a small number of large capitals tended to dominate the market in each field of business. At the same time, by the process of centralization, separate individual capitals were amalgamated into larger units. The whole process was indeed linked historically with the rise of joint stock companies and the growth of large deposit and investment banks and financial institutions which centralised the financial reserves of the system as a whole. This later development in the market situation was termed by Hilferding as 'finance capital'.

In the Marxist theory, the expansionist drives of advanced capitalism are associated with the emergence of large amalgamations of capital both in the industrial form and in money form in the hands of banks and giant financial institutions. Continuing accumulation and the maintenance of profitability however demanded a large and growing market. Government contracts at home and abroad became indispensable. The growth of monopoly and finance capital was irrepressible; capitalism could not be fixed in its earlier competitive shape. The role of national states is very important in this expansionist drive.

The process of expansion into the world market inevitably assumed an internationally competitive character because of the national state form in which the dominance of the bourgeoisie as a ruling class expressed itself. It therefore took place beneath a cover of nationalism and patriotism. On the surface politics and ideology ruled; deep down it was the imperative necessities of the capitalist mode of production which exercised the determining role. The Marxist method of historical materialism, in this way, is the method which is most likely to provide an objectively valid, scientific account of the epoch of imperialism.

The Contribution of Lenin

The Marxist theory of imperialism derives not directly from Marx but from Lenin's application of Marx's method to a study of the economic and political developments which brought about the First World War in his famous work, Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916). Lenin gave the title 'imperialism' to what he considered to be the distinguishing features of the latest stage in capitalist development. It is to this meaning that the Marxist theory now generally refers. It was in a way a more complete and finished conceptual form of those traits about which Marx and Engels talked few decades ago.

Lenin stressed that monopoly capitalism was a necessary outgrowth from the old style competitive capitalism, that it took over in a very uneven way and produced new antagonisms and contradictions. He associated these new forms of capitalism, arising within the nation-state, with the division of the world into empires and spheres of economic influence and hence with the international rivalries and tensions which had produced the war. According to Lenin, 'imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general'.

In the course of defining imperialism Lenin referred to the following five basic features:

1. The high stage of the concentration of production and capital has created monopolies which play a decisive part in economic life.
2. The merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "financial capital", of a financial oligarchy.
3. The export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance.
4. The formation of international monopolist capitalist combines which share the world among themselves.
5. And, the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

Lenin's theory of imperialism put the emphasis on the structural changes in capitalism rather than upon the relations between the metropolitan countries and their colonies, and to suggest that they still accurately characterise the dominant features of capitalism today. The significance of Lenin's contribution lies in his ability to bring together all the contradictory

features of advanced capitalism under a single head. The Marxist theory of imperialism normally rests on his definition of imperialism.

A Critique of Marxist Theories of Imperialism

It is a critique of Marxist theories of imperialism by one who stands within the Marxian tradition. Here, Barratt Brown tries to abstract certain of Lenin's ideas as well as some of Marx's in order to produce a 'Marxian' account of the expansion of Europe in the late nineteenth century. However, he tries to rely more on some of Marx's ideas and less on those of Lenin, particularly the former's emphasis on the tendency of capitalist development to lead to a greater and greater concentration of capital. It was this, in Barratt Brown's opinion, which was responsible for one of the most important characteristics of the new imperialism of the late nineteenth century, the drive for markets overseas by competing European industries backed by competing European states. It was this, too, which provides an important part of the explanation of why the expansion of Europe was accompanied by a polarization of wealth on an international as well as a national scale, and a widening of the gap between the level of development of the industrial countries and the rest. Against this, Barratt Brown is critical of one of the central tenets of the Leninist theory: its emphasis on the importance of the export of European capital.

The Relation of Imperialism to Capitalism

Imperialism has undoubtedly been developed as a Marxist theory. As such it was used to describe and explain the spread of European capitalism throughout the world in the nineteenth century. In origin, however, it was not a Marxist word and does not appear in the writing of Marx or Engels. It was in fact first used by those who were themselves colonial powers. For example, nationalism in Britain throughout the nineteenth century was fostered not by a war of

liberation, nor even by wars of domination, but by glorification of the Empire and of the common interest of the British people in it.

J. A. Hobson, who wrote the first major critique of imperialism at the turn of twentieth century, said that the economic tap root of imperialism lay in the export of capital in search of investment opportunities that were declining at home. However, Schumpeter, after analysing the British trend in 1920s, argued that the connection between capitalism and imperialism was not substantiated. Lenin, unaware of the trend, and drawing upon the facts of capital export from European countries other than Britain enthusiastically endorsed the chief elements in Hobson's analysis. Thus, because of the differences of the facts Schumpeter and Lenin chose their interpretations also went differently.

There are diverse factors- ideological, political, social and economic- for the expansion of imperialism. Although a decaying military aristocracy and an underemployed middle class was a common feature of Britain, Japan, Austria, Germany and France, it was not a feature of the United States, or Russian, Belgium or the Netherlands. Again, there were similar sociological structures in other countries that showed no sign of outward expansion to obtain privileged positions in other lands: China provides an obvious example to this.

Marx's Economic Model

Marx's model of capitalist economic structures, in essential, is contained in the formula, M-C-M^1 (money-commodities-money). In short, owners of money (capital) turn it into commodities for the purpose of making more money. In fact, this is the rationale of private capital ownership.

