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ABSTRACT

Globalization has really impacted the social formation of the Third world countries. While some of these impacts are positive and others negative, one cannot deny the fact that no matter the perspective of one’s analysis, the grip of globalization is simply overwhelming just as it is so demanding and challenging. Incidentally, the Third World social formation is part of this new global arrangement. This paper therefore examines the ways in which globalization has impacted on the social formation of Third World states through its various agents. It argues that despite the changes ushered in by the forces of globalization Third World countries are still facing developmental challenges and that unless urgent and sincere measures are taken, Third World countries would be totally overrun by the reality of this raging trend thereby making their development an impossibility. Thus, bearing in mind the possibilities and obstacles thrown up by these changes, the paper also proffers solution.

Introduction

Globalization is simply an overwhelming and phenomenal growth of trend that has evolved during the past decades. Its meaning is as diverse as the various ideological perspectives held by the various authors. It describes the increasing flow of goods, services, capital, technology, information, ideas and labour at the global level driven by universal policies and technological changes. At the top political and economic levels, globalization is the process of denationalization of markets, politics and legal systems and at the economic level is seen as the process of cooperation between and among their many factories and products around the world at ever more rapid rate of speed in search of cheaper labour, raw materials and government willing to ignore or abandon consumer, labour and environmental protection laws. It is a process or set of processes which
embody transformations in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions generating transnational and inter regional flows and network of activities. It

‘… is a complex reality at political, cultural and social levels geared towards transcending the nation-state as a privilege forum for organizing political and social life. It corresponds to an unprecedented contraction of space and time through the development of means of communication and information across the planet’ (Hakim, 2000).

There is no gain-saying the fact, that the Third World states have been involved in the stated attempt to transform their socio-economic and political environments by embracing the globalization trend but rather than developing, the reverse is the case. This can be attributable to the brutal exploitation of the Third World economies by the colonizers. in the early decades of the post independence period which made the majority of Third World states to fail in taking the advantages of the opportunities provided by the dynamic growth impetus associated with globalization in the 70s and 80s such that, instead of becoming more integrated into the world economy, they were marginalized with resultant effects of poverty, unemployment, educational backwardness, low and high birth and death rate, etc. This is because the incorporation of the Third World economies into the global capitalist system produced profound underdevelopment changes on the various states or societies and now globalization has also begun to impact these states significantly. This paper attempts to examine these impacts in line with the reality of the phenomenon on the social formation of Third World states with a view to finding the way forward for Third World economies in the face of the razing effect of the concept.

**Conceptual Clarifications**

**Globalization**

The definition of globalization is, no doubt, problematic. This difficulty, no doubt, is not unconnected to the ideological orientations and perspectives of scholars on this unprecedented sweeping reality that cuts across the globe. According to Goldstein and Pevehouse (2009), Globalization encompasses many trends including international trade, telecommunications, monetary coordination, multinational corporations, technical and scientific corporations, cultural exchange of new types and scales, migration and refugee flow and relations between the world’s rich and poor countries. Akani (2004) posits that
globalization emphasizes forces; it is the liberalization of closed or restricted system, deregulation of controls and privatization of public industries and utilities, as well as the creation of a favourable investment climate and an investor friendly environment for all states. While Owugah (2004) argues that globalization is a process which breaks down barriers between nations and encourages closer economic, political and social integration among nations, Eregha (2008) sees it as an imperialist policy which hinges on dismantling domestic constraints for unfettered integration and interaction of global capital and labour. Thus, Ekwurke (2005) added a new dimension to the discussion when he submits that globalization is the increasing integration of economies around the world especially by way of trade and financial flow across the globe. This integration of financial markets on a global scale is very much enhanced by modern electronic communication technologies. This position is supported by Isitoah (2010) who stated that globalization refers to an extension beyond national boundaries of aged old market forces. It refers sometimes to the mobilization of people (Labour) and knowledge (Technology) across international borders and besides, it has a broader reference to cultural, environmental and political activities in a worldwide dimension.

