



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 4 Sayı: 16

Volume: 4 Issue: 16

Kış 2011

Winter 2011

A CRITIQUE OF THE DIALECTICS OF GLOBALIZATION

Chiedozie OKORO*

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to critique the dialectics of globalization. By the dialectics of globalization, we simply mean the philosophical temperament which propels the idea of globalization. Fundamentally, all existing world philosophies can be reduced to three basic foundations which are monism, dualism and pluralism. All of these philosophical foundations promote different philosophical temperaments which have the tendency to either fuel or ameliorate conflicts. To illustrate, as it relates to tolerance as a basis for a lasting peaceful world order, monism is tolerant of only one worldview, dualism is tolerant of only two worldviews, while pluralism is tolerant of many worldviews. By implication, monism is completely absolutist, dualism is mildly absolutist, while pluralism totally abhors absolutism. Consequently, a globalization process that follows a monistic or dualistic order, not only has the tendency to frustrate the global quests for a lasting world peace and a progressive world development, it also has the tendency of catapulting existence to that dangerous and dreaded point of nihilism. From the existentialist point of view, an essential quality of man is the ability to foresee danger and ceaselessly work towards averting such. Based on this, we advocate that a dialectical process which is pluralistic in orientation should be adopted to replace the monistic and monolithic dialectical order that has so far ravaged mankind with multiple conflicts and untold hardship.

Key Words: Dialectic, Globalization

The Idea of Globalization

In a way, globalization signals man's attainment of what Teilhard de Chardin (1881 - 1955) calls the *Omega Point*, at which stage man enters into a new and higher sphere of being known as the *theosphere*. In the view of Chardin, the *theosphere* is the point or stage when man "will become suprapersonalized" (Omogbe, 1999, 24). Before Chardin, Rene Descartes (1596 – 1650) developed a rationalist epistemological method which had the task of instituting a: *Plan for a Universal Science Capable of Raising Our (Human) Nature to Its Highest Degree of Perfection* [this, incidentally happens to be the original title of Descartes Magnus opus *Discourse on Method and Meditations* (Sorell, 1987, 46)]. The quest to develop a profound philosophical system capable of raising human consciousness to that level whereby man will begin to utilize his potentialities to the fullest continued under Kant, Husserl and the philosophers of existence. For instance, Kant in the *Critique of Pure Reason* speaks of the *tribunal*, which is that ontological pedestal at which the human mind attains total autonomy and through the formation of ideas and concepts legislates or imposes order upon the world. Edmund Husserl in his phenomenological system speaks of the "phenomenological standpoint" which is that Olympian height which signals the departure from *lebenswelt* and the elevation to the point of the *transcendental ego* where upon we garner beatific vision. But it is the existential philosophers who opened the door to a novel interpretation of man. They argued that man is not and will never be a finished project. They argued that man has unlimited and inexhaustible talent for meaning making, that human life is a continuum - an open ended mutation, that man is a being who always transcends any given circumstance, and that with such a being taking charge of the affairs of our universe, possibilities will always be higher than actualities. Consequently, it can be seen that beginning with the ancients, human evolution towards the *Omega Point* seems to have become manifest in the age of globalization.

* Department of Philosophy University of Lagos; Now on Sabbatical Visit at the Department of Classics and Philosophy, Cape Coast University

What then is globalization? What are its implications? And is the idea of globalization entirely novel? The foregoing questions under this section will be tackled at three levels thus: (a) definition of globalization, (b) analysis of the implications of globalization and (c) history of globalization.

(a) Definition

The term globalization which gained current in the 1990s is subject to multiplicity of interpretations. In the most ordinary sense it means the transformation of world economy into a global village linked together by the latest advancements in information and communication technology. Thus, it would seem that principally, globalization is a project meant to unify world economies under one umbrella known as western capitalism propped up by the latest breakthroughs in science and technology which have enhanced interconnectivity. Today, we hear of *electronic – life* or what is simply called the *e-life*, which has permeated our entire existence. Hence, as it concerns world economic control, the pursued agenda is trade liberalization, the globalization of capital market through the efforts of transnational corporations, the rapid diffusion of information through advanced technologies and also the rapid diffusion of consumption patterns. This point is reiterated by Richard Jolly who defines globalization as “the process of integrating economy, culture, technology and governance across the borders” (1999, 5; cited by Ogbinaka, 2002, 184). Ogundokun on his part, defines globalization as “the rapid integration of trade relations, productive and investment decision across the globe by economic agents who employ and move investment capital and technology around to take advantage of environments where their competitive edge can manifest in high returns” (2000, 87 – 97; cited by Ogbinaka, 2002, 184).

A basic feature of globalization therefore, is the subtle but steady erosion of the political authority and economic autonomy of less powerful nations and states of the world (what in the technical sense has been dubbed the promotion of “transboundary/transcultural values”). The promotion of these transboundary values is facilitated by the growing influence of internet and satellite communication (these involve the use of computers, electronic mails and mobile phones) through which ideals in business, sports, fashion, the automobile industry, architecture and pornography are spread round the globe. The result is the establishment of “a qualitatively and symmetrically new convolution of internationalization and interdependence of the world economy” (Alexei Vassiliev, 1999, 1). The implication of all this is that the less developed nations of the world become perpetually condemned to a life of consumerism. Put succinctly, the developing nations of the world become preys for the predator advanced capitalist nations to devour.