With the aid of Marx's model Marxists have approach an understanding of international relations. The following is the list of relationships that is central in their definition of imperialism as a stage of capitalism:

1. The widening gap in economic development between industrialised European countries and those restricted to primary production;
2. The outward movement of labour and capital from the more developed countries to the less;
3. The annexation of territories all over the world by the more developed nations in a competitive scramble for supposed strategic and economic advantages, especially in the last quarter of the nineteenth century;
4. The growth of international economic rivalries and of a series of arms races leading to two world wars and threatening a third;
5. The emergence of the international firm and the continuation of attempts by the more developed nations to maintain and extend their political, military or economic power over the less, even after the ending of direct colonial rule.

Marx's View on Foreign Trade

Marx's view of the expansion of Britain's worldwide military and political power, including colonial expansion, was that this was an essential part of freeing the trade of the world to the products of the most advanced industrial producer. For such a producer, free trade, not protection or privilege, was the key to increased profit. In the third volume of Capital, Marx writes in the following way of foreign trade as one of the counteracting forces to the tendency of the rate of profit to fall:

"Foreign trade permits an expansion of the scale of production… The expansion of foreign trade which is the basis of the capitalist mode of production in its stages of infancy, has become its own product in the further progress of capitalist development through its innate necessities, through its need for an ever expanding market… an advanced country."

There are four stages of imperial expansion that Marx talked about especially with relation to India. First, the combined interest of merchants, army and aristocracy in the East India Company.

Second, the growing interest of the British capitalist mill-owners in expanding the market for their products.

Third, the decline of handicraft and other indigenous manufacturing industries.

Fourth, and at this last stage, a new worldwide division of labour developed in which Britain produced the manufactured goods and the rest of the world raw materials.

On such a division of labour bargaining power was strongly on the side of the more advanced economy. According to Marx, the country that is more developed industrially only shows to the less developed the image of its own future. However, this was not true in many cases. Elsewhere, underdevelopment followed.

NEOCOLONIALISM

Neocolonialism, neo-colonialism or neo-imperialism is the practice of using capitalism, globalization and cultural imperialism to influence a developing country in lieu of direct military control (imperialism) or indirect political control (hegemony). It was coined by Kwame Nkrumah in the context of African countries undergoing decolonization in the 1960s. Neo-colonialism is also discussed in the works of Western thinkers such as Jean-Paul Sartre

(*Colonialism and Neo-colonialism*, 1964) and Noam Chomsky (*The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*, 1979).

Origins of Neocolonialism

Neocolonialism labels European countries' continued economic and cultural relationships with their former colonies, African countries that had been liberated in the aftermath of Second World War. Kwame Nkrumah, former president of Ghana (1960–66), coined the term, which appeared in the 1963 preamble of the Organization of African Unity Charter, and was the title of his 1965 book *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965). Nkrumah theoretically developed and extended to the post–War 20th century the socio-economic and political arguments presented by Lenin in the pamphlet *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1917). The pamphlet frames 19th-century imperialism as the logical extension of geopolitical power, to meet the financial investment needs of the political economy of capitalism. In *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*, Kwame Nkrumah wrote:

> In place of colonialism, as the main instrument of imperialism, we have today neo-colonialism . . . [which] like colonialism, is an attempt to export the social conflicts of the capitalist countries. . . .
>
> The result of neo-colonialism is that foreign capital is used for the exploitation rather than for the development of the less developed parts of the world. Investment, under neo-colonialism, increases, rather than decreases, the gap between the rich and the poor countries of the world. The struggle against neo-colonialism is not aimed at excluding the capital of the developed world from operating in less developed countries. It is aimed at preventing the financial

power of the developed countries being used in such a way as to impoverish the less developed.

Non-aligned World

Neocolonialism was used to describe a type of foreign intervention in countries belonging to the Pan-Africanist movement, as well as the Bandung Conference (Asian–African Conference, 1955), which led to the Non-Aligned Movement (1961). Neocolonialism was formally defined by the All-African Peoples' Conference (AAPC) and published in the *Resolution on Neo-colonialism*. At both the Tunis conference (1960) and the Cairo conference (1961), AAPC described the actions of the French Community of independent states, organized by France, as neocolonial.

Throughout the decades of the Cold War, the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America defined neocolonialism as the primary, collective enemy of the economies and cultures of their respective countries. Moreover, neocolonialism was integrated into the national liberation ideologies of Marxist guerrilla armies. During the 1970s, in the Portuguese African colonies of Mozambique and Angola, upon assuming government power, the Liberation Front of Mozambique (FRELIMO, Frente de Libertação de Moçambique), and the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola — Labour Party (MPLA, Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola — Partido do Trabalho), respectively, established policies to counter neocolonial agreements with the (former) colonist country.

Françafrique

The representative example of European neocolonialism is *Françafrique*, the "French Africa" constituted by the continued close relationships between France and its former African

colonies. In 1955, the initial usage of the "French Africa" term, by President Félix Houphouët-Boigny of Ivory Coast, denoted positive social, cultural and economic Franco–African relations. It was later applied by neocolonialism critics to describe an imbalanced international relation. The politician Jacques Foccart, the principal advisor for African matters to French presidents Charles de Gaulle (1958–69) and Georges Pompidou (1969–1974), was the principal proponent of *Françafrique*. The works of Verschave and Beti reported a forty-year, post-independence relationship with France's former colonial peoples, which featured colonial garrisons *in situ* and monopolies by French multinational corporations, usually for the exploitation of mineral resources. It was argued that the African leaders with close ties to France — especially during the Soviet–American Cold War (1945–91) — acted more as agents of French business and geopolitical interests, than as the national leaders of sovereign states. Cited examples are Omar Bongo (Gabon), Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Ivory Coast), Gnassingbé Eyadéma (Togo), Denis Sassou-Nguesso (Republic of the Congo), Idriss Déby (Chad), and Hamani Diori (Niger).

