

# GLOBALIZATION AND VIOLENT CONFLICT: THE NORTH EAST EXPERIENCE

MOTUBOMA THOMAS<sup>1</sup>, INYIKALUM, DANIEL<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political & Administrative Studies (International Relations)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Political & Administrative Studies (Political Methodology)  
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Abstract:** In this paper we examined the relationship between globalization and violent conflict in North East region of Nigeria. The study argued that although Globalization as succeeded in making the world smaller i.e., a global village it has also generated new forms of insecurities among nations and cultural communities that have been cocooned from external influences for centuries. This work further examined the effect of globalization on the violent conflict that has been sustained in the North East over the years in the face of open market and easy border pass. The Wallenstein world system theory was used to analyze how uneven the gain of globalization is shared between the developed and under developed countries of the world. It further established that the North East being a border region has experienced a surge of violent conflicts which has been sustained due to the trade routes where weapons and arms are easily smuggled in. Subsequently, the paper suggests that the government should formulate strong national security policies that will help to curb or minimize border insecurity and assist the government in putting an end to violent conflict in the North East region.

**Key Words:** Globalization, Violent Conflict, North East.

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Evaluating the Post-cold war political changes and the transformation of the global balance of power reveals new forms of international cooperation and competition as well as new sources of international tension and violence. The grim but predictable bipolar world of super power rivalry between the United States and the former Soviet Union has been replaced by the uncertain ties of a multi-polarity map of global power. Increasing economic, religious and ethnic divisions creates tensions in every corner of the globe. We have witnessed an upsurge of brutal clashes of civilizations between and within countries, along with a quieter dynamic of fierce competition and a rash of trade wars and perpetual diplomatic combat among professed allies.

Globalization is simply defined as the process of increasing inter-connectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world increasingly have effects on peoples and societies far away (Baylis et al, 2012). It is the fast interdependent spread of open society, open economy and open technological infrastructure. A globalized world is one in which political, economic, cultural and social events becomes more and more inter-connected around the globe and also one in which their effect of happenings have more impact. As observed by Axel Hulsemeyer (2002) and Alapiki (2005) political science literature is replete with different aspects of globalization such as economic, political, cultural, social, technological etc and has been influenced above all by developments in systems of communications. Globalization is a multi-dimensional phenomenon; information technologies along with a variety of other technologies are developing rapidly and spreading widely. Now people and products cross borders in hours, ideas and capital move around the globe at the touch of a keystroke. Trade is expanding globally as in the flow of private capital and investments; Interdependence is growing in all aspects of our lives. This development creates real possibilities to achieve economic prosperity, spread political freedom and promote peace. Yet they are also producing powerful forces of social fragmentation, creating critical vulnerabilities and sowing seed of violence and conflict. Economic crises and exploitation extend across state borders and are producing global hardships. All these are aspects of globalization with important security implication.

The emergence of globalization that come with new information and communication technologies brings about new threat to national security and challenge the traditional approach to national security as being obsolete

and inadequate to combat the new threats. A growing body of scholarly writing argues that globalization has weakened the national security of states, major security threats no longer consist primarily of military (traditional) challenges but take the form of human security such as food security, terrorism, drug trafficking, disease, ecological disasters and mass poverty (Paul, 2009). Two very strong factors predominate and have global significance on national security in the 21st century. The first is the demographic movement of people and the second is the great increase the world is experiencing threats and attacks by various extremist, particularly those termed “threats from within a nation” (Simmons, 2006). Violent conflict includes acts of deliberate violence resulting in direct attack on a person’s physical or psychological integrity. This includes all forms of homicide, genocide, war, crime, massacre, murders, terrorism as well as all types of coercive or brutal action involving physical or psychological suffering such as kidnapping, torture, rape, maltreatment etc ( Saheed, 2012). The extent to which globalization in its many facets have brought about change has remain the subject of much disagreement and debate and the effects of globalization as it relates to violent conflict is vital for consideration, this work is poised to examine the relationship between globalization and violent conflict as experienced in the North East region of Nigeria.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### On Globalization

Interestingly, Globalization have become the dominant paradigm of the 20th and 21st centuries but yet remains a popular and controversial issue, though often remaining a loose and poorly-defined concept. Sometimes too comprehensively, the term is used to encompass increases in trade and liberalization policies as well as reductions in transportation costs and technology transfer, the concept connotes different things to different people (Maku, 2007). The earlier dominant perspective had tilted in favour of economic institutionalization, which relates to greater integration and interdependence of the economy. Such background informs the European Commission definition of globalization as:

The process by which markets and production in different countries are becoming increasingly interdependent due to the dynamics of trade in goods and services and flows of capital and technology. It is not a new phenomenon but the continuation of developments that have been in train for a considerable time. (EC 1997:45).

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) also defined globalization as the “increasing close international integration of markets both for goods and services and for capital”. In line with this definition Gilpin (2001) defined it as “the integration of world economy”. Also Scholte (2000) argued that globalization is the de-territorialisation or the growth of supra-territorial relations between people. In the same light Grieco and Ikenberry (2002) sees globalization as the emergence and operation of a single worldwide economy. To them globalization is measured in respect of the growing intensity, extensity and velocity of worldwide economic interactions and interconnectedness from trade through production and finance to migration.