(b) Analysis

What exactly are the implications of globalization on the world in general and on the developing nations of the world in particular? Making a response to this question, Olasupo Akano argues thus, “with respect to the effects of globalization, there seems to be a spectrum of views suggesting that globalization is far from globalized prosperity, in sharp contrast to the suggestion of neoliberal think tank in the West” (2005, 466). For instance, in UNCTAD’s “Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistic”, Stewart and Berry (2000) contend that “the globalization process has been accompanied by a substantial deterioration in the state of income distribution between and within nations, in Africa, globalization has enriched a well-connected few while the majority, with little or no capital assets have become poorer”. This position of Stewart and Berry is bolstered by Hahnel (1999) who opines that “most of the world’s citizens were worse off in income terms in 1996 than they were at the end of the 1970s, and the growth of the world GDP per capita was lower than during the 30 years following World War II, when international market controls and government intervention were stronger” (cited by Akano),

As it pertains to the developing and underdeveloped nations of the world, particularly, the nation-states of Africa, globalization has turned out to be nothing short of a neo-colonial project meant to completely enslave Africans politically and economically. Pondering aloud on this issue, Olasupo Akano attempts an evaluation of the “empirical perspectives on globalization” and without mincing words he posits as follows:

Globalization may be characterized as the process of worldwide expansion of capitalism and the free market philosophy. The methodology of outward expansion from Europe and America encompasses diverse but interrelated elements affecting global finance, production, investment and trade as well as ownership and control of associated resources. It is no secret that the aim of the globalization process is two-fold: (1) the control

of global resources by international private capital; and (2) unrestricted access of the major industrialized countries to global markets, especially in the developing countries, under the *laissez-faire* principle (2005, 463).

Under the guise of multilateralism, the method usually employed consists in stripping governments of developing countries of the powers to make and implement independent political and economic policies that affect; “ownership and control of national resources, patterns of investment and foreign participation, international trade, prices, factor rewards patterns of employment and social welfare” (Ibid.). In essence, globalization is the same thing as internationalization of capitalism through trade liberalization controlled principally by three multilateral bodies namely; the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which metamorphosed into World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Needless to say, the metamorphosis of GATT into WTO meant greater control of the market of the developing and underdeveloped nations of the world. This point has been argued by M. W. Bray (1999) who states that “trade policy under the hegemony of the WTO would be less responsive to the interests of weaker nations within the international trading system” (cited by Akano, 2005). It would seem then that since the strategies and intentions of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) have been completely flawed, there is the need to quickly re-strategize in order to continue the dominance of developing economies through the assistance of diplomatic missions and transnational corporations (TCN).

The scenario painted above shows that though globalization has outlived the “cold war era”, it nevertheless, has generated a competing partner in *localization*. The question on ground for now concerns which of the contending forces “globalization” or “localization” will succeed the other. Hence, “the forces of globalization and localization imply that much of the political institution-building is likely to take place at either the supranational or subnational level. This in a way means that “one of the greatest challenges facing humanity today is how to ensure that globalization is managed in a manner which attaches the highest priority to the elimination of poverty and the creation of a more just world in which people are at the center of development and are empowered to participate in decisions affecting their lives” (Commonwealth Current, 1999, 5; cited by Ogbinaka, 2002). To bridge the huge gap that has been created between globalization and localization, nations of the Far East Asia such as China developed a strategic approach known as *glocalization*, which aims at localizing the tenets of globalization and globalizing the tenets of localization (i.e. the internationalization of local cultural genres). This way the conflicting worlds of globalization and localization are resolved thereby empowering the citizens of the nation in question.

(c) The History

If we grant that globalization is the attempt by a superior power to impose a monistic, monolithic and universal order upon the rest of the world, it will then become easy for us to accept that the attempt at imposing a global structure on the world is not at all a new phenomenon. It started 34 centuries ago when Akhenaton (also spelt as Akhnaton or Akhenaten) the then Pharaoh of ancient Egypt invented monotheism. Pharaoh Akhenaton (1350 BC) of the Eighteenth Dynasty, son of Amenhotep III, grandson of Thutmose III, came to the throne as Amenhotep IV (also known as Amenophis IV). It so happened that during his reign as Pharaoh, there was the need for a unified belief system which was to act as a binding force meant to hold together the Egyptian empire which had become very large. As Rodman R. Clayson reports:

With his father, Amenhotep IV felt apparently that there was a need to offset the power of Amon and a need, as well, for a universal god who would be recognized not only in Egypt but also in the foreign provinces. Then perhaps the allegiance of the subject peoples could be maintained without the frequent show of force by the army (1977, 189).

Clayson’s view is buttressed by Doris Darkwah who states that:

By about 1350 BC, international expansion had become the order of the day. Pharaoh Amenophis opposed war as a means of achieving this, and also opposed all forms of violence. He was a poet and a writer in addition to being a pacifist, idealist and humanitarian. This leader, Amenophis IV, renamed himself Akhnaton, meaning, “Devoted to the God Atom” (also known as Aten or Aton or Atum). He combined absolute authority as a monarch with compassion towards his fellowman. He imposed a religion based on

monotheism on his people, using it to strengthen his central government (cited by Osahon, 2002, 71 – 72).

Historically therefore, monotheism was founded as a means of political and economic control. The aim was to form an absolute kind of system for administering large empires which obviously was a way of foisting the culture of the then leading empire (ancient Egypt) upon the rest of the world. After Akhenaton, monotheism (i.e. the imposition of a monistic monolithic order upon the world which is religiously rendered as the worship of one God) became an instrument of globalizing the culture of the world's stronger nations, while at the same time, suppressing the culture of the perceived weaker nations.

Akhenaton's matriarchal monotheism gave birth to three other forms of patriarchal monotheism which include: Judaism (Yahwehism), Christianity and Islam. These latter forms of patriarchal monotheism bear striking similarities and dissimilarities with Akhenaton's matriarchal monotheism. On matters of similarities, like Akhenatonian monotheism, patriarchal monotheism is monistic, absolutist and impositional. Second, like Akhenatonian monotheism, patriarchal monotheism was founded to promote societal cohesion, political stability and economic prosperity. To achieve this, patriarchal monotheism like Akhenatonian monotheism (Atenism) had to be fanatical and brutal. The fanaticism and brutality here consists in the refusal to accept any other view contrary to the operating belief system. Hence, we find here a re-enactment of the fanaticism and intolerance displayed by Akhenaton in ancient Egypt. With the ushering in of monotheism by Pharaoh Akhenaten says Chinweizu;

The ancient spirit of tolerance and the syncretic rivalry which were traditional between the cult of Kemet's gods were abrogated and in keeping faith with the logic of monotheism, and with an iconoclastic passion alien to Kemetic temperament, Akhenaten strove to extirpate the Kemetic galaxy of gods, so that only his sole god, *Aten*, might shine in the sky, day and night (2005, 18).