Belgian Congo

After the decolonization of Belgian Congo, Belgium continued to control, through the Société Générale de Belgique, an estimated 70% of the Congolese economy following the decolonization process. The most contested part was in the province of Katanga where the Union Minière du Haut Katanga, part of the Société, controlled the mineral-resource-rich province. After a failed attempt to nationalize the mining industry in the 1960s, it was reopened to foreign investment.

Neocolonial Economic Dominance

In 1961, regarding the economic mechanism of neocolonial control, in the speech *Cuba: Historical Exception or Vanguard in the Anti-colonial Struggle?*, Argentine revolutionary Ché Guevara said:

We, politely referred to as "underdeveloped", in truth, are colonial, semi-colonial or dependent countries. We are countries whose economies have been distorted by imperialism, which has abnormally developed those branches of industry or agriculture needed to complement its complex economy. "Underdevelopment", or distorted development, brings a dangerous specialization in raw materials, inherent in which is the threat of hunger for all our peoples. We, the "underdeveloped", are also those with the single crop, the single product, the single market. A single product whose uncertain sale depends on a single market imposing and fixing conditions. That is the great formula for imperialist economic domination.

Dependency Theories

Dependency theory is the theoretical description of economic neocolonialism. It proposes that the global economic system comprises wealthy countries at the center, and poor countries at the periphery. Economic neocolonialism extracts the human and natural resources of a poor country to flow to the economies of the wealthy countries. It claims that the poverty of the peripheral countries is the result of how they are integrated in the global economic system. Dependency theory derives from the Marxist analysis of economic inequalities within the world's system of economies, thus, under-development of the periphery is a direct result of development in the center. It includes the concept of the late 19th century semi-colony. It contrasts the Marxist perspective of the Theory of Colonial Dependency with capitalist economics. The latter proposes that poverty is a development stage in the poor country's progress towards full integration in the

global economic system. Proponents of Dependency Theory, such as Venezuelan historian Federico Brito Figueroa, who investigated the socioeconomic bases of neocolonial dependency, influenced the thinking of the former President of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez.

Cold War

During the mid-to-late 20th century, in the course of the ideological conflict between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., each country and its satellite states accused each other of practising neocolonialism in their imperial and hegemonic pursuits. The struggle included proxy wars, fought by client states in the decolonized countries. Cuba, the Warsaw Pact bloc, Egypt under Gamal Abdel Nasser (1956–70), *et al.* accused the U.S. of sponsoring anti-democratic governments whose régimes did not represent the interests of their people and of overthrowing elected governments (African, Asian, Latin American) that did not support U.S. geopolitical interests.

In the 1960s, under the leadership of Chairman Mehdi Ben Barka, the Cuban Tricontinental Conference (Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America) recognized and supported the validity of revolutionary anti-colonialism as a means for colonized peoples of the Third World to achieve self-determination, which policy angered the U.S. and France. Moreover, Chairman Barka headed the Commission on Neocolonialism, which dealt with the work to resolve the neocolonial involvement of colonial powers in decolonized counties; and said that the U.S., as the leading capitalist country of the world, was, in practice, the principal neocolonialist political actor.

Multinational Corporations

Critics of neocolonialism also argue that investment by multinational corporations enriches few in underdeveloped countries and causes humanitarian, environmental and

ecological damage to their populations. They argue that this results in unsustainable development and perpetual underdevelopment. These countries remain reservoirs of cheap labor and raw materials, while restricting access to advanced production techniques to develop their own economies. In some countries, monopolization of natural resources, while initially leading to an influx of investment, is often followed by increases in unemployment, poverty and a decline in per-capita income.

In the West African nations of Guinea-Bissau, Senegal and Mauritania, fishing was historically central to the economy. Beginning in 1979, the European Union began negotiating contracts with governments for fisheries off the coast of West Africa. Commercial, unsustainable, over-fishing by foreign fleets played a significant role in large-scale unemployment and migration of people across the region. This violates the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Seas, which recognizes the importance of fishing to local communities and insists that government fishing agreements with foreign companies should target only surplus stocks.

International Borrowing

To alleviate the effects of neocolonialism, American economist Jeffrey Sachs recommended that the entire African debt (ca. 200 billion U.S. dollars) be dismissed, and recommended that African nations not repay the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF):

The time has come to end this charade. The debts are unaffordable. If they won't cancel the debts, I would suggest obstruction; *you* do it, yourselves. Africa should say: "Thank you very much, but we need this money to meet the needs of children who are dying, right now, so, we

will put the debt-servicing payments into urgent social investment in health, education, drinking water, the control of AIDS, and other needs".

"One Belt, One Road" of China

In 2018, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad cancelled China-funded projects, and warns "there is a new version of Colonialism happening." Before this meeting, China-funded "One Belt, One Road" projects was called by the Prime Minister as "unfair" Chinese infrastructure deals authorized by former prime minister Najib Razak and would leave Malaysia "indebted" to China.

> "We do not want a situation where there is a new version of colonialism happening because poor countries are unable to compete with rich countries."

The centerpiece of China's Belt and Road infrastructure push in Malaysia is the ambitious $27 billion East Coast Rail Link project. Mr. Mahathir has also halted work on two projects worth more than $3.1 billion awarded to the China Petroleum Pipeline Bureau that have been linked to corruption at state fund 1MDB. While on the campaign trail of Prime Minister Mahathir, he also criticized "we gain nothing" and warned of selling off the country to foreigners. The same political tensions are raised from Australia to Sri Lanka since Sri Lanka handed over the strategic port of Hambantota to China on a 99-year.