Baylis et al (2011) defines globalization as the process of increased interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world increasingly have effects on peoples and societies far away. Here globalization refers to a process in which the very distinction between the domestic and the external breaks down. Distance and time are collapsed, so that events many thousands of miles away can come to have almost immediate local consequences while the impacts of even more localized developments may be diffused rapidly around the globe. Paul R.V and Mark K. (2009) opined that globalization is “the process of continual increase in transnational and worldwide economic, social and cultural interaction that transcends the boundaries of states aided by advances in technology”. To them globalization is exemplified in the economic realm by the formation and accelerated growth of a global capitalist economy that increasingly disregards state boundaries and make economic self-sufficiency virtually impossible, this involves Multinational Corporations (MNCs), trade integration, global financial linkage and technology. As this brief description suggests there is more to the concept of globalization than simply interconnectedness. This implies that the cumulative scale, scope, velocity and depth of contemporary interconnectedness are dissolving the significance of the borders and boundaries that separate the world into its many constituent states or national economic and political spaces (Rosenau, 1997). Some of

these definitions portend a narrow perspective of globalization based only on the economic perspective, because the concept though has economic origin and connotations spans across international economic interactions, it also comprises cultural, political and ideological relations.

The liberalist position of world politics shows that states are no longer central actors as they once were, economic process have made traditional states obsolete as economic units. States are thereby losing authority to supranational institutions of differing importance according to the issue-area concerned. The liberals tend to see globalization as the end product of a long-running transformation of world politics, a fruition of liberal economic principles, and a global marketplace which has brought about growth and prosperity. (Joshua et al 2011). Thomas Friedmann (2005) posited that empowered individuals and non-state actors, not state government are becoming the primary agents of change in a globalized world. He advances globalization “as the integration of everything with everything else, the integration of markets, finance and technology in a way that shrinks the world from a size medium to a size small”. Giddens also (1990) posits that globalization is the “intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many mile away and vice versa.” David Held agrees that the term globalization has become synonymous with the unfettered expansion of the global market place thereby assuming the status of an ideology with orients the future action and expectation of groups with the corporate world on the extreme side of the analysis, a victory of markets over states. (Ogonor, 2000).

Important literatures emerged out of this liberal view of globalization. Specifically, there were very influential works on the nature of economic interdependence (Cooper 1968), the role of transnational actors (Keohane and Nye 1977) and the resulting cobweb model of world politics (Mansbach, Ferguson and Lampert 1976) much of this literature anticipates the main theoretical themes of globalization, although again, it tends to be applied much more to the developed world than is the case with developing world. Liberals are particularly interested in the revolution in technology and communication represented by globalization. The increased interconnectedness among states which is economically and technologically led in advance in technology (satellite systems, GSM technology, internet, cable TV etc) results in a different pattern of world political relations from those which has gone before. William A. Joseph (2005) posited that globalization is a “global diffusion of investment, trade, production and extraordinary communication technologies.” To him globalization has other features that are less visible but equally important, examples are new applications of information technologies.

For the realist however, globalization no matter how its proponents define it does not alter the most significant feature of World politics which is nation-states. While the increased interconnectedness between economies and societies might make them more dependent on one another, the same cannot be said about the states-systems. Realists believe that the global system is made up of powerful states that retain their sovereignty, and globalization does not render obsolete the struggle for political power between states nor does it undermine the importance of the balance of power. To them, globalization may affect our social, economic and cultural lives but it does not transcend the international political system of states. What the realist failed to take into cognizance is the proliferation of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, inter-governmental organizations among others, and how their activities undermine the sovereignty of states within the global system. Likewise, terrorist groups and transnational crime cartels have created global crimes and terrorist activities and other transnational and trans-sovereign problems that require global solution. This shows that the “state-centric” view of the global order is shrinking. States are no longer sealed units, if ever they were and as a result the world looks more like a web of relations than like the state model of realism or the class model of Marxist theory. (Baylis et al, 2011).

Although some hyper-globalist argues that globalization is bringing about the demise of the sovereign nation-states as global forces undermine the ability of governments to control their own economies and societies (Ohmae, 1995; Scholte, 2000). Sceptics of this view reject the idea of globalization as so much “globally”. They argue that states and geo-politics remain the principal agents and forces shaping world order. (Krasner 1999; Gilpin 2001). Sceptics conclude that not only has globalization been highly exaggerated but also that it is a myth or “conceptual folly” that conceals the reality of a world which is much less interdependent than it was in the

nineteenth century and one that remains dominated by geopolitics and western capitalism. (Hirst and Thomas 1999; Gilpin 2002; Rosenberg 2000). To the realist it is not clear, that economic interdependence has made war less likely, and that the state continues to be the dominant unit in world politics. For realist such as Colin Gray and Kenneth Waltz 9/11 was not the beginning of a new era in world politics so much as a case of business as usual. To the sceptics oriented theoreticians for whom globalization is not “an epochal transformation of world affairs” but a myth which conceals the reality of an international economy “increasingly segmented into three major regional blocs in which national government remain very powerful”. (Held and McGrew, 2000).