Alan Gardiner captures the discriminatory and non-conformist nature of the Akhenatonian religion in the following words:

The true faith could not be spread without suppression of the countless gods and goddesses hitherto worshipped. Accordingly, he dispatched his women throughout the entire length of the land to cut out their names wherever they were found engraved or written ... The very word "gods" was taboo (1964, 228; cited by Chinweizu).

However, in the evolution of patriarchal monotheism from Atenism, "three important developments are discernible: a more categorical assertion of the monist attribute of the deity, masculinization of the sole deity and the rise of cultural monolatry" (Chinweizu, 2005, 141). We note here that Akhenaton's monotheistic god (Aten): "like other self-created deities of Pharaonic Egypt, was androgynous. It was addressed as 'the mother and father' of all things created" (Ibid.). Contrary to this, patriarchal monotheism declares its god to be solely male and without any female attribute which makes patriarchal monotheism to be more absolutist and totalitarian. And whereas in the Akhenatonian matriarchal monotheism, 'the female and male' are combined in order to create balance in the society and by so doing, tame excessive aggression, in patriarchal monotheism, the complete absence of the female would leave the world at the mercy of an overzealous god who has no form of restraint. Chinweizu is more explicit on this matter.

Aten was addressed as "Thou sole god, like whom there is no other". In Judaism and Christianity, the attribution of uniqueness is rendered as the henotheist injunction by Yahweh/Jehovah to his worshippers: "Thou shalt have no other god before me". With Mohammedanism, this *prima donna* demand for precedence becomes the categorical declaration: "There is no god but Allah", an absolute denial of existence to all other gods. In these claims, injunctions and declarations are rooted the intolerance displayed by these religions; they sanction their adherents' zeal in eradicating the rival cults of other gods, so as to deny them recognition, precedence or existence (Ibid.).

Cheikh Anta Diop explains that the races and cultures of humanity evolved in two different cradles. The warm Nile African Basin which represents the older or Southern Cradle where the Black race evolved

and developed a sedentary agricultural mode of culture and the fiercely cold steppes of Eurasia which represents the younger or Northern Cradle where the White and Yellow races evolved by mutations from the original Black race. The settlers of Eurasia evolved a nomadic mode of culture during some thirty thousand (30,000) years of adaptation to the cold environment of the last Ice Age. Diop is of the view that it was in these two early cradles that "nature fashioned the instincts, temperaments, habits and ethical concepts of the two sub-divisions" (1991, 111; cited by Chinweizu, 2005, 141) of humanity. Of the settlers of the Eurasia (the Northern Cradle), Diop says:

The ferocity of nature in the Eurasian steppes, the barrenness of those regions, the overall circumstances of material conditions, were to create instincts necessary for survival in such an environment. Here, Nature left no illusion of kindness: it was implacable and permitted no negligence: man must obtain his bread by the sweat of his brow ... man in those regions long remained a nomad. He was cruel. The cold climate would engender the worship of fire ... Nomadism was responsible for cremation: thus the ashes of ancestors could be transported in small urns (Diop, 112 – 113; cited by Chinweizu, 141).

Diop's summation above could perhaps explain why ancient Egyptians rejected Atenism and completely threw away its monistic, monotheistic and monolithic orientation after Akhenaton's death. On the contrary, monotheism (which lasted only 30 years in Egypt) with its propensity for zealotry, monomania and monolatry will find total expression among the Eurasians namely: Semites (Jews and Arabs) and Caucasians (Greeks and Romans). It seems therefore, that the historic heresy of Akhenaton, which violated the syncretic order of ancient Egypt and in its place, enshrined the monistic spirit of monotheism, absolutism and intolerance, aroused in the psyche of the Semites and Caucasians the xenophobic instinct to completely suppress and dominate the other. This is much evident in the monotheistic doctrines of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, and in the monistic nature of traditional Western and Arabic philosophies. Be it from the angle of religion or philosophy, the essential temperament of Semitic and Caucasian cultures is to arrogate absolute superiority to themselves. By so doing, they also arrogate to themselves the power and right to absolute knowledge which other supposedly inferior races have no choice but to take a cue from.

Jews left Egypt by 1230 BC after sojourning there for 400 years. The Greeks took Egypt in 332 BC under Alexander the Great. The Romans took Egypt from the Greeks in 49 BC, while the Arabs in 624 AD under Caliph Omar, for the first time took Egypt from the Romans. Need we mention here that the whole struggle to topple ancient Egypt was for the purpose of world control. The empires and civilizations mentioned above were simply trying to establish a new world order. Incidentally, all of them still remain relevant to the globalization context for space. Islam for instance has a population of more than 1.5 billion people worldwide. It remains a contending power in contemporary world politics. In actual fact, Arab-Islamic culture began with the birth of Mohammed, such that by the 9th C AD, the Moors had overrun Spain and made incursion into Northern France, just as the whole of North Africa had been taken by the Almoravids. Ancient Ghana fell by 1076 AD, Songhai Empire fell by 1591 AD, while Northern Nigeria fell to the Jihadists by 1804. The West on the other hand, is the power currently in control of world affairs. The Western civilization has a firm grip on the world through religion (Christianity), mysticism (the Rosicrucian Order, AMORC), intellectualism (the academic culture) economy (capitalism), commerce (mercantilism and the liberalization process), and politics (liberal democracy). Precisely, the ancient phase of globalizing Western culture started in 325 AD when Emperor Constantine of Rome conveyed the Nicene Conference where he put together 219 Bishops to draw the grand plan for the formation of the Christian religion. He also commissioned Michelangelo to paint the Cistern Temple. To allow the new religion to gain ground, the teaching of the doctrine of reincarnation was discontinued and its place was introduced the doctrine of hell. Then in the 4th and 6th Cs AD, the Edicts of Theodosius and Justinian were enacted respectively. The Edict of Theodosius ordered the closure of Egyptian Temples, while the Justinian Edict of Toleration suppressed the remnants of Egyptian religion. All of these means of controlling the world are welded together by the marvels known as science and technology, thereby living the rest of the world at the mercy of the West. Looking at the world picture in contemporary time, one can easily contend that westernization tantamount to globalization. The only powers that have shown the temerity to contest with the West are the yesteryears Asian Tigers who themselves have become like elephants and whales on matters of economy, commerce, politics, science and technology.