> "Here we gain nothing from the investment, we don't welcome that."

"We don’t have enough people with wealth to buy all those very expensive flats, so you’re bringing in foreigners,” Mahathir said. “No country wants to have an influx of huge numbers of foreign people into their country."

Sino-African relations and neocolonialism of China

Historically, China and Somalia had strong trade ties. Giraffes, zebras and incense were exported to the Ming Empire of China, which established Somali merchants as leaders in the commerce between Asia and Africa. The People's Republic of China has built increasingly strong ties with African nations, becoming Africa's largest trading partner. As of August 2007, an estimated 750,000 Chinese nationals were working or living for extended periods in Africa. In the 1980s and 90s, China continued to purchase natural resources — petroleum and minerals — from Africa to fuel the Chinese economy and to finance international business enterprises. In 2006, two-way trade had increased to $50 billion expanding to $500 billion by 2016.

In 2007, China and Democratic Republic of the Congo entered into an agreement whereby Chinese state-owned firms would provide various services (infrastructure projects) in exchange for an equivalent amount of Congolese copper. Although China is investing large amounts across Africa and Asia some authors state that these strategies include some characteristics of neo-Colonialism, the purpose of which may be to ensure China's hegemony in Asia and Africa.

South Korea's Land Acquisitions

To ensure a reliable, long-term supply of food, the South Korean government and powerful Korean multinationals bought farming rights to millions of hectares of agricultural land in under-developed countries. South Korea's RG Energy Resources Asset Management CEO Park Yong-soo stressed that "the nation does not produce a single drop of crude oil and other key industrial minerals. To power economic growth and support people's livelihoods, we cannot emphasize too much that securing natural resources in foreign countries is a must for our future survival." The head of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Jacques Diouf, stated that

the rise in land deals could create a form of " neocolonialism", with poor states producing food for the rich at the expense of their own hungry people.

In 2008, South Korean multinational Daewoo Logistics secured 1.3 million hectares of farmland in Madagascar to grow maize and crops for biofuels. Roughly half of the country's arable land, as well as rainforests were to be converted into palm and corn monocultures, producing food for export from a country where a third of the population and 50 percent of children under 5 are malnourished, using South African workers instead of locals. Local residents were not consulted or informed, despite being dependent on the land for food and income. The controversial deal played a major part in prolonged anti-government protests that resulted in over a hundred deaths. This was a source of popular resentment that contributed to the fall of then-President Marc Ravalomanana. The new president, Andry Rajoelina, cancelled the deal. Tanzania later announced that South Korea was in talks to develop 100,000 hectares for food production and processing for 700 to 800 billion won. Scheduled to be completed in 2010, it was to be the largest single piece of overseas South Korean agricultural infrastructure ever built.

In 2009, Hyundai Heavy Industries acquired a majority stake in a company cultivating 10,000 hectares of farmland in the Russian Far East and a South Korean provincial government secured 95,000 hectares of farmland in Oriental Mindoro, central Philippines, to grow corn. The South Jeolla province became the first provincial government to benefit from a new central government fund to develop farmland overseas, receiving a loan of $1.9 million. The project was expected to produce 10,000 tonnes of feed in the first year. South Korean multinationals and provincial governments purchased land in Sulawesi, Indonesia, Cambodia and Bulgan, Mongolia. The national South Korean government announced its intention to invest 30 billion

won in land in Paraguay and Uruguay. As of 2009 discussions with Laos, Myanmar and Senegal were underway.

Other Approaches

Although the concept of neocolonialism was originally developed within a Marxist theoretical framework and is generally employed by the political left, the term "neocolonialism" is found in other theoretical frameworks and charges of neocolonialism are now leveled against Marxist and other left-wing states, such as the previously mentioned Chinese policies.

Coloniality

"Coloniality" claims that knowledge production is strongly influenced by the context of the person producing the knowledge and that this has further disadvantaged developing countries with limited knowledge production infrastructure. It originated among critics of subaltern theories, which, although strongly de-colonial, are less concerned with the source of knowledge.

Cultural Theory

One variant of neocolonialism theory critiques *cultural colonialism*, the desire of wealthy nations to control other nations' values and perceptions through cultural means such as media, language, education and religion, ultimately for economic reasons. One impact of this is "colonial mentality", feelings of inferiority that lead post-colonial societies to latch onto physical and cultural differences between the foreigners and themselves. Foreign ways become held in higher esteem than indigenous ways. Given that colonists and colonizers were generally of different races, the colonized may over time hold that the colonizers' race was responsible for their superiority. Rejections of the colonizers culture, such as the Negritude movement, have been employed to overcome these associations. Post-colonial importation or continuation of cultural mores or elements may be regarded as a form of neocolonialism.

Post colonialism

Post-colonialism theories in philosophy, political science, literature and film deal with the cultural legacy of colonial rule. Post-colonialism studies examine how once-colonized writers articulate their national identity; how knowledge about the colonized was generated and applied in service to the interests of the colonizer; and how colonialist literature justified colonialism by presenting the colonized people as inferior whose society, culture and economy must be managed for them. Post-colonial studies incorporate subaltern studies of "history from below"; post-colonial cultural evolution; the psychopathology of colonization (by Frantz Fanon); and the cinema of film makers such as the Cuban Third Cinema, e.g. Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, and Kidlat Tahimik.