Hirst and Thompson (1999), in their work, starting from the very same predominantly Weberian mode of analysis constructed two ideal types; an international economy and an authentically global economy and they form a very distinct line between the two. Whereas the former is characterized by the “exchange between relatively distinct national economy the later identified as a perfectly integrated world market which the “law of one price” is its dominating feature. To them “globalization in its radical sense should denote the development of a completely new economic structure, not just conjunctural changes towards an increased international trade and investment”. Like Hirst and Thompson the leading neorealist Kenneth Waltz (1999) insisted on the need for differentiation between global and interdependent economy;

Economic globalization would mean that the economy or at least the globalized portion of it would be integrated and not merely interdependent. The difference between an interdependent and integrated world is a qualitative one and not a mere matter of proportionately more trade and a greater and more rapid flow of capital. With integration, the world would look like one big state. Economic markets and economic interests cannot perform the functions of government. Integration requires or presumes a government to protect, direct and control. Interdependence, in contrast to integration, is “the mere mutualism” of states as Emile Durkheim put it. (Waltz 1999).

Waltz claims that the concept of globalization lacks some aspects, pointing to a very significant fact that the majority of world is left behind, far away of globalistic processes. Moreover, for many countries the degree of participation in the global economy varies by region. So, to him in fact the world is not global at all, but mainly limited to Northern Latitudes. Globalization skeptics conclude that the term globalization represents nothing more than a most common ideological construction, “a necessary myth” with one purpose, to hide the US government global hegemonic project encapsulated in the so-called Washington consensus – a link between the American government, World Bank and International Monetary Fund that is mainly oriented towards further expansion of the neoliberal policies throughout the world. (Tadija 2006) To them the term globalization itself is incoherently deficient, terms like internationalization, regionalization or triadization have much higher explanatory and descriptive value and provide much better conceptualization of contemporary affairs, their argument here is that if evidence confirms anything at all, it is only further internalization of economic activities. Another important conclusion that skeptics draw upon detailed empirical investigation of contemporary trends of economic activities is related to the fact that trade, investments and financial flows usually fluctuates among three main economic blocs, the European Union, the North America and the Pacific Rim. All that points to the fact that the world economy is far from being perfectly integrated; quite the contrary, it is evident that fragmentation of the world into regional blocs is taking place, featured in the tendency to strengthen economic interdependence and transactions within them but not among them. Moreover, to them there is a much stronger triadation of economic activities going on whose bottom line leads to a further marginalization of the so called third world. (Rosenau, 1997)

According to Akani (2009) in his work on globalization and education in Nigeria pointed out that though globalization has brought about huge profits to the developed nations it has not benefited the developing countries in the same vein. Invariably, globalization has become synonymous with western exploitation and ‘the highest stage in the development of imperialism’ (Akani, 2004). In other words, it has become a new trend for capitalist expansionism. After all, the modern world system is a capitalist world-economy because the accumulation of private capital, through exploitation in production and sale of profit in a market, is the endless accumulation of capital through the eventual commodification of everything (Wallerstein, 1998). Claude Ake defined globalization as the “march of capital all over the world in search of profit, a process reflected in the reach and power of the

multinational corporation.” He explains that globalization is about growing structural differentiation and functional integration in the entire world economy as well as about interdependence. It is a form of domination underpinned basically by economic power and it is driven by economic forces, consequently it represents victory of materialism and its ultimate triumph in mastering the world (Ogonor, 2000).

For Marxist, globalization is a bit of a sham, it is nothing particularly new, and is really the only latest stage in the development of capitalism. To them “globalization” is a western led capitalist phenomenon that basically simply furthers the development of global capitalism. Rather than make the world alike, it furthers deepens the existing divide between the core- the semi periphery and the periphery. (Rosenberg 2000; Teschke 2003; Marx and Engels 1967). According to Marxist theorists, “the globe has long been dominated by a single integrated economic and political entity – a global capitalist system that has gradually incorporated all of humanity within its grasp. Within this system, all elements have always been integrated to such an extent that their very nature has been dependent on their position, within a capitalist world economy.” (Baylis et al 2011). While the intensity of cross border flows may be increasing, this does not necessarily signify the fundamental change in the nature of world politics proclaimed by so many of those who argue that we have entered an era of globalization. Marxist theorists insist that the only way to discover how significant contemporary developments really are is to view them in the context of the deeper structural processes at work. Many Marxist for example, regard the de-legitimation of the sovereign state as very important contemporary development. The essential first step in generating any understanding of those trends regarded as evidence of globalization must be to map the contours of global capitalism. To them, if we fail to do so, we shall inevitably fail to gauge the real significance of the changes that are occurring. As we have seen, the understanding proffered by the Marxist theorists suggests that there is nothing natural or inevitable about a world order based on a global market. “ Rather than accept the inevitability of the present order, the task facing us is to lay the foundations for a new way of organizing society – a global society that is more just and more humane than our own.” (Baylis et al 2011).

Critics of globalization have continued to contend that the globalization thesis is merely a buzz-word to denote the latest phase of capitalism. This seems to agree with the Marxist theorist that globalization is the universalization of Western values-capitalism. In a very powerful critique of globalization theory, Hirst and Thompson (1996) argued that one effect of the globalization thesis is that it makes it appear as if national governments are powerless in the face of global trends. Believing that most globalization theory lacks historical depth, they point out that it paints the current situation as more entrenched than it might in fact be. They, concludes that the more extreme versions of globalization are a myth and they support this claim with five main conclusions from their study of the contemporary world economy. Related to this views of Hirst and Thompson is the obvious objections by critics that globalization is very uneven in its effects. In the rest of the world, there is nothing like the degree of globalization. We are in danger of over estimating the extent and the depth of globalization (Hirst and Thompsin 1999; Gilpin 2002; Rosenberg 2000).