Monistic Metaphysics and the Globalization Process

As it applies to dialectics, monistic metaphysics presents a linear trajectory of world history. Better still, monistic metaphysics argues that the dialectics (i.e. the evolution) of world history has so far followed a one way track. This one way track (i.e. linear dialectics) of history is said to have taken place in a particular region (among a particular race) of the world and in this instance Europe. By implication, the globalization process has followed and will continue to follow a linear projection, which is another way of saying that Europe will continue to serve as the shining model for the rest of the world. At this point one may wish to dismiss the idea of globalization as a myth, in the sense that, there is no such thing as eternity in the human realm. And if the human realm is subject to change, it will simply be futile trying to placate a particular region or race of the world as an eternal model to others. But whether we like it or not, once myth is created, it becomes part of our daily reality. Myth itself is definitely not historical, but once it has been created, it gains consciousness and recognition and begins to live with us. Following this trend, the myth of globalization has been created and as it is today, the Western world is bossing the world for now.

Consequently, it would not be out of place to describe globalization as an attempt by the ruling powers to impose a “monolithic decalogue” (to borrow the words of Dennis Brutus) on the world’s less privileged peoples and nations. This absolutist temperament to be impositional and totalitarian in attitude, as already stated, is a manifestation of metaphysical monism. Metaphysical monism is that parochial and fanatical attitude of reducing the whole of reality to a narrow perspective, in exclusion of other perspectives. Jim Unah aptly captures the problem with metaphysical monism thus:

Metaphysical thinking is manifested in two main forms. Either it reduces all reality to some common substance, or that it focuses attention on an ultimate divine Being. Of a variety of things that are-P,Q,R,S,T,U, ad-infinitum- a metaphysician says he sees or experiences P or that the thought of P occupies his mind (Unah, 1995,65).

The problem with metaphysical monism is that it is domineering in attitude and by encroaching upon the domain of another; it sows the seed of discord, intolerance, fundamentalism and violence. Accordingly Jim Unah further explains that;

When a metaphysician takes a basic position and relegates whatever does not fall within his conceptual scheme to a second order reality or a total unreality, he is thinking a nihilating thought. When a metaphysician repudiates what does not “fit in” he nihilates it as not. In other words, metaphysical thought cancels out as nothing what does not fall within its perspective as Being (pp.66-67).

Now, let us suppose that there are other metaphysicians holding repudiating views, the tendency is that the world is made a battle field for the supremacy of views, which soon lapses into a ding dong affair of winner takes all and loser loses all. It is in this sense that a metaphysician sees his views as the only real reality and repudiates other views either as utter nonsense or absolute nothing. Needless to say, this monistic metaphysical temperament informs our everyday attitude in the world as found in the following expressions: “Democracy is the best form of government”, “Socialism is an ideology for revolt and poverty”, “Christ is the only true way, no one cometh to the father but by him”, “Islam is the supreme ‘will’ of Allah and Mohammed his (Allah’s) prophet of prophets” and so on. A world dominated by such inflammatory pronouncements is bound to be ridden in crises.

This is not to say that metaphysical monism does not have any advantage for mankind. On the contrary, metaphysical monism provides a strict orientation for rapid development. But it soon squanders this single advantage by creating a divide between the superior and the inferior races. It then goes one step further to impose the will of the strong over the weak; thereby justifying the saying that might is right. This sort of temperament is most true of traditional western philosophy, in particular, Greek philosophy. Making evaluation of Greek metaphysics J. I. Unah argues that though Greek metaphysics creates a comprehensive view of the world for rapid development, but in later years this same advantage resurfaced as a grave injury to mankind. Thus he says:

By insisting that his perspective encompasses the totality of being, the metaphysician creates an orthodoxy – a total system of norms and values from which every other mortal must not deviate thereby extolling an attitude of fixism, fanaticism and intolerance. On account of this, we say metaphysical thinking that is both nihilistic and vengeful threatens the human vocation “to see” and “say (p. 45)

It thus seems that metaphysical monism may be a veritable tool for rapid national development, but it is definitely not good enough for the peaceful coordination of world affairs and the mobilization of the different races of the world towards a common global understanding.

Traditional Western metaphysics started on a monistic and atomistic note. Greek cosmologists preoccupied themselves with the quest for the fundamental element of the universe. Even when Greek metaphysics evolved to the level of dualism, it became a common practice among the dualists, such as Parmenides and Plato, to assign primordality to the immaterial over and above the material. This manner of thought in which the immaterial is considered to be real and the material is considered to be mere appearance is technically known as “two realm cosmology”. The act of dichotomizing appearance from reality manifests itself in Western epistemology by way of dissecting the epistemic subject from the epistemic object. No doubt, the culture of creating the epistemic doublet (i.e. the act of distancing the epistemic subject from the epistemic object), created room for scientific objectivity, but its consequences on the human society and the entire environment is devastating. Within the confines of Western culture therefore, it is very easy for dualism to transform into monism or what we prefer to call monistic dualism. Monistic dualism is the chief blemish of classical Western metaphysics. It is the attitude of excluding the middle, which in traditional logic is known as the law of excluded middle. Of the two options available, once one of them is certified to be the case, the other is rejected as false and unacceptable. This mentality is most acceptable in science and it is indeed the procedure of science, whose essential goal is to prove whether a given situation is true or false. But when such logocentric temperament is carried into intercultural relations, it is bound to generate bitterness and rancour. Unfortunately, it so happens that this temperament of intolerance called metaphysical monism is the very foundation of globalization.