Robertson (1992) is one of the first and the most general in terms of seeing globalization as a concept which ‘refers to both the compression of the world and intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole... both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole in the twentieth century’. Majide (2005) gave the argument of some historical relevance when he said that Globalization as a process had been going on for the past 5,000 years, but it had significantly accelerated since the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. He classified the main engines of globalization as TNC’s, IGO’s NGO’s and Alternative Government Organizations etc. He went on to add that, it involved the narrowing and widening of income gaps among and within nations, intensifying and diminishing political domination and homogenizing and pluralized cultural identities. In this regard, Ake, (1995) opines that economic forces are constituting the world into one economy and, to a lesser extent, one political society. Nations’ participate in global governance according to their economic power, which is coextensive with their rights. The global order is ruled by an informal cabinet of the world's economically most powerful countries; its law is the logic of the market, and status in this new order is a function of economic performance.
On a wider spectrum, Held (1999) sees the concept as the widening, deepening and speeding up of the world-wide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life from the cultural to the criminal, financial to the spiritual. For him, three schools of thought can be identified in the globalization debate namely, Hyper-globalisers, Skeptics and the Transformationalists. Watson (2008) goes on to say that globalization "is a quantitative and qualitative process" that "undermines national economic and political borders"; Transnational Enterprises (TNEs) become more powerful than national governments. Globalization transfers the character of economies from national to international. Under globalization, TNEs now comprise over 500,000 foreign subsidies established by 60,000 parent companies based mainly in the industrial countries. The world's largest TNEs hold US$1.8 trillion in foreign assets and employ about six million persons in their foreign subsidies. The effects of “globalization”, is such that, power in whatsoever form is internationally centralized.

**Third World Countries**

The concept of “Third World Countries” is used to describe economically undeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, Oceania and Latin America. Although the term “Third World” is used to describe the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America today, it includes as well some capitalist (e.g. Venezuela) and communist (e.g. North Korea) countries as well as very rich (e.g. Saudi Arabia) and very poor (e.g. Mali) countries.

In some cases, a better understanding of the Third World countries can be created by referring to First World countries and Second World countries. First World countries refer to so called developed, capitalist, industrial countries, roughly a bloc of countries aligned with the United States after World War II, with more or less common political and economic interests: North America, Western Europe, Japan and Australia. The Second World countries refers to the former communist, socialist, industrial states, (formerly the Eastern bloc, the territory and sphere of influence of the Union of Soviet Socialists Republic) today Russia, Eastern Europe (e.g. Poland) and some of the Turk States (e.g. Kazakhstan) as well as China (www.nationsonline.org/oneworld). This implies that any country or region that does not fall under First World or Second World classification is a Third World country.
The concept of Third World serves to identify countries that suffer from high infant mortality, low economic development, high levels of poverty, low utilization of natural resources and heavy dependence on industrial nations. Third World nations are generally characterized as countries with unstable governments and having high rates of population growth, illiteracy and lacking middle class. Third World countries are devoted to producing primary products for the developed world and to provide markets for their finished goods. Nevertheless, the Third World is sharply differentiated, as it includes countries on various levels of development. And despite the poverty of the country-side and the urban shanty towns, the ruling elites of most Third World countries are wealthy. Global dynamics between the First World and other Worlds are essentially split into two. Relationship with the Second World were competitive ideological and hostile. Relationships with Third World countries were normally positive in theory, while some were quite negative in practice (e.g. wars). Present inter world relationships are not so rigid although there is a disparity in terms of the First World having more influence wealth, information and advancements than the other Worlds.

Globalization is an increasingly important phenomenon which has been fuelled largely by the first or advance countries and their connections with other Worlds. Through globalization, for example, the First World (through the European Union) has brought much cooperation and integration to the region. Multinational corporations also provide examples of the First World’s impact on globalization, as they have brought economic, political and social integration in many countries.

**Social Formation**

In Political Science, the term Social Formations refers to the totality of arrangement, pattern and structures that make for the development of a country. It also refers to various socio-political and cultural practices that show the direction of a country in terms of the overall development of the country. Social formations can also be referred to the structures of a country that conditions the overall behaviour that enhances the good management or administration of a country. The social formations thus provide us with the information on how a country manages herself in terms of providing conducive environment for the growth and development of her citizens.
Theoretical framework

This work is situated within the Burton Human Needs Theory of Social Conflict. Burton explains that in analyzing conflict one must distinguish among needs, values and interests. In trying to resolve disputes it should be understood that only interests are negotiable in the short run; while values can only change over the long run in an atmosphere of security and non-discrimination, and needs cannot be negotiated away under any circumstances Burton (1990) posited that the implications of this formulation are far-reaching, for instance, it suggests "...that there are limits to the extent to which the human person, acting separately or within a wider ethnic or national community, can be socialized or manipulated..."; and "...that there are human development needs that must be satisfied and catered for by institutions, if these institutions are to be stable, and if societies are to be significantly free of conflict."