Post- colonial scholarship on globalization is much similar to Marxist thought in that it highlights the important degree of continuity and persistence of colonial forms of power in the globalized world. For example, the level of economic and military control of western interests in the global south is in many ways actually greater now than it was under direct control – a form of neo-colonialism. So, although the era of formal colonial imposition by force of arms is largely over, an important starting point for post-colonial scholarship is the issue of vast inequality on a global scale the forms of globalizing power that make this inequality possible, and the continued domination of sub-Saharan peoples, those classes dominated under hegemony such as poor rural women in the global south (Frank 1979, Cardoso and Faletto, 1979, Alipiki 2004, Akani (ed) 2004).

If pattern of contemporary globalization are uneven, they are also highly asymmetrical. It is a common misconception that globalization implies universality; that the “global” in globalization implies that all regions or countries must be similarly enmeshed in world-wide processes. This is plainly not the case, for it very markedly involves differential patterns of enmeshment, giving it what Castells calls its “variable geometry,” (Castells 2000). According to Castells, the rich OECD countries are much more globalized than many of the poorest sub-Saharan African states. Globalization is not uniformly experienced across all regions, countries, or even communities since it is inevitably a highly differentiated process. Among the OECD countries and sub-Saharan

African states, elites are in the vanguard of globalization while the poorest in these countries find themselves largely excluded from its benefits. Inequality is deeply inscribed in the very processes of contemporary globalization such that it is more accurately described as asymmetrical globalization. Critics of globalization state that it is a form of controlling and influencing an economy of a country by overseas corporations which therefore implies a surrender of power from the local government. It is viewed as a means of keeping developing nations exactly that. Low paid workers, genetically modified seed pressed on developing world farmers, the selling off of state owned industry in order to qualify for IMF and World Bank loans and the increasing dominance of Western corporate culture across the globe has come to symbolize globalization for its critics (The Guardian, 2002).

This has given rise to a movement known as the anti-globalization movement. Though unorganized, the movement believes in the creation of another world and condemns the evils associated with contemporary globalization. In their book- *Globalization from below: the power of solidarity*, Jeremy Brecher, Tim Costello and Brendan Smith contend the economic and cultural interconnectedness signified by globalization is irreversible and possibly a good thing; this interconnection, they assert could potentially serve the interests of people and the earth, not just the elites. Although the rich and powerful have shaped globalization in their interest thus far, they call this “globalization from above,” there is a counter- movement that seeks to reshape our interconnected world in interests of people and the planet which they call “globalization from below”. They believed that the globalization from below is disparate but growing and in their book which is meant to promise a framework for uniting it into a common grassroots struggle. They want to build a world structured by human values other than greed and domination, one less dominated by the culture and greed of global capital. (Starzed 2001, Brecher et al 2000; Jazz 2001; Davis and Rowley 2002; Jones 2001; Porter 2001; Klein 2002; Epstein 2002; Aronwitz 2002).

Considering the asymmetrical nature of contemporary globalization and the flood of opinions of various authors, scholars, theorists we can thus, analyze that one should not be surprised to learn that globalization does not prefigure the emergence of a harmonious global community or an ethic of global cooperation.

### **3. ON VIOLENT CONFLICT:**

The term conflict is derived from the latin word “conflictus” meaning strike together. Conflict means clash, contentions, confrontations, a battle or struggle, controversy or quarrel (Nwalise, 1997). Conflict may be either violent or non-violent. It becomes violent when an illegal method of physical coercion for personal or groups end are employed and there is destruction of lives and properties but when it is not occasioned with threat or actual destruction of lives and properties it is non-violent. Conflict has been conceived in different ways by different scholars in their bid to describe the nature and meaning of conflict.

Conflict can also be defined in terms of good or bad depending on the outcome, when the outcome of a conflict scenario is positive, it is defined as a functional or constructive conflict those that end up in negative or bad outcomes is regarded as dysfunctional conflicts. To Coser (1956, cited in Joshua 2013) conflict is a struggle over values and claims over status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals. Igwe (2002) sees conflict as a universal and permanent attribute of nature, life and society necessary and unavoidable, but when irresolvable their consequences are negative for society and man. For Olufemi et al (2012) in their work asserted that conflict on its own is disagreement between individuals or groups of people over ideas or interests and it is a normal part of life. It is neither good nor bad; it is how it is managed that is important. Wilmot and Hocket (1998) assert that conflict is an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceived incompatible goals, scarce resources and interference from others in achieving their goals. According to them conflict can be destructive or constructive, whatever form conflict takes, it is likely to have several impacts, which may include physical harm to humans and natural resource base, impact on productivity levels and economic development more generally.