The modern phase of the Western globalization project started in the 15th C which is commonly known as the Renaissance. The modern period in Europe was the time when Europeans shifted focus away from religion to science. An essential feature of this age therefore, was the idolization of reason over faith. This idolization of reason is mostly epitomized by the Enlightenment period. The thinker whose thought happens to be an embodiment of the Enlightenment period is Immanuel Kant, the German philosopher. As put by Karl Popper, “Kant believed in the Enlightenment, he was the Enlightenment’s last great defender” (1969, 176). And as Kant sated, the Enlightenment represents “the emancipation of man from a state of self imposed tutelage ... of the incapacity to use his own intelligence without external guidance ... **Sapare aude!** Dare to use your own intelligence! This is the ballet cry of the enlightenment” (Ibid. 177). Accordingly, Kant theorized that human pure reason on its own establishes a tribunal over which it sits in judgment and autonomously legislates for man the rules, ideas and concepts which he uses in organizing reality. What this simply means is that man, by virtue of the gift of reason is the editor of reality, the determiner of value and the discoverer of truth. Then, in his theory of race, he drew a hierarchy of the races in which he deliberately and skillfully placed the White race as the first and best of the races. In other words, Kant made colour the capstone of rationality. Such that in the *Observation on the Beautiful and the Sublime*, White is used to symbolize reason and is beautiful, while Black is used to symbolize lack of reason and it is sublime. It then seems that the whole of Kant’s philosophy is meant to sensitize Europeans on the need to realize the awesome power of reason latent in them and upon this realization proceed to dominate the rest of the world.

Kant made reason the cornerstone of history. For him the proof of rationality is societal freedom. By societal freedom he means a community of humans who have attained the realization that it is through the exercise of their mental faculties that they are able to mobilize resources towards the transformation of society and environment. To this Kant’s notion of societal freedom Hegel added his perspective of historical freedom, while Marx added his perspective of economic freedom. The point to note here is that reason is the faculty of man that legislates or draws a universal plan for the attainment of freedom. Therefore, it is in the quest to accomplish the plan or ideal set by reason that man attains both historical and economic freedom, and any

other kind of freedom in the society and in the world at large. But in demonstrating how reason comes about accomplishing its universal plan for freedom, Modern philosophers in Europe, particularly, Hegel and Marx, who followed after Kant the diehard patriot, made Europe the heart bit of the world. By making world history to be Europe centered, Modern philosophers made Europe to become the model for the rest of the world.

To illustrate, Hegel in his theory of idealistic and historical dialectics of history propounds that world history has gone through four phases. These four phases in history represent four stages of freedom in historical consciousness. Thus, among the Orientals only one man (the monarch) was free. Even at that, this one man did not understand the dynamics of spirit and as such did not know what it means to be free. Among the Greeks and the Romans, *man as such*, was free, the institution of slavery notwithstanding. In the Germanic race, represented by the Lutheran version of Christian Protestantism, spirit, in its quest for freedom, attained self-fulfillment. Hegel also predicted the realization of greater freedom in the future in the United States of America. As for the continent and the peoples of Africa, Hegel says that the spirit of world civilization ignored Africa because, in its itinerary from Asia, it flew over the continent of Africa and went to domicile in Europe, Germany in particular. When queried about the fact that ancient Egypt, a black civilization, pioneered world history, Hegel replies that that part of Africa was looking Europe wards. This was how Africa earned the name “the dark continent”.

Furthermore, Karl Marx presents a sound account of the evolution of the globalization (or is it the westernization or the occidentlization of the rest of the world) of Western culture. In his doctrine of historical and dialectical materialism, Marx demonstrates that the historical and dialectical transformation of matter shows how economic modes of production have traversed from lower to higher level, from quantitative to qualitative level of existence. And whereas economic history shows the changing mode of production at every historical stage, the dialectics of history on the other hand discuss the factors that brought about economic changes. According to Marx, mode of production has so far moved in four stages and these are the commune economic stage, the feudal economic stage, the capitalist economic stage and the socialist economic stage. At every stage, ownership of the means of production changed hands. At the commune level, every member of the society was the owner of property and controller of the means of production. At the feudal stage, feudal lords emerged to acquire large portions of property and took in the less aggressive members of the society as serfs. But the industrial revolution ushered in the bourgeoisie who with huge capital changed the mode of production. The era of the bourgeoisie marked the emergence of capitalism. Capitalism brought to the fore class-consciousness such that there was a huge divide between the bourgeoisie, the proletariat and the peasants. The capitalist mode of production or capitalist economy marked the phase of excessive exploitation. Soon the bourgeoisie teamed up into cartels for international control of capital. Expressing V. I. Lenin’s view on how bourgeois capitalism became internationalized, Anthony D. Smith in *State and Nation in the Third World* explains that:

From 1884-1885, European bourgeoisie cartels, monopolies, associations and capitalism had partitioned and Balkanized the world into spheres of political and economic interests. By 1916, Europe had entered into the era of mature finance capital dominated by cartels and monopolies in search of new wealth and markets, now that domestic capitalism was in a state of crises and decay. Inevitably, the cartels sought to export their surplus capitals as a result; they took on international dimensions and divided the world into competing economic spheres, to control markets and supply of vital raw materials. This was the real meaning of modern imperialism. The growth of huge trusts and cartels inevitably entailed colonial annexation to ensure access to raw materials and extended markets (cited by Smith, 1983, 20).

Lenin further sheds light on this matter when he states as follows:

Imperialism is capitalism at the last stage of development, in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established, in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance, in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist power has been completed (1983, 84).