Critical theory

Critiques of post colonialism/neocolonialism are evident in literary theory. International relations theory defined "post colonialism" as a field of study. While the lasting effects of cultural colonialism are of central interest, the intellectual antecedents in cultural critiques of neocolonialism are economic. Critical international relations theory references neocolonialism from Marxist positions as well as post positivist positions, including postmodernist, postcolonial and feminist approaches. These differ from both realism and liberalism in their epistemological and ontological premises. The neo-liberalist approach tends to depict modern forms of colonialism as a benevolent imperialism.

Conservation and Neocolonialism

Wallerstein and separately Frank claim that the modern conservation movement, as practiced by international organizations such as the World Wide Fund for Nature, inadvertently developed a neocolonial relationship with underdeveloped nations.

DEPENDENCY THEORY

Dependency theory is the motion that resources flow from a "periphery" of poor and underdeveloped states to a "core" of wealthy states, enriching the latter at the expense of the former. It is a central contention of dependency theory that poor states are impoverished and rich ones enriched by the way poor states are integrated into the "world system". The theory arose as a reaction to modernization theory, an earlier theory of development which held that all societies progress through similar stages of development, that today's underdeveloped areas are thus in a similar situation to that of today's developed areas at some time in the past, and that, therefore, the task of helping the underdeveloped areas out of poverty is to accelerate them along this supposed common path of development, by various means such as investment, technology transfers, and closer integration into the world market.

Dependency theory rejected this view, arguing that underdeveloped countries are not merely primitive versions of developed countries, but have unique features and structures of their own; and, importantly, are in the situation of being the weaker members in a world market economy. Dependency theory no longer has many proponents as an overall theory, but some writers have argued for its continuing relevance as a conceptual orientation to the global division of wealth.

History of Dependency Theory

Dependency theory originates with two papers published in 1949 – one by Hans Singer, one by Raúl Prebisch – in which the authors observe that the terms of trade for underdeveloped countries relative to the developed countries had deteriorated over time: the underdeveloped countries were able to purchase fewer and fewer manufactured goods from the developed countries in exchange for a given quantity of their raw materials exports. This idea is known as the Prebisch–Singer thesis. Prebisch, an Argentine economist at the United Nations Commission for Latin America (UNCLA), went on to conclude that the underdeveloped nations must employ some degree of protectionism in trade if they were to enter a self-sustaining development path. He argued that import-substitution industrialisation (ISI), not a trade-and-export orientation, was the best strategy for underdeveloped countries. The theory was developed from a Marxian perspective by Paul A. Baran in 1957 with the publication of his *The Political Economy of Growth*. Dependency theory shares many points with earlier, Marxist, theories of imperialism by Rosa Luxemburg and Vladimir Lenin, and has attracted continued interest from Marxists.

Some authors identify two main streams in dependency theory: the Latin American Structuralist, typified by the work of Prebisch, Celso Furtado, and Aníbal Pinto at the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC, or, in Spanish, CEPAL); and the American Marxist, developed by Paul A. Baran, Paul Sweezy, and Andre Gunder Frank.

Using the Latin American dependency model, the Guyanese Marxist historian Walter Rodney, in his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, described in 1972 an Africa that had been consciously exploited by European imperialists, leading directly to the modern underdevelopment of most of the continent.

The theory was popular in the 1960s and 1970s as a criticism of modernization theory, which was falling increasingly out of favor because of continued widespread poverty in much of the world. It was used to explain the causes of over urbanization, a theory that urbanization rates outpaced industrial growth in several developing countries.

The Latin American Structuralist and the American Marxist schools had significant differences but agreed on some basic points:

> Both groups would agree that at the core of the dependency relation between center and periphery lays [lies] the inability of the periphery to develop an autonomous and dynamic process of technological innovation. Technology – the Promethean force unleashed by the Industrial Revolution – is at the center of stage. The Center countries controlled the technology and the systems for generating technology. Foreign capital could not solve the problem, since it only led to limited transmission of technology, but not the process of innovation itself. Baran and others frequently spoke of the international division of labour – skilled workers in the center; unskilled in the periphery – when discussing key features of dependency.

Baran placed surplus extraction and capital accumulation at the center of his analysis. Development depends on a population's producing more than it needs for bare subsistence (a surplus). Further, some of that surplus must be used for capital accumulation – the purchase of new means of production – if development is to occur; spending the surplus on things like luxury consumption does not produce development. Baran noted two predominant kinds of economic activity in poor countries. In the older of the two, plantation agriculture, which originated in colonial times, most of the surplus goes to the landowners, who use it to emulate the

consumption patterns of wealthy people in the developed world; much of it thus goes to purchase foreign-produced luxury items –automobiles, clothes, etc. – and little is accumulated for investing in development. The more recent kind of economic activity in the periphery is industry—but of a particular kind. It is usually carried out by foreigners, although often in conjunction with local interests. It is often under special tariff protection or other government concessions. The surplus from this production mostly goes to two places: part of it is sent back to the foreign shareholders as profit; the other part is spent on conspicuous consumption in a similar fashion to that of the plantation aristocracy. Again, little is used for development. Baran thought that political revolution was necessary to break this pattern.

In the 1960s, members of the Latin American Structuralist school argued that there is more latitude in the system than the Marxists believed. They argued that it allows for partial development or "dependent development"–development, but still under the control of outside decision makers. They cited the partly successful attempts at industrialization in Latin America around that time (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico) as evidence for this hypothesis. They were led to the position that dependency is not a relation between commodity exporters and industrialized countries, but between countries with different degrees of industrialization. In their approach, there is a distinction made between the economic and political spheres: economically, one may be developed or underdeveloped; but even if (somewhat) economically developed, one may be politically autonomous or dependent. More recently, Guillermo O'Donnell has argued that constraints placed on development by neoliberalism were lifted by the military coups in Latin America that came to promote development in authoritarian guise (O'Donnell, 1982).