Francis (2006) conceives conflicts as an intrinsic and inevitable part of human existence. Hence, he defined Conflict as the pursuit of incompatible interests and goals by different groups. Hellriegel and Slocum (1996) posited that conflict is an opposition arising from disagreement about goals, thoughts or emotions with or among individuals, teams, department or organization. Wilmot and Hocker (2011) also described conflict as a felt

struggle between two or more independent individuals over perceived incompatible differences in beliefs, values, goals or difference in desires for esteem, control and connectedness. From the definitions above according to Aloysius-Michaels (2009) practically demonstrate clearly that conflicts are largely the expressing of opposing interests. Conflict can be defined as manifestation of hostile attitude in the face of conflicting interests between individual, groups or states. These conflicting interests can be over resources, identity, power, status or values. It has been generally seen as a situation in which two or more parties strive to acquire the same scarce resources at the same time (Wallenstein, 2002; Onu, 2009).

Conflict would generally incorporate perceived differences in issue positions between two or more parties at the same moment. Conflict stems from the basic fact of human interdependence for individuals to meet even their basic needs, they depend on the active participation of other individuals (Foltz 1991). Conflict arises from the interaction of individuals who have partly incompatible ends, in which the ability of one actor to gain his ends depends on an important degree on the choices or decision another actor will take. Conflict can also be described as a situation of incompatibility, struggle or unhealthy competition or rivalry between individuals or groups in a condition where there is a strong desire on the part of one party to carry out the means or achieve the ends, or the distribution and allocation of collectively owned resources which are, or appear to be incompatible with others. Conflict is thus a manifestation of a struggle to resist or overcome opposing forces or powers in a condition of opposition, antagonism or discord (Phil-Eze, 2009 as cited in Olufemi, 2012).

In the dialectics of human existence, it has been recognized that no human society is an island, no matter how developed or civilized that society might be. Human society has been seen as a collectivity of political, social, economic, cultural activities of individuals which gives them access to the basic necessities of life. So, by nature man is a dependent creature that depends on his environment and others around him. So, for self-preservation humans consciously or unconsciously relates with each other for their interest. This presumes that interdependence is a central feature of all human societies constant and basic. Thereby, for natural anarchy theorist like Thomas Hobbes (1958) he argues that the natural state of man is that of war in which everyman is pitched against everyman, thus making life solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short, thereby seeing humans as selfish and prone to violence by nature.

For the Marxian viewpoint Karl Marx espoused is theory in his *Das Capital* that conflict is the dominant character of human relations, he sees conflict as a result of oppression by feudal lords and capitalist, therefore in his materialistic conception of history he posits that human society is the history of class struggle. So, to him what prevails in society is not order, solidarity or consensus but struggle between groups for control of the means of subsistence and livelihood (as cited in Ayokhai, 2013; Olufemi, 2012). Though the two theorists both Hobbes and Marx sees conflict as an integral part to human and group relations in society, the Marxist sees it as the engine that drives revolutionary transformation and development . So, in a sense it has been equated with competition or treated as a derivative of competition. But according to Ayokhai (2010) he notes that the prefix of violence to conflict complicates it and takes it well out of the realm of competition since it entails the taking up of arms by a group against another within a state or against the state itself.

Since human relations are interdependent, the extent and degree of this interdependence in social group relations must necessarily entail or breed conflict and a constant fact about conflict is that it is an ever present phenomenon in any given social relations because it is predicated on the assumption that individual interest in a society differs and as such human society and the relations in it as logically antagonistic and conflicting. It's been noted that due to the striving of man conflict occurs because in the course of promoting some of his ideas, objectives and goals either intentionally or unintentionally upsets and directs to negative uses, instead of strengthening along beneficial lines some of the arrangement that ought to benefit man (Ayokhai, 2010; Olufemi et al 2013).

For Darling and Fogliasso (1999) they clearly describes conflict as a state of incompatible behaviour, an opposition, an interaction of interdependent parties, a bad omen and positive or constructive outcomes. As a state of incompatibility conflict is described as a situation in which the concerns of two or more individuals operating within the unit appear to be in-compatible and this breed's conflict. For Gray and Starke (1984) conflict is

considered as the behaviour by a person or group intended to inhibit the attainment of goals by another person or group. To them therefore conflict will emerge when behaviour is laced with emotions which are expressed in an antagonistic form. To Hoelscher and Robert (2002) conflict is viewed as the underlying power that stimulates innovation. For Denohue and Kolt (1992) they suggested some fundamental elements that need to be achieved before conflicts can take place, situations such as:

- a) When people are interdependent
- b) Expressed in manifest or latent form
- c) When there conflicting needs and interest
- d) And also it's caused by interference.

Sometimes also parties concerned may blow the problem out of proportion for people to know about its existence or they may make people not to be aware of the conflict. According to studies carried out, it revealed that proximate groups are often prone to conflict. Hewstone et al (2008) posited that groups in proximity are groups are likely to be competitors for scarce resources such as land or may be victimized because they possess wealth that can be conveniently confiscated (Glick, 2008). So, it's in line with Osita (2007) when he asserted that any engagement with conflict phenomenon in the present day Nigeria must be a matter of necessity grapple with the multiple impacts of the complex nexus among which are history, economic, political, cultural, religion and psycho-social dimensions of conflict.