By 1900, about 60 per cent of the earth's land mass and 64 percent of its inhabiting population remained under colonial domination and exploitation, out of which 90 percent of Africa had been subsumed under colonial tutelage (Oyebode, 1973, 62).

The international ownership of capital by the capitalist nations meant the emergence of economic liberalism, which "sought to establish a self-regulating market using as its main methods *laissez-faire*, free trade and regulatory controls" (Fotopoulos, 1997, 15). In actual fact, economic liberalism is a manifestation of the marketization process, which according to Fotopoulos, has proceeded in three-phase: the liberal phase, the statist phase and the neo-liberal phase.

The liberal phase of marketization means the commercialization and commodification of land and labour as exemplified by the principle of mercantilism. This phase was facilitated "at the end of the 18th century, precisely in 1795, in England, by the institutionalization of physical mobility of labour, in which ensued conflict between those controlling the market economy and the rest of the society; almost immediately, a political and industrial working-class movement emerged and, as a result of its pressure, factory laws and social legislation were introduced" (Ibid.). The liberal phase of marketization did not last for more than forty years, since between the 1870s and 1880s "protectionist legislation" (p.17) was introduced to check the excesses of bourgeoisie capitalism. Protectionism is a form of market controls meant to check the obnoxious measures of the "Gold Standard" (pp.15ff) of marketization. Invariably, protectionist measures meant the emergence of *statism* or the statist phase of marketization. In this phase, capitalism evolved from the stage of bourgeoisie-controlled economy to the state control of economy. The highest level of Statism is marked by the emergence of Soviet Union and the socialist economies. It is at this level that the world was polarized into two economic and ideological blocs. Liberal economists were absolutely unhappy with this situation so they intensified efforts to see to the total control of world resources by the multinationals dictated by market forces. The demise of Soviet Union and the statist economy in the 20th century gave impetus to a re-launch of liberalism, which now re-surfaced as neo-liberalism.

Neo-liberalism marks the third phase of capitalism and it is this third phase of capitalism that has been technically classified as globalization. Needless to say, neo-liberalism in itself is marketization without conscience; it is like letting loose Satan in broad daylight. Thus, "in contrast to the Liberal Old Right that was founded on tradition, hierarchy and political philosophy, the Neo-liberal New Right's credo was based on blind belief in the market forces, individualism and economic science" (Bosanquet, 1983,126,cited by Fotopoulos, 33). To take effective control of market forces, the United States and Britain under the leadership of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher respectively, introduced measures such as "the privatization of state enterprise, reduction of the welfare state into a safety net and parallel encouragement of the private sector's expansion into social services, the redistribution of taxes in favour of high income groups and the liberalization of markets" (Fotopoulos, 36). Ultimately, the fundamental aim of neo-liberalism is 'to enhance the power of those controlling the economy, through a drastic reduction of social control over market.'(p.34). Besides, the "liberalization of capital markets has increased the opportunities for tax evasion, eroded the tax base for financing welfare state and made capital flight much easier" (p.35). It thus becomes clear that the rise of capitalist mode of economy and its third phase known as neo-liberal economy signaled the emergence of globalization proper.

Adopting the Pluralistic Approach to the Globalization Project

Let us pause a while and reconsider the human condition under the orientation of monistic metaphysics. The human condition under the orientation of monistic metaphysics is at the very point of nihilism. Not with the logocentric, sectarian and absolutist posture of monistic metaphysics which dichotomizes between the "elect" and the "reject" of the world and propagates the philosophy of winner wins all and loser loses all. A philosophical orientation that discourages the "win win" attitude, a metaphysical orientation that abhors symbiotic co-existence of "live and let live", is bound to generate anarchy. In such a universe governed by vainglory and avarice, entities (both individuals and states) will perpetually seek to out do one another. And since a monistic metaphysical orientation cannot guarantee us collective security and also grant us a truly globalized world, we like to ask whether time is not overdue for us to look for an alternative.

We find this alternative in a pluralistic metaphysics which is abstracted from African metaphysics of interfusion (i.e. symbolic metaphysics or metaphysical symbiosis) and Martin Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology. The former is a lived metaphysical system among traditional Africans, while the latter a theoretical metaphysical system developed by Martin Heidegger. Akin to the metaphysics of interfusion is the principle of interpenetrability (i.e. thermodynamism) which encourages one to feel, empathize and sympathize with the other. Akin also to Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology is the principle of intersubjectivity which admonishes us to adopt the attitude of openness so that we can empathically rationalize with others and through this process become tolerant of others' views. The connecting words here are empathy and care. These cannot come about without intersubjective and interpenetrative discourse which in postmodernists' term should happen in the open arena. With this manner of seeing things, it will be possible for mankind to re-enact and institute pluralistic metaphysics as the official way of live.

The essence of a pluralistic kind of metaphysics therefore, is to let us understand that the world is big enough for all, only if we agree to "live and also let others be". After all, the essence of human existence is to institute justice by inculcating in everyone the etiquettes of cooperation and co-existence. Put differently, the world is an umbrella for multiplicity of events. Everyman must be taught to know that nothing can survive in isolation, and that the only way by which the myriad elements of the world can be sustained is by way of continuous integration. We have to appreciate the fact that our existence makes meaning only within the group (since no tree can make a forest), in return the group also acknowledges the fact that like broom sticks, it is the togetherness of individual entities that brings about the strength of the group. Thus, the inter-relationship between entities and the world is compared to that between fish and water. The fervent prayer then is that the river should not dry so that the fish does not die. Hence, the clarion call by the Igbo (South East of Nigeria) - for the Eagle and the Hawk to perch whichever says the other should not perch let its wings be broken. What we mean to say is that from the African perspective, pluralistic metaphysics is meant to "strengthen, not weaken all forces, that an individual should be seen in the light of the whole and that meaning, significance and value depend on the art of integration" (Anyanwu, 1981, 371). Again, in the universe of integration where forces and levels interfuse, we do not speak of disunity or dissociation, but of association, co-existence and co-operation. We do not speak of isolated activities, but of symbiosis. In the universe of holism, things are not compartmentalized, departmentalized and fragmented. Accordingly, K.C. Anyanwu makes the following submissions:

- (i) Since there are no isolated life forces in the universe, there can be no isolated individual person
- (ii) Society is the manifestation of the order of the universe.
- (iii) All relationships between all the life forces ought to be strengthened and not weakened.
- (iv) There is no dissociation of sensibility in the African culture. The duality of experience should not harden into dualism. Politics therefore, should not be discussed as if it were separated from religion, or religion as if it were separated from all practical activities (Anyanwu, 1983, 53 – 54)

Consequently, in the attempt to make the world a global village, we must take cognizance of the fact that globalization should address our collective interests.