While acknowledging that there is still only limited consensus in this research area, Burton does present a plausible list of needs. First, human beings require a sense of security and of identity. Second, since we have a generic drive to learn, we require a consistent response from the environment, without which learning is impossible. Third, from their social context people require both recognition and valued relationships, or bonding. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, individuals require (some) control over their environments in order to ensure that their needs are fulfilled.

This approach has important implications for social institutions. If, on balance, needs, whatever they are determined to be, are being met within an institution, the institution receives support and is consolidated and perpetuated. If, however, needs are not met, the institution loses support and legitimacy, and confronts increasing opposition. In the latter case, authorities tend to react with repression and coercion, but if an institution is "de-legitimated" for enough people, conflict cannot be resolved this way. Rather, the institutional structures have to evolve, sooner or later, to more fully accommodate the needs of the people they affect. If a particular social order is only legitimized for a portion of the society, one would expect that, given enabling conditions, those whose needs are not met would react. Burton goes so far as to assert that this has become the general condition in modern societies, arguing that:
Human needs are being frustrated on a large scale in all modern societies, and the more law and order is enforced to control frustration the more the frustration. There is now a widespread concern regarding the legitimacy of even the most seemingly legitimized authorities. The members of protest movements of many kinds in different societies, and the terrorists who spring from relatively privileged classes, are demonstrating that there are features of societies, of all political types, unacceptable to a significant number of the people that comprise them. He went on to explain how this can lead to various forms of deviant behavior, because “deprivation frequently leads to overreaction, and the individual goes beyond the normal pursuit of needs satisfaction...”, and overreaction which may find an outlet in extremism of one form or another.

Despite the divergence of views about globalization and its conflicts, there is more common ground in this debate than is apparent at first glance. These points indicate a need for new thinking about old questions, and in that sense, globalization issues are world order issues. As the existing institutions of international politics and society have confronted these issues, basic questions of political philosophy having to do with power, authority and distributive justice-resolved, to some extent, for the nation-state in the 18th and 19th centuries are increasingly being raised again, but this time in regard to the planet as a single political, social and economic system. Again, somewhat paradoxically, globalization lays a foundation for such new thinking by creating a growing awareness of the planet as "one place", a perspective which some have called globalism. Mark Ritchie, for instance, defines globalism as: ...the belief that we share one fragile planet whose survival requires mutual respect and careful treatment of its entire people and its environment.

Globalism is also a set of values and ethical beliefs requiring active practice in our day-to-day lives. Active communications to foster understanding, the sharing of resources on the basis of equity and sustainability, and mutual aid in times of need are three central activities that undergird globalism (Ritchie, 1996). Globalist thinking grows out of a perception of the world as steadily becoming more interdependent and integrated - a trend which is reflected in phenomena as diverse as the delicate balance of the biosphere, the emergence of planet-straddling systems of communication and transportation and the destructive power of modern weapons (Bahá’í International Community, 1995). Ritchie agrees that the negative dimensions of globalization are both creating unprecedented crises (such as ozone depletion,
climate change and massive waves of migration) and undermining the ability of states and peoples to cooperate across borders to cope with these issues. For him, Globalism is the belief that the well-being of each and every neighbour, no matter how far away, affects us all is the only weapon we still have for tackling the level of ecological and social dislocation caused by unbridled globalization, especially the political violence of war and the personal violence of crime, racism and xenophobia. He concludes that, the longer a creative response to the negative trends of globalization is delayed, the more difficult it becomes, as globalization causes greater poverty and hunger, it fuels involuntary emigration, which in turn may result in racism and fear of immigrants. In this way, globalization destroys the feelings of globalism, love and concern with neighbours around the planet, while creating the economic and ecological conditions that cry out for more, not less, globalism. However, while most dispassionate analysts of the "Global Agenda" calls for closer international cooperation, leadership adequate to the necessary tasks has not yet emerged. The Commission on Global Governance put the matter this way:

At national, regional, and international levels, within communities and in non-governmental bodies, the world needs among others, leadership that is proactive, not simply reactive, that is inspired, not simply functional, that looks to the longer term and future generations for whom the present is held in trust. This cannot be leadership confined within domestic walls. It must reach beyond country, race, religion, culture, language, and life-style. It must embrace a wider human constituency, be infused with a sense of caring for others, a sense of responsibility to the global neighbourhood (Commission on Global Governance, 1995: 353). There is no gain saying the fact, that originally, the social formation of third world countries (TWC) is selflessly driven. It is based on communal relations until they came in contact with their respective colonial masters. And thus debase the socio-cultural values for new ones. To this, end a new pattern of social economic relationship was created with the TWC undermining their social values and embracing hook, line and sinker the foreign social formations that emphasized individualism and survival of the fittest. The above no doubt, is the consistent conflict between the foreign values and that of the original social values of the TWC, which of course they unconsciously want to practice. The dilemma of the above no doubt, has negatively impacted on the Third World countries thus, building weak social values for them.
Impact of Globalization on the Social Formations of Third World Countries

Interestingly, the postulations of the globalization theorists have backfired. For over a decade they argued that the socio-political and economy spheres of the world had changed fundamentally and that the system that has been integrated by the market forces and driven by capitalist energies would deliver growth and unprecedented prosperity. A 'global era' of free flowing capital was to open up new opportunities for humanity as a whole, affecting economic structures, political, social and cultural life of the people in the third world states.

The ‘globalisers’ predicted rapid development of Africa, Asia and Latin American countries even arguing that divisions between 'developed' and 'developing' nations, 'First' and 'Third' Worlds, would become less significant and eventually meaningless with time. This is because according to them, globalization creates wealth through increased competition due to improved global competition, employment as well as investment and capital flow into Third World states. They further went on to add that; globalization would enhance the spread of technical advancement, the spread of culture and education in Third World states. In the face of renewed economic crisis, however, and of stark evidence of deepening inequalities and the impoverishment of vast numbers of people, every index of economic and social advancement, however, suggests otherwise as discussed below

Impact of Globalization on Third World Economy

Globalization, economically speaking, entails the integration of world trade and financial markets; but given that developing countries are not really catching up with the advanced economies, the impact of globalization on the Third World Countries, leaves much to be desired. In the arena of world trade, the share of primary commodities in world exports of items such as food and raw materials has declined relatively in recent times. In the area of capital movements, it is noticed that the net official flows of “aid” or development assistance from the advanced economies to the Third World Countries have dwindled significantly since the early 1980s. Regarding, the movement of people from the poorer zones to the richer zones, it is noted that there is an increase in the number of workers who migrate to the developed countries in search of better paying job opportunities, and many in the Third World would blame the poor home economic situation on adverse effects of globalization.
Technology-advanced and richer nations should promote and implement globalization in solidarity, of the values of equity, freedom and justice, based on the firm conviction that the global marketplace needs to be appropriately controlled by the forces of society and by the state, so as to guarantee that the basic needs of the whole society are satisfied. Globalization, when not carried out in the right spirit of humane solidarity, could very easily become a mega bombshell of exploitation of the already economically, technologically and socially disadvantaged Third World countries. And this, history sadly shows that the lending policies of the IMF and the World bank as well as the modus operandi of many multinationals have often plunged the Third World Countries into deeper economic crises than ever before.

To reverse the above, it could be more appreciable to mobilize for global justice and not for corporate greed: there is an ever increasing need to globalize liberation from oppressive structural Adjustment Programs and also to ensure that both the World Bank and the IMF desist from giving any conditionality in their lending schemes which could result in environmental destruction and dislocation of poor peoples in the southern hemisphere of the globe. In this regard, strong voices have been raised in recent times, calling for debt relief or even the total cancellation of the debts of the poorest of the developing countries. Such clarion calls have incidentally not fallen on deaf ears, as the IMF and the world bank have jointly agreed to write off some debts, about $ USD 27 billion owed them by the poorest countries of the Third world. However, even after the cancellation of the debts owed the IMF and World Bank, some Third world Countries (like Mali and some others in the sub-Saharan region) would still have to grapple with some other enormous bilateral debts from low-interest loans that have been given them as foreign aid by Japan, France etc.