The importance of multinational corporations and state promotion of technology were emphasized by the Latin American Structuralists.

Fajnzybler has made a distinction between systemic or authentic competitiveness, which is the ability to compete based on higher productivity, and spurious competitiveness, which is based on low wages. The third-world debt crisis of the 1980s and continued stagnation in Africa and Latin America in the 1990s caused some doubt as to the feasibility or desirability of "dependent development".

The *sine qua non* of the dependency relationship is not the difference in technological sophistication, as traditional dependency theorists believe, but rather the difference in financial strength between core and peripheral countries–particularly the inability of peripheral countries to borrow in their own currency. He believes that the hegemonic position of the United States is very strong because of the importance of its financial markets and because it controls the international reserve currency – the US dollar. He believes that the end of the Bretton Woods international financial agreements in the early 1970s considerably strengthened the United States' position because it removed some constraints on their financial actions.

"Standard" dependency theory differs from Marxism, in arguing against internationalism and any hope of progress in less developed nations towards industrialization and a liberating revolution. Theotonio dos Santos described a "new dependency", which focused on both the internal and external relations of less-developed countries of the periphery, derived from a Marxian analysis. Former Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (in office 1995–2002) wrote extensively on dependency theory while in political exile during the 1960s, arguing that it was an approach to studying the economic disparities between the centre and periphery. Cardoso summarized his version of dependency theory as follows:

- there is a financial and technological penetration by the developed capitalist centers of the countries of the periphery and semi-periphery;

- this produces an unbalanced economic structure both within the peripheral societies and between them and the centers;
- this leads to limitations on self-sustained growth in the periphery;
- this favors the appearance of specific patterns of class relations;
- these require modifications in the role of the state to guarantee both the functioning of the economy and the political articulation of a society, which contains, within itself, foci of inarticulateness and structural imbalance.

The analysis of development patterns in the 1990s and beyond is complicated by the fact that capitalism develops not smoothly, but with very strong and self-repeating ups and downs, called cycles. Relevant results are given in studies by Joshua Goldstein, Volker Bornschier, and Luigi Scandella. With the economic growth of India and some East Asian economies, dependency theory has lost some of its former influence. It still influences some NGO campaigns, such as Make Poverty History and the fair trade movement.

Other theorists and related theories

Two other early writers relevant to dependency theory were François Perroux and Kurt Rothschild. Other leading dependency theorists include Herb Addo, Walden Bello, Ruy Mauro Marini, Enzo Faletto, Armando Cordova, Ernest Feder, Pablo González Casanova, Keith Griffin, Kunibert Raffer, Paul Israel Singer, and Osvaldo Sunkel. Many of these authors focused their attention on Latin America; the leading dependency theorist in the Islamic world is the Egyptian economist Samir Amin.

Tausch, based on works of Amin from 1973 to 1997, lists the following main characteristics of periphery capitalism:

1. Regression in both agriculture and small scale industry characterizes the period after the onslaught of foreign domination and colonialism
2. Unequal international specialization of the periphery leads to the concentration of activities in export-oriented agriculture and or mining. Some industrialization of the periphery is possible under the condition of low wages, which, together with rising productivity, determine that unequal exchange sets in (double factorial terms of trade < 1.0; see Raffer, 1987)
3. These structures determine in the long run a rapidly growing tertiary sector with hidden unemployment and the rising importance of rent in the overall social and economic system
4. Chronic current account balance deficits, re-exported profits of foreign investments, and deficient business cycles at the periphery that provide important markets for the centers during world economic upswings
5. Structural imbalances in the political and social relationships, inter alia a strong 'compradore' element and the rising importance of state capitalism and an indebted state class.

The American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein refined the Marxist aspect of the theory and expanded on it, to form world-systems theory. This postulates a third category of countries, the *semi-periphery*, intermediate between the core and periphery. Wallerstein believed in a tri-modal rather than a bi-modal system because he viewed the world-systems as more complicated than a simplistic classification as either core or periphery nations. To Wallerstein, many nations do not fit into one of these two categories, so he proposed the idea of a semi-periphery as an in between state within his model. In this model, the semi-periphery is industrialized, but with less

sophistication of technology than in the core; and it does not control finances. The rise of one group of semi-peripheries tends to be at the cost of another group, but the unequal structure of the world economy based on unequal exchange tends to remain stable. Tausch traces the beginnings of world-systems theory to the writings of the Austro-Hungarian socialist Karl Polanyi after the First World War, but its present form is usually associated with the work of Wallerstein.

Dependency theory has also been associated with Johan Galtung's structural theory of imperialism. Dependency theorists hold that short-term spurts of growth notwithstanding, long-term growth in the periphery will be imbalanced and unequal, and will tend towards high negative current account balances. Cyclical fluctuations also have a profound effect on cross-national comparisons of economic growth and societal development in the medium and long run. What seemed like spectacular long-run growth may in the end turn out to be just a short run cyclical spurt after a long recession. Cycle time plays an important role. Giovanni Arrighi believed that the logic of accumulation on a world scale shifts over time, and that the 1980s and beyond once more showed a deregulated phase of world capitalism with a logic, characterized - in contrast to earlier regulatory cycles - by the dominance of financial capital.