In hermeneutic phenomenology, intersubjective discourse results into openness. Needless to say, the openness theory is meant to lead us on the path of pluralism through which we hope to transcend the anomalies of monistic metaphysics. Besides, Openness captures a mood (state of mind) in which human thought commits itself to silence, withdraws into its subjective self, meditatively, reflectively, explores and discovers essences afresh. Openness creates "awareness of mind" or "the presence of mind" by which thought defines its scope or range and operates the law of simultaneity; human thought directs and records its own activities as it intuits, reasons and imagines all at the same time. Openness depicts the freedom of human thought to autonomously render objects luminous and also draw up a plan for world transformation. In all and within the context of African ontology, openness as a condition for revelation depicts our immersion into Being. An open state of affair is one of sober reflections in which one is spontaneously involved, entangled in

free discourse. Free discourse entails that the participants should move towards that state of mental tranquility or equanimity of mind that allows for the serenity of thought.

Now, *eidetic* systemization of the theory of openness along the paradigms of hermeneutic phenomenology and the notion of immersion in African ontology yields three levels of meaning of the term "openness:"

- (i) There is openness as it relates to our universe and the objects therein
- (ii) There is openness at the inter-personal or inter-subjective level
- (iii) There is openness at the inter-cultural or communal level.

Openness in the first sense admonishes man to be a friend of his universe, to shepherd his environment with love, so that in the process of technologizing, man does not "enframe" (Heidegger, 1977, 20) both nature and himself into "standing-reserve" (p.19). It is in this sense that Heidegger opines that technology as "enframing" raises the question about the ontological ability of man to humanize science, while Husserl advocates that phenomenology should guide or direct science. Openness in the second sense grounds inter-subjectivity as the foundation of human interaction in the society. Inter-subjectivity in this second sense becomes the criterion for instituting pluralism, tolerance and cohesion in the society. Openness in the third sense refers to human interaction at the global or international level. This is the stage where the postmodernists' concept of intersubjectivity as "social discourse" comes in most handy. At this level of relationship among peoples and cultures, disagreement is most rife such that disensus becomes the basis for consensus. Just as man could lose out if he is gullible in his relationship with nature, just as gullible individuals could lose out to the crafty members of the society, gullible states can be subsumed to serve the will of predator nations.

Human international relationship is turbulent because everywhere man turns, he wants to enframe the world and the entities therein. The lust for profit has overwhelmed the quest for care and empathy. Empathy and care are like Siamese twins that emanate from deep concern, from communal existence, from symbiotic relationship. Empathic existence in itself is made possible when we empathize with Being. To empathize with Being is to understand the manifold nature of Being. We then come to the realization that Being is hierarchicized in its manifestations. It is in this sense that Heidegger says that Being manifests itself in profiles. First, it unconceals, withdraws, and then displays its manifold nature, now as appearance, as semblance, and as manifest. Only one who empathizes with Being, understands its hierarchical nature and imbibes the open attitude of letting things be. It is in this sense that Innocent C. Onyewuenyi says that within the confine of African epistemology, knowledge of the world is determined by "how deeply one understands the nature of forces, true wisdom lies in the understanding of forces, their hierarchy, their cohesion and their interaction" (1978, 250). What all this boils down to is that intersubjective discourse is insufficient for accomplishing communality and cohesion at the global level. For the world to be truly reconstructed on a genuine human ontology, discourse has to become interpenetrating. For discourse to be interpenetrating, it means that humankind must strive to get acquainted with the manifold or hierarchical nature of Being.

As it pertains to the globalization project, pluralistic metaphysics presents a cyclical (as opposed a linear) account of history. It argues that historical dialectics has moved centrifugally and centripetally. That events do not have to follow a serialized or linear trajectory, rather, every entity in the world (state or race) can rise to historical limelight only if such entity in question draws a universal plan which it consistently struggles to accomplish. Incidentally, the cyclical account of history which operates on the principle of the dialectics of concentric circles is propagated by both African theory of metaphysical interfusion and Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology. The dialectics of concentric circles argues that civilizations rise and fall, so no civilization stays on top forever. It argues that it is given to every people and race to explore their ontological powers, to discover their potentialities, identify their aims and aspirations, legislate for themselves what constitutes historical reality, truth and value, as well as discover their historical essence in world affairs. This apart, because of the pluralistic nature of the dialectics of concentric circles, it encourages every nation, state and race to imbibe the attitude of "live and let live" or to be tolerant of the views of others. This does not mean that conflict will vanish automatically from human existence. It simply means that world

temperament on how to resolve crisis will change. Instead of the “win lose” philosophy that currently rules the world, a new temperament of “win win” philosophy will be adopted.