As noted earlier conflicts can be either violent or non-violent, but notably what constitutes violence and non-violence varies depending on the context or perception of the legitimate use of force or challenge of authority. The concept of violence serves as a destruction or muscle flexing which a given observer happens to fear or condemn (Joshua et al, 2010). Force and violence are two different concepts that connote different meaning and different reasons are attributed to it. Anifowose (2011) says to properly conceptualize violence, it is necessary to distinguish it from force. So, deducing from his explanations force means legal and legitimate use of violence by a government so as to protect the state, while violence carries an overtone of violating that is illegitimate use of force by non-governmental individuals and groups (Segun, 2013; Tilly, 1974; Anifowose, 2011). Max Weber in conceptualizing the state contended that violence is legitimate in the rule over men, but to Wolff (2006) violence is the illegitimate or unauthorized use of force to effect decisions against the will or desire of others.

For Chaturvedi (1999) violence is destructive action undertaken against property or persons it can be deliberate or spontaneous, undertaken by government or private individuals. It therefore embraces a wide range of actions including intimidation, terrorism, repression, riots, revolutions and all forms of warfare. It does not just refer to conflict but the use of arms and other means to cause havoc, mayhem, harm and injury. There are different categories of violence it can be small or large –scale depending on the intensity. According to Coady (1999) large scale violence is difficult to control and its consequences are hard to predict. It can also be categorized as physical or psychological. Physical violence is an act that palpably involves physical means such as bombardment, whipping, stabbing to death, overpowering, poisoning, forceful intrusion, malevolent intrusion among others and its destructive effects are swift and direct while psychological violence is an act of violence in the absence of a violent act. The destructive effects are gradual and cumulative; it involves brain washing, indoctrination and threats (Turpin and Kurtz, 1999).

Violent conflict are conflicts in which one of both parties involved in a dispute, disagreement and struggle over resource, services exchange of goods or on which position or decision should be taken takes up arms or other material or non-material elements to do harm and destruction through words of mouth or other spiritual means. In essence violence includes acts of deliberate violence resulting in direct attack on a person's physical or psychological integrity. This includes all forms of homicide, genocide, war, crime, massacre, murders, terrorism as well as all types of coercive or brutal action involving physical or psychological suffering such as kidnapping, torture, rape, maltreatment etc ( Saheed, 2012).



Violent conflict has high direct and indirect cost and as seen it is the pathway to poverty and a major challenge to the development of most countries embroiled in conflicts in Africa. In Nigeria for instance, the various violent conflict it has experienced have taken a heavy toll on its development. The insecurity of lives and properties which tends to prevent foreign economic relations to jump-start the economy is one major implication of persistent conflicts in the country. Saheed (2012) noted that victims of ethno religious conflicts while taking refuge in refugee camps are cut off from optimal engagement in economic activities; thereby they cannot make meaningful contributions to the development of the country (Adeyemo, 2006; Saheed, 2012). One area in Nigeria that violent conflict often emanates from is the religious sphere. There are people who are fanatical about their religion and most times it caused by aggressive evangelism, jealousy, incitement, misuse of the media, selfish religious elites, poverty etc like what is happening in the North Eastern part of Nigeria.

#### **4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:**

Marx's legacy in social theory does not lie in his predictions of future utopias but rather in his analysis of the workings and contradictions of capitalism, and this is very much alive in world systems analysis; a perspective developed by Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970's. The capitalist world economy, as envisioned by Wallerstein, is a dynamic system which changes over time and the modern nation state exist within a broad economic, political and legal framework which he calls a "World System". However, though the change certain basic features remains in place, Perhaps most important is that when one examines the dynamics of this system, the core regions of north-western Europe clearly benefited the most from this arrangement. Wallerstein explains the defining characteristics of world-systems analysis: its emphasis on world-systems rather than nation-states, on the need to consider historical processes as they unfold over long periods of time, and on combining within a single analytical framework body of knowledge usually viewed as distinct from one another—such as history, political science, economics, and sociology. He describes the world-system as a social reality comprised of interconnected nations, firms, households, classes, and identity groups of all kinds. He identifies and highlights the significance of the key moments in the evolution of the modern world-system: the development of a capitalist world-economy in the sixteenth-century, the beginning of two centuries of liberal centrism in the French Revolution of 1789, and the undermining of that centrism in the global revolts of 1968. He argues that capitalism has had a division of labour that encompassed several nation states. Beginning in Europe it has expanded its process to absorb small mini-systems, world empires as well as competing world economies. It has created long distance trade in goods linking production process worldwide, all of which allowed the significant accumulation of capital in Europe.

Through extremely high profits gained from international trade and from an exchange of manufactured goods for raw materials from the periphery (and, to a lesser extent, from the semi-peripheries), the core enriched itself at the expense of the peripheral economies. This, of course, did not mean either that everybody in the periphery became poorer or that all citizens of the core regions became wealthier as a result. In the periphery, landlords for example often gained great wealth at the expense of their underpaid coerced laborers, since landowners were able to expropriate most of the surplus of their workers for themselves. In turn in the core regions, many of the rural inhabitants, increasingly landless and forced to work as wage laborers, at least initially saw a relative decline in their standard of living and in the security of their income. Overall, certainly, Wallerstein sees the development of the capitalist world economy as detrimental to a large proportion of the world's population. Through this theory, Wallerstein attempts to explain why modernization had such wide-ranging and different effects on the world. He shows how political and economic conditions after the breakdown of feudalism transformed north-western Europe into the predominant commercial and political power. The geographic expansion of the capitalist world economy altered political systems and labor conditions wherever it was able to penetrate. Although the functioning of the world economy appears to create increasingly larger disparities between the various types of economies, the relationship between the core and its periphery and semi-periphery remains relative, not constant. Technological advantages, for example, could result in an expansion of the world economy overall, and precipitate changes in some peripheral or semi-peripheral areas. However, Wallerstein asserts that an analysis of the history of the capitalist world system shows that it has brought about a skewed development in which economic and social disparities between sections of the world economy have increased rather than provided prosperity for all.