Hence, the cancellation of foreign debts alone would not be the panacea to counteract the financial maladies of the Third World. It would take something more, especially in the delicate area of evolving truly and just economic policies on the part of the IMF and the World bank, such that the poor nations would not end up being systematically crushed and exploited anymore, but would be realistically helped to build and consolidate vibrant economies for the common good as a fallout from globalization.
Impact of Globalization on Third World Poverty

Globalization, while essential to the success of the global marketplace, has a darker, less visible side. It benefits some third world countries, most wealthy countries, as well as large, well-known multinational companies. It, however, causes the economies of many countries and smaller companies to collapse. It has helped raise the standard of living for many people worldwide. It has also, however, driven many deeper into poverty. Small businesses and third world countries are not capable of updating their technology as often as their larger, wealthier counterparts. Unable to compete with multinational firms and wealthy nations, small businesses and third world countries are forced to do business locally, not growing and reaching their full potential.

Technological advances are made daily throughout the world. However, it is expensive to rapidly make and deliver these advances globally. This high production cost causes the consumer's price to be unnecessarily high. Today, there are many countries in the world that cannot afford to pay such a high price for the latest technology, and by the time they can afford to pay, newer, more advanced technology exists. The democratization of technology benefits mainly the wealthier countries. The global marketplace is based on a winner take all system. The wealthy, “winning” companies and countries are able to sell their goods and services to a global market, while the “losing”, poorer countries and businesses are limited to their local markets. Increasing the number of “haves” in the world has also dramatically increased the number of “have-nots”. It has also driven the poor further into poverty making it more and more unlikely that they will ever recover.

Added to the above is that, globalization creates tensions, especially within nations and companies, between those who have the skills and resources to compete in the global market and those who do not. When the Internet was first introduced to the public, the wealthier countries in the world were able to incorporate it into their economies before the poorer countries. The wealthier countries had already established a strong hold on the Internet by the time the poorer countries were able to buy computers and pay for Internet access. Such that by 2001, two hundred sixty-eight million computers were connected to one another. The wealthy countries control most world-renowned businesses and services on the Internet. They also control the registration of domain names on the Internet, forcing the poor countries to pay the wealthy countries for the rights to names to create e-companies. This gave the
wealthier countries an enormous advantage because a product that previously required months to ship by sea would take a matter of days to reach its destination by air and automobile. Businesses in the wealthier countries were also able to send their executives around the world to meet with executives from other countries and close their deals, while the executives of businesses from poorer countries were still on their boats travelling. If a country does not update its transportation industries, international companies will not want to build warehouses and distribution centres within that country.

This, in turn, creates high unemployment rates, driving the people further and further into poverty. According to Moore’s law, computing power doubles every eighteen to twenty-four months. This means that only countries that can afford to pay millions every year and a half will have the newest technology. The newest technology that many countries can afford is sometimes outdated by years, driving their economies further into poverty because they are unable to compete with wealthy countries. For the wealthier countries, however, an increase in computing speed leads to faster transfer of documents. It also speeds up production because faster machines that are capable of handling more data are used in factories in wealthier countries. While the economy of the United States has developed into one of the strongest, most stable in the world, many third world countries were forced deeper into poverty as a result. A contributing factor to the success of globalization has been the creation of alliances and economic integration. The countries that benefit the most from these alliances, however, are traditionally wealthier countries. Free trade, customs unions, common markets, and economic unions are essential to the spread of globalization; however, they impede the growth of third world countries not included in the group.

Social impact of Globalization

a. Migration

Globalization also has transformed existing characteristics of migration by creating new phenomena that are associated with it. For instance, economic-voluntarily migration is one of the examples of how contemporary globalization enables people freely move from one place to another “without changing their permanent place of living” (Korobkov and Paley, 2006). During last decades of accelerated globalization the world has been seeing an unprecedented rise of international migratory movements. One of the explanations of this process is the “globalization of world economy and its labor market” that has created a system that makes
economically disadvantaged people move from their home countries to places where human capital is treated as another profitable resource. According to Schiff and Ozden (2005) and the World Bank updated estimate, there are around 200 million people living outside their home countries temporary or permanently. The region of former Soviet Union is not an exception.