It is argued that, at this stage, the role of unequal exchange in the entire relationship of dependency cannot be underestimated. Unequal exchange is given if double factorial terms of trade of the respective country are < 1.0. The former ideological head of the Blekingegade Gang and political activist Torkil Lauesen argues in his book *The Global Perspective* that political theory and practice stemming from dependency theory are more relevant than ever. He postulates that the conflict between countries in the core and countries in the periphery has been

ever-intensifying and that the world is at the onset of a resolution of the core-periphery contradiction – that humanity is "in for an economic and political rollercoaster ride".

Criticism

Economic policies based on dependency theory has been criticized by free-market economists such as Peter Bauer and Martin Wolf and others:

- Lack of competition: by subsidizing in-country industries and preventing outside imports, these companies may have less incentive to improve their products, to try to become more efficient in their processes, to please customers, or to research new innovations.
- Sustainability: industries reliant on government support may not be sustainable for very long, particularly in poorer countries and countries which largely depend on foreign aid from more developed countries.
- Domestic opportunity costs: subsidies on domestic industries come out of state coffers and therefore represent money not spent in other ways, like development of domestic infrastructure, seed capital or need-based social welfare programs. At the same time, the higher prices caused by tariffs and restrictions on imports require the people either to forgo these goods altogether or buy them at higher prices, forgoing other goods.

Market economists cite a number of examples in their arguments against dependency theory. The improvement of India's economy after it moved from state-controlled business to open trade is one of the most often cited (*see also* economy of India, *The Commanding Heights*). India's example seems to contradict dependency theorists' claims concerning comparative advantage and mobility, as much as its economic growth originated from movements such as outsourcing – one of the most mobile forms of capital transfer. South Korea and North Korea provide another example of trade-based development vs. autocratic self-sufficiency.

Following the Korean War, North Korea pursued a policy of import substitution industrialization as suggested by dependency theory, while South Korea pursued a policy of export-oriented industrialization as suggested by comparative advantage theory. In 2013, South Korea's per capita GDP was 18 times that of North Korea. In Africa, states which have emphasized import-substitution development, such as Zimbabwe, have typically been among the worst performers, while the continent's most successful non-oil based economies, such as Egypt, South Africa, and Tunisia, have pursued trade-based development.

According to economic historian Robert C. Allen, dependency theory's claims are "debatable", and that the protectionism that was implemented in Latin America as a solution ended up failing. The countries incurred too much debt and Latin America went into a recession. One of the problems was that the Latin American countries simply had too small national markets to be able to efficiently produce complex industrialized goods, such as automobiles.

IMPACT OF IMPERIALISM ON THIRD WORLD NATIONS

The term "imperialism" carries with it many (perhaps rightfully attributed) negative connotations: slavery, subjugation, genocide, et cetera. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary defines it as: "The policy of seeking the extension of the control, dominion, or empire of a nation, as by the acquirement of new, especially distant, territory or dependencies." Now one knows what it literally is and what it may entail, and thus, further inquiry into the subject of its "good"-ness or "bad"-ness may entail, from the perspective of the conquered.

Perhaps the best example of post-colonial failures is with the nearly the entire continent of Africa. Josef Conrad, who wrote many stories involving the Dark Continent, wrote "Everything here is repellent to me," upon his arrival in the Congo-the sights of colonized Africa

had sickened him to the core, and the supposedly high-minded ideals of the European imperialists, especially his own King Leopold II were reflected in Kurtz, from Conrad's most celebrated story, Heart of Darkness. (Along those same lines, the Francis Ford Coppola film loosely based upon that story, Apocalypse Now, did the same for the former French colony of Vietnam.) That was in the relatively tame days when the subjugated African nations had not been loosed upon themselves; since that time, several of those same nations have seen mass genocide and civil war follow in the wake of European withdraw.

Imperialism has been one of the most powerful forces in human history, serving to set the foundation of our modern world. While this has led to the formation of a global society where cultures, ideas, and innovations are spread across countries, imperialism has also left a history of exploitation, racism, and violence that is still affecting the world today. Imperial relationships are always imbalanced when it comes to power and influence; that is, one group (known as the metropole) maintains authority.

There are nations that have prospered after imperial control. One must remember that the United States of America, the last surviving world superpower, was once a series of British colonies, worked diligently to profit not itself but a nation across the length of an entire ocean. In one's consideration of this topic, one must also consider that Japan was once forced open to Western civilization, though not actually colonized, and is now one of the richest and most technologically advanced nations in the world. In addition, India, another former British possession, has the technology to create their own nuclear arsenal. China, once carved into spheres of influence, now poses one of the largest threats to the United States. Even Canada maintains a respectable position upon the world stage.

CONCLUSION

The current structure of the world economic order is an artificial creation by the advanced nations of the world in their bids to achieve their imperialistic desires. As a result, there exists a dichotomy in the global system evidential in the categorization of the nations of the world as north, and south, respectively. While the north constitutes the highly industrialized nations, otherwise known as the developed nations, the south comprises of the underdeveloped nations where African nations are categorized. The hit of this dichotomy which is more evident in their relations creates more deleterious effects on the southern countries hence underdevelopment becomes a common feature of these polities. On this axiom, thus, this study appraises the various means through which imperialism has been perpetuating underdevelopment in post-independence third world nations.

REFERENCES

1. Sartre, Jean-Paul (2001). Colonialism and Neocolonialism. Psychology Press. ISBN 978-0-415-19146-3.

2. Arnold, Guy (2010). The A to Z of the Non-Aligned Movement and Third World. Scarecrow Press. p. 108.

3. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism Archived October 11, 2016, at the Wayback Machine.. transcribed from Lenin's Selected Works, Progress Publishers, 1963, Moscow, Volume 1, pp. 667–766.