For him the capitalist world system theory is a mechanism for surplus appropriation that is both subtle and efficient. It relies upon the creation of surplus through constantly expanding productivity. It now extracts the surplus for the benefit of the elite through the creation of profits. But these economic relationships were not created in a vacuum, early European capitalists established a world-economy based on extremely unequal division of labour between European states and the rest of the system and also a strong political and military power to enforce this inequality. As with capitalism within nation states this unequal power between nation states is not uncontested. It is the subject of struggle there are internal contradictions that with the passage of time can cause political instability and unrest. Eventually according to Wallerstein a worldwide economic crisis will be reached and the capitalist world system will collapse opening the way for revolutionary change.

It is based on this background that this approach could best be used to examine why there is an unequal sharing of the loss and gains of contemporary globalization between the developed global North and the underdeveloped global South. The approach will also critically explain why there is the erosion of legitimacy and the upsurge of trans-sovereign problems such as food security, terrorism, drug trafficking, oil theft etc in Nigeria. From this perspective this approach would best explain the co-relationships between globalization and violent conflict.

## **5. GLOBALIZATION AND VIOLENT CONFLICT IN NORTH EAST NIGERIA:**

Nigeria in the past few years has experienced increased violent conflict in the North East region. The North East region has international boundaries with 3 countries: Chad, Niger, Cameroon called the Lake Chad basin, however the borders are very porous with few customs and immigration checkpoints, the area where the four countries' borders meet is generally poor and has long been ignored by governments. The people of north eastern region and these other nations across borders share custom, religion, identical levels of low education both for the male and female gender, high level of poverty whereby more than 70 percent of the population lives on less than a dollar per day, desertification and common occupation; they often belong to the same tribe and speak the same local languages (Faul, 2014).

Globalization has aided trade transactions both locally and internationally and as most economists would agree that globalization has brought with it several positive fallouts in terms of improved international trade and investments; providing an impetus to growth and enhanced global welfare. Indeed, the emergence of new economic powers such as China, India and Brazil would not have been possible without the relaxation of domestic as well as global barriers to the movement of people, goods, services and capital. Thanks to liberalization and digital technologies, our world has become the proverbial 'global village'. The internationalization of world markets, the expansion in global trade and the movement of capital through instantaneous communication and the impact of electronic media such as CNN and Al-Jazeera have brought the world closer as never before. Today, information travels at the speed of light. Governments can no longer hide information from their own citizens as they have done in the past.

On the negative side, however, globalization has engendered new forms of vulnerabilities for nations and communities. Financial contagion and the spread of epidemic viral diseases pose greater risks than ever before in our borderless world. Communities that have hitherto lived in cultural cocoons have suddenly found themselves exposed to new habits and mindsets. Terrorist networks such as al Qaeda have become transnational organizations that thrive on the opportunities opened by new technologies and communications channels. Not only are they able to coordinate their activities through such channels, they are also able to raise funds, network and coordinate their activities across national borders and frontiers with greater ease than would have been considered feasible just two decades ago and in Nigeria the Boko Haram terrorist group have actually strived due to the benefits of globalization.

While globalization has made the world smaller, it has generated new forms of insecurity among nations and cultural communities that had been cocooned from external influences for centuries. Globalization has compounded the crisis of governance in some developing countries, deepening the tendencies towards state failure while undermining the capacity to govern at national and international levels. All these factors have weakened the capacity of state authorities, leading to the emergence of transnational terrorist groups that are

competing for power and influence with established state authorities. With globalization, the boundaries between the domestic and the international are becoming increasingly blurred. It has also engendered new inequities between the rich and the poor. In the advanced industrial nations as well as in low-income developing, all the relevant indicators show that income inequalities are reaching alarming proportions. Deepening inequalities are, on their part, fostering new forms of anxiety and frustration among dispossessed groups, especially in the developing world. We see this phenomenon in countries such as oil-rich Nigeria, where the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen. In the context of an increasingly desperate young, educated and unemployed urban youth, we have a ready army of people who can easily be mobilized for ethnic or religiously inspired violence, as we have seen in the recent history of the North East. These developments, combined with expanding global economic interactions, and due to the phenomenon of “uneven development” contribute to some of the problems and resentments that lie at the root of these security threats which we are facing today.