One may ask if such way of inter-human relationship is at all possible? But this was exactly the temperament that obtained in traditional Africa. Conflicts were resolved based on the “win win” philosophical temperament. This would simply explain why in traditional Africa, there were no vanquished states which were assumed to have been totally conquered and are to be thus, completely dominated. By complete domination here, we mean that the vanquished or conquered people are to give up the totality of their culture and embrace the culture of the victorious power. The defeated in traditional Africa were not completely vanquished. They simply became vassal states who paid tributes to the ruling power. This, however, does not mean that the reigning power did not discriminate against the defeated. Of course there was a demarcation between the superior and the inferior. But since the operating principle was metaphysical pluralism, it was the practice, to allow every entity (individual or group) to hold on to its view about life. The belief among traditional Africans is that every entity in the universe has a unique incarnation and purpose which must not be tempered with; else the ontological essence of the entity in question will be decapitation. Consequently, the dialectics of concentric circles argues that since every group evolved differently, it follows that the dignity of every people or race should be respected and preserved. This traditional African pluralistic temperament which encourages the attitude of tolerance, seems to be absent in the philosophical orientation of the Semites and the Caucasians. Among these latter, the official temperament is monism which is largely intolerant of other worldviews. This totalitarian temperament is best epitomized by the doctrine of Eurocentrism which has the task of subsuming the rest of the world under the European/Western way of life.

Conclusion

Thus far, we have argued that the quest to universalize or globalize is inherent in human nature. Hence, the quest for globalization should not at all surprise us. No doubt, globalization has its pros and cons. But even if we are to grant that the globalization process has a more damaging effect (i.e. assuming this is true), it will still be useless trying to argue against globalization. The best we can possibly do is to argue for a change in the approach to the issue of globalization. This should be done by replacing the piecemeal approach to the issue of globalization which promotes a false sense of holism. This false sense of holism, not only has the tendency to checkmate the globalization project (i.e. assuming it has not done so already), it also has the propensity of taking mankind to that dreaded point of nihilism.

Consequently, the highpoint of this paper is to argue that, if mankind is to be saved from the dreaded point of nihilism, there is the urgent need to bail out the globalization project from the quagmire into which it has been entrapped. This can be done by immediately replacing the metaphysical orientation of monism with a pluralistic kind of metaphysics. Pluralistic metaphysics here advocated, is abstracted from African metaphysics of interfusion and Martin Heidegger’s hermeneutic phenomenology. Basically, pluralistic metaphysics simply argues that if globalization is to be truly holistic, the grand designers and manipulators of the globalization process, should strive towards attaining the pedestal of transculturalism. By transculturalism we mean cultural interfusion or cultural symbiosis. At this level, all cultures would conjoin (without having to lose their independence), such that globalization becomes a process of collective effort into which all cultures make contributions and from which each can borrow without sinister conditions. At this level, conflict will no doubt continue, however, peoples and nations of the world would no longer be afraid of absolute domination.

REFERENCES

- AKANO, Olasupo (2005). “Globalization and the Nigeria Economy” in *Issues in Money, Finance and Economic Management in Nigeria: Essay in Honour of Professor Obasanmi Olakanpo* (ed. Fakiyesi O. O. and S. O. Akano), Lagos: University of Lagos Press.
- ANYANWU, K.C., and E. A. Ruch. (1981). *African Philosophy: An Introduction to the main Philosophical Trends in Contemporary Africa*, Rome: Catholic Book Agency.
- ANYANWU, K. C. (1983). “Presuppositions of African Socialism” in *The Nigerian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 3, nos.1&2.

- BOSANQUET, N. (1983). *After the New Right*, London: Heineman
- CLAYSON, Rodman (1977). *Egypt's Ancient Heritage*, San Josae: Supreme Grand Lodge of AMORC, INC. Chinweizu (2005), "Gender and Monotheism: The Assault by Monotheism on African Gender Diarchy", published as Appendix in *Anatomy of Female Power: A Masculinist Dissection of Matriarchy* (New Edition), Lagos: Pero Press.
- DIOP CHEIKH, Anta (1991). *Civilization or Barbarism*, New York, Lawrence Hill
- DARKWAH, D. (1977). *The Role of Africa in the Rise of Judaism*, USA: Black Books Bulletin Vol. 5.
- GUARDINER, A. (1964). *Egypt of the Pharaoh*, London: Oxford University Press.
- FOTOPPULOS, T. (1997). *Towards an Inclusive Democracy*, London: Willington House.
- HAHNEL, R (1999). *Panic Rules*, Cambridge Mass: South End Press.
- HEIDEGGER, Martins (1977). *The Question Concerning Technology and other Essays*. W. Lovitt (trans.), New York: Harper & Row.
- KANT, Immanuel (1960). *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, (trans. J. T. Goldthwait), Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- LENIN, V.I. (1983). *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow: Progress Publishers. Jolly Richard (1999), "The New Challenge for the World: Globalization with a Heart" in *Commonwealth Current*, Vol. 3.
- OGBINAKA, Moses (2002). "The Underdeveloped World, Globalization, Development Trends in Science and Technology" in *Man, History and Philosophy of Science: A Compendium of Readings* (ed. E. K. Ogundowole), Lagos: Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos.
- OGUNDOKUN, M. F. (2000). "The Implications and Challenges of Globalization for Nigerian Economy" in *Union Digest*, Vol. 6, Nos. 1 & 2.
- OMOREGBE, Joseph (1999). *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy, Vol. 3, Contemporary Philosophy*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers LTD.
- ONYEWUENYI, Innocent (1978). "Towards an African Philosophy", in *Readings in African Humanities: African Cultural Development*. Kalu, O.U. (ed.). Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press,
- OSAHON, Naiwu (2002). *The End Knowledge*, Lagos: Heritage Books.
- OYEBODE, Akin (1980). "Towards a New policy on Decolonization", in *Nigeria and the World: Readings in Nigerian Foreign Policy*, (ed. A.B. Akinyemi), Ibadan: University press.
- POPPER, Karl (1969). *Conjectures and Refutations*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- SMITH, Anthony (1983). *State and Nation in the Third World*, Great Britain: Whatsheaf Book Ltd
- SORELL, Tom (1987). *Descartes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNAH, Jim (1995). *Essays in Philosophy*, Lagos: Panaf Books Incorporation.
- VASSILIEV, Alexei (1999). "Africa: A Stepchild of Globalization", Report at the 8th Conference of Afrucanists, Moscow: Academy of Science