4. Ernest Mandel, "Semicolonial Countries and Semi-Industrialised Dependent Countries", New International (New York), No.5, pp.149-175.

5. Ruether, Rosemary Radford (2008). Christianity and Social Systems: Historical Constructions and Ethical Challenges. Rowman & Littlefield. p. 138. ISBN 978-0-7425-4643-1. Neo-colonialism means that European powers and the United States no longer rule dependent territories, directly through their occupying troops and imperial bureaucracy. Rather, they control the area's resources indirectly, through business corporations and the financial lending institutions they dominate ...

6. Siddiqi, Yumna (2008). Anxieties of Empire and the Fiction of Intrigue. Columbia University Press. pp. 123–124. ISBN 978-0-231-13808-6. provides the standard definition of "Neo-colonialism" specific to the US and European colonialism.

7. Edward M. Bennett. "Colonialism and Neo-colonialism" (pp. 285–291) in Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy. Alexander DeConde, Richard Dean Burns, Fredrik Logevall eds. Second Edition. Simon and Schuster, (2002) ISBN 0-684-80657-6. Clarifies that neo-colonialism is a practice of the colonial powers, that "the Soviets practiced imperialism, not colonialism".

8. "World Bank, IMF Threw Colombia Into Tailspin"Archived September 29, 2012, at the Wayback Machine. The Baltimore Sun, April 4, 2002.

9. "Europe Takes Africa's Fish, and Boatloads of Migrants Follow" Archived September 26, 2015, at the Wayback Machine. The New York Times, January 14, 2008

10. Sabrin, Mohammed (2013). "Exploring The Intellectual Foundations Of Egyptian National
Education" (PDF). https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/sabrin_mohammed_201305_phd.pdf.

11. Shandra, John M., Bruce London, and John B. Williamson. "Environmental Degradation, Environmental Sustainability, and Overurbanization in the Developing World: A Quantitative, Cross-National Analysis." Sociological Perspectives 46, no. 3 (1 September 2003): 309–29.

12. Amadi, Luke. (2012). "Africa, Beyond the New Dependency: A Political Economy." African Journal of Political Science and International Relations 6(8):191–203.

13. Boianovsky, Mauro and Ricaedo Solis. (2014). "The Origins and Development of the Latin American Structuralist Approach to the Balance of Payments, 1944–1964." Review of Political Economy 26(1):23–59.

14. Cesaratto, Sergio. (2015). "Balance of Payments or Monetary Sovereignty? In Search of the EMU's Original Sin." International Journal of Political Economy 44(2):142–56.

15. Chilcote, Ronald H. (2009). "Trotsky and Development Theory in Latin America." Critical Sociology 35(6):719–41.

16. Cypher, James M. (2013). "Neodevelopmentalism vs. Neoliberalism: Differential Evolutionary Institutional Structures and Policy Response in Brazil and Mexico." Journal of Economic Issues 47(2):391–400.

17. Garcia-Arias, Jorge, Eduardo Fernandez-Huerga, and Ana Salvador. (2013). "European Periphery Crises, International Financial Markets, and Democracy." The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 72(4):826–50.

18. Grinin, L., Korotayev, A. and Tausch A. (2016) *Economic Cycles, Crises, and the Global Periphery*. Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London, ISBN 978-3-319-17780-9;

19. Harvold Kvangraven, Ingrid et. al. (2017). "Dialogues on Development: On Dependency Theory." http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/38253/6/McKenzie-R-38253-VoR.pdf.

20. Jalata, Asafa. (2013). “Colonial Terrorism, Global Capitalism and African Underdevelopment: 500 Years of Crimes Against African Peoples.” The Journal of Pan-African Studies 5(9):1–43.

21. Kay, Cristóbal. (2011). “Andre Gunder Frank: ‘Unity in Diversity’ from the Development of Underdevelopment to the World System.” New Political Economy 16(4):523–38.

22. Köhler G. and Tausch A. (2002) Global Keynesianism: Unequal exchange and global exploitation. Huntington NY, Nova Science.

23. Lavoie, Marc. (2015). “The Eurozone Crisis: A Balance-of-Payments Problem or a Crisis Due to a Flawed Monetary Design?” International Journal of Political Economy 44(2):157–60.

24. Olutayo, Akinpelu O. and Ayokunle O. Omobowale. (2007). “Capitalism, Globalisation and the Underdevelopment Process in Africa: History in Perpetuity.” Africa Development 32(2).

25. Puntigliano, Andrés Rivarola and Örjan Appelqvist. (2011). “Prebisch and Myrdal: Development Economics in the Core and on the Periphery.” Journal of Global History 6(01):29–52.

26. Tarhan, Ali. (2013). “Financial Crises and Center-Periphery Capital Flows.” Journal of Economic Issues 47(2):411–18.

27. Vernengo, Matías and David Fields. (2016). “DisORIENT: Money, Technological Development and the Rise of the West.” Review of Radical Political Economics 48(4):562–68.

28. Young, R.J.C. (2001). Post-colonialism – An Historical Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publication.

29. Kanu, I. A. (2014). African Traditional Religion in a Globalizing World. International Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Education 1, 8: 4-12.

30. Orji, I. (2014), Politician, interviewed in Owerri, Imo State.

31. Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H.C. (2010), International Relations, Third Revised Edition, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S. Publishers.

32. Sayare, S. (2013), “Rebel Coalition in Central African Republic Agrees to Short Cease-Fire”, in the New York Times, 12th June