There is no doubt, that an understanding of the positive or negative effect of labour migration can be beneficial in several ways. First of all, it can provide useful tools for shaping public policies that can better regulate the process of migration that often takes a form of uncontrolled movement of people, which can be harmful for both sending and receiving migrant’s countries. Secondly, it can help to develop policies that will prevent or minimize a possible negative impact of labour migration on socio-economic development by minimizing or preventing spread of such phenomena as brain drain or loss of skilled workers that can have a long term devastating effect on the economy of sending them to other countries. For instance, an estimate of 5,000 Nigerian professionals leaves the country annually (IOM in Hernandez-Coss et al 2006). Nigeria has 100,000 immigrants in the United States alone (Emeagwali, 2007) while 21,000 Nigerian doctors were practising in the US alone (UNDP 1993). Approximately 90,000 Nigerians living in the UK are highly skilled (Elam et al 2000).

It is a truism that, different motives produce different kinds of people flows, such as temporary labour or permanent migration. There are several possible negative impacts of labour migration on development. One of them is a “brain drain” which is a decrease of labour and intellectual force that often affects countries with smaller population such as Bulgaria or Kyrgyzstan (Mansoor and Quillin, 2006). It also affects migrant family household, changing its dynamic and structure that might lead to a decrease in fertility rate or decrease in children education if mothers are the ones who migrate, because children do not get enough supervision to go to school Labour migration leads to decreases in labour and intellectual forces which is called “brain drain” that might affect such social indicators as life expectancy or human development.

a. Education

Education has been recognized as one of the critical pathways to promote social and economic development. Female participation in education has been cited as the single most
important investment that a developing country can make, translating into better living conditions for families and increased productivity. The international community has made commitments to universal primary education and free education for all (EFA), particularly for the girl child. For example at the 2000 Dakar Word Education Forum, one of the goals was to eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and to achieve gender equality in education by 2015. However, realization of these goals appears to be elusive, particularly in the Third World. Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa indicates that although there have been improvements in female participation, girls and women’s access to education remains limited in many countries across the region, and there has actually been a drop in girls’ enrolment and retention rates in both primary and secondary education Oniyama (2008). This is due to a combination of socio-economic, socio-cultural, political and institutional factors constraining women’s education. All over Africa the main focus of the process of globalization that was implemented since the 1980s was the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). African countries are in debt and poverty partly due to the policies of international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and WTO. Debt repayment pushed governments to embark on drastic measures like the retrenchment of workers. Other crucial aspects of life (education, health, social welfare, environmental sanitation, agriculture etc. were neglected. The ‘lost decade’ of the 1980s is in effect still continuing for hundreds of millions of people in many countries of Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America. One of the major constraints affecting education is the direct cost of schooling, the major component being tuition fees. Even in countries where primary education is free, the costs of education include building funds, books, uniforms, extra tutorials, examination fees and transportation, among others. This is because most families, faced with financial constraints, are generally more likely to withdraw girls from school than boys due to gender biases regarding the perceived higher value of boys’ education over that of girls’.

b. Politics

Institutional adjustment is needed in response to this process, to maintain the competition to reach efficiency and effectiveness of the government. Moreover, the pressure of changes toward more globalize government because of effects of globalize economy, should be supported by political institutional adjustment. Globalization is broadly viewed by experts as a process of interconnectedness and interdependence between countries in the world. From
An economist perspective, this process led to economic integration of many nations in terms of trading among countries, international labour division, and trans-national investment or capital flow and more fluid mobility of people (Kohler, 2003). Moreover, the other impacts of globalization exist from spreading of thought and ideas until competing spiritual values. This is of two parallel political frequencies for survival. For instance, third world states’ balance of payment is not encouraging due to debt overhang and declining institutional capacity and capacity utilization such that foreign companies still dominate the private sectors, with state owned enterprises or parastatals increasingly playing a minor role as pictured by the world bank (2002) which posited that the most productive companies in third world states are those owned by multinational corporations which it attributed to corruption of the power elites which obstructs the operations of industries and divert profits to elite consumption and capital flight.

At the nation-state level, globalization changes the way we organize a political system to avoid its bad effects and gets its valuable impact. Nation-state as human collectively with its objectives and goals basically just like organism, in which has forming structures and mechanism in social orders and cooperation. Institutionalization is the consequence process of state structure, commonly codify with constitution, legal system, formal organization, government and public services. Politics is a mechanism to resolve the different competing interest among citizen, especially relating to decision making on allocation of the scarcity of resources. Laswell (in Agbefe, 2004,) stated that politics is “the process of deciding who gets what, how and when”. In context of Indonesia as multiethnic archipelagic country, politics also means canalization of different aspiration in a civilized way. Political institutionalization is the continuing process for national identity building as a result of independence or other historical processes. However, in Third World states, globalization has done more harm than good because it emphasizes unequal yoking.