Globalization has made trade among nations easy and very possible especially in the North East which is a border region. This further ensures that trade and smuggling of weapons and arms between the insurgents and the outside world is made easy thereby giving access to weapons which ordinarily they would not have had access to and this has reached an unprecedented level aiding the level of insurgency in the North East. Research further reveals that due to the violent conflict in the North East there are a lot of negative outcomes which comes along with it. First, it takes a heavy toll on the region economy and overall on the economy of Nigeria as a whole since the region is a major contributor to the national economy. According to one expert he acknowledge the fact that the GDP of the Nigerian agriculture was badly affected in 2010 he said, “In 2010 the GDP in agriculture hit a record low of 2594759.86 million in the first quarter this can be attributed to the violent conflict in the North Eastern zone of the country”. Massive population displacements and insecurity in the Lake Chad basin are putting livelihoods and food security at high risk. In North East Nigeria alone, the impact of the conflict on agriculture is estimated at USD 3.7 billion due to livestock losses and reduced agricultural production, destruction of irrigation and farming facilities, and collapse of extension services including veterinary health facilities. The trade flows between Nigeria and her neighbors also have been affected; exports to Chad, Niger, Cameroon, Sudan and Central African Republic have declined steeply, with importers staying away because of the insecurity in the country. The Boko-Haram related conflict has made agricultural trade between markets in North East Nigeria more difficult to access. There are direct costs resulting from damage to physical infrastructures and economic assets, there is large infrastructural decay and depreciation; it brings about damaged roads, bridges thereby restricting mobility, increasing scarcity of consumption goods and productive inputs and raising their prices, making markets less accessible and harder for people to access schools, and also health care facilities. Then we have the indirect costs associated with counter security threats and intense military presence on the highways and other area of the town. It is evident that violent conflict scares foreign investors and increases the costs of doing business within and between countries thereby, there will be loss of domestic and inward investments associated with violent conflict. The prevalence of violent conflict have also reduced investors’ confidence in the region, according to the Central Bank of Nigeria from 2009-2013 the mean amount of loans accessed from Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme (CACS) a fund established by the central bank of Nigeria and the federal ministry of agriculture and water resources to provide loans for agricultural projects was drastically lower in the North East 2.4 billion naira, compared to the North Central area of 4.5 billion naira. The mean number of projects executed by the CACS was also lower for the North East with 2.2 projects completed compared to 5.9 projects in the North Central region (CBN, 2012; 2013).

## 6. CONCLUSION:

Conclusively, it has been seen that globalization though has a lot of positive attributes is not devoid of negative features too especially to third world countries. This is basically because criminally minded people have also explored the usefulness of globalization to their own negative gains and this has caused a serious problem for which violent conflict is among them. For the North East region though the gains of globalization has been harnessed in the area of international trade it has also led to the unprecedented increase in violent conflict since the insurgents also use that as a means to purchased arms and other weapons giving rise to the insecurity experienced in the region. Globalization, if not properly utilized can bring about negative outcomes. Thus, it beholds on our government to brace up to adequately deal with the issue of border protection and also ensure that

policies that promote national security are promulgated. This will help ensure that Nigerians enjoy the positive gains of globalization.

## REFERENCES:

1. Adam, P (ed) (2001) *It was like this before, "in on fire". The battle of Genoa and anti-capitalist movement*. London: one-off press.
2. Adebayo, A.A (2010) *Food Security in Nigeria: Pre and Post Economic Deregulation Review*. Lagos: IJEDRI Press.
3. Aina, A.T (1986): *What is Political Economy? In Nigerian Economic Society*. London:
4. Alapiki, H (2005): *the Political Economy of Globalization*. Nigeria: Shapee Publishers
5. Amara, T.C et al (2010): *Manual of Research Methodology and Theses Writing*. Aba: Ker Expert Books.
6. Ayokhai, F .E (2013): *Natural resource, identity politics and violent conflict in post-independence Nigeria*; African Journal of History and Culture.
7. Baylis, J et al (2011): *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
8. Brinkman, H et al (2011): *Food insecurity and violent conflict; causes, consequences, and addressing the challenging*; occasional paper number 24; World Food Programme.
9. Bruce, R et al (2006): *World Politics the Menu for Choice*. USA: Thomson Higher Education.
10. Charles, H (2006): *Comparatives Politics: Domestic Responses to Global Challenges (5<sup>th</sup>ed)*. USA: Thompson Wadsworth Publishers.
11. Collis, J. et al (2003): *Business Research: a practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students, second edition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
12. Cramer, C (2009): *Violent conflict and the very poorest*; London; Chronic poverty research centre.
13. Crenshaw, M (1989) *Terrorism and International Cooperation*. New York: Institute for East West Security studies.
14. Cusimano, M. L (2002) *Globalization Ethics and the War on Terrorism. Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy. Vol 65*.
15. Diego, J (ed) (2001) *Shooting Blanks, "in on fire". The battle of Genoa and anti-capitalist movement*. London: One-off press.
16. Emeka, T. (2011) *Globalization and Terrorism in Nigeria*. Foreign Policy Journal.
17. Goldstein, J.S et al (2011) *International Relations 2010- 2011 update*. USA: Pearson Publishers.
18. Gunaratna, R (2002) *Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror*. New York: Columbia University Press.
19. Hirst, R et al (3<sup>rd</sup>ed) (2009) *Globalization in Question*. New York: Columbia University Press.
20. Homer-Dixon, T. (2006) *The Rise of Complex Terrorism in Thomas J. Badley (ed) Violence and Terrorism*. Dubuque Iowa, McCraw Hill Publishers.
21. Huntington, S (1993) *The Clash of Civilization; Foreign Affairs Journal, Vol 72*.