No wonder, Eregha (2008) alluded to the fact that, of the 4.4 billion people living in Africa, Asia and Latin America, life has become a more desperate struggle for survival. In support of the above, The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) estimated that 840 million people are malnourished, the great mass of them living in countries of the third world. More than half the countries for which statistics are available do not have enough food to provide for all their population with the minimum daily requirement of calories.
In some regions hunger have become far more general, across Africa and other Third World states such that the average household now consumes 25 percent less than in the early 1970s. Between 1995 and 1997 only 21 out of 147 Third World countries recorded per capita growth of over 3 percent a year, the rate specified by the UN for reduction of poverty. There are staggering inequalities as compared to the developed countries, for example, California which is a state in the U.S alone has a gross domestic product (GDP) of equal value to that of China and India combined; the wealth of the world’s 15 richest people now exceeds the combined GDP of sub-Saharan Africa; the wealth of the richest 84 individuals exceeds the GDP of China, with its 1.2 billion inhabitants.

There is no evidence to suggest that the ‘global era’ has brought prosperity or an alleviation of human suffering. Third picture of the Third World is of the picture of ‘a backlog of shortfalls and gaping inequalities’. In fact, the globalization thesis as a whole is suspect because an investigation into the world economy today reveals a situation plainly at odds with the globalisers’ main principles. Although some areas of the world economy show evidence of more fluid capital movement, some do not. Although, in one sense, there has been integration because nowhere is immune from the market economy, some regions formerly central to world capitalism have been driven to its margins, some states are weak but only in relation to very strong states which continue to dominate world affairs.

Added to the above, is the fact, that, most countries of the third world have been unable to reap benefits from globalization because of several weaknesses. Eregha and Etchie (2006) posited that, this phenomenon of “uneven development” showing how globalization mainly benefits the developed world, at the expense of the developing world; the benefits accrue only to a few developing countries, There is no doubt, that, Third World states or developing countries have been an integral part of globalization in the late 20th century. They accounted for 66 per cent of total exports from developing countries in 1992 (up from 30 per cent in the period 1970 - 1980); 66 per cent of annual FDI inflows to developing countries in 1981 - 1992 and most of portfolio investment flows to the developing world. Some of these countries have since been badly affected by financial crises, debt and economic slowdown, thus diluting further the rate of success of the third world states in integration into the world economy.
The Third World states’ weaknesses stem from several factors, which made them to be economically weak. This could be traced to the lack of domestic economic capacity and weak social infrastructure following the colonial experience. They were made weaker by low export prices and significant terms of-trade decline as well as the debt crisis and the burden of debt servicing. The policy conditionality attached to loan rescheduling packages hampered the recovery of many Third World countries and led to further deterioration in social services. Thus, given the unequal capacities of the developed and underdeveloped states, the development of technology (especially information and communications technologies) further widens the gap. On top of these unfavourable international factors, many developing countries have also been characterized by dictatorships, abuse of power and economic mismanagement, which undermined the development process. All these factors meant that, the developing states was in a weak position to take on the challenges of globalization, as the conditions for success in liberalization were not present.

Given the lack of conducive conditions and preparedness, rapid liberalization caused more harm than benefits. The Third World states’ weakness also stems from its lack of bargaining and negotiating strength in international relations. Being heavily indebted and dependent on bilateral aid donors and loan organizations, Third World states have been drained of their capacity to negotiate (even on the terms of loan conditionality). The powers of the UN in which in the third world states is in a more favourable position, have been diminished, whereas the mandate and powers of the institutions the IMF, World Bank and WTO increased tremendously. The North has leverage in the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO to shape the content of globalization to serve their needs and to formulate policies which the developing countries have to take on.

Obviously, the developed states are in a dominant position and have been prepared to use this to further their control of the global economy. However, the Third World states have not done well in organizing themselves to coordinate substantial policy and negotiating positions or strategy in relation to the discussions and negotiations in the WTO and IMF as well as in other forums. The developed countries are well placed to determine the globalization agenda. This is because they are well organized within their own countries, with well-staffed departments dealing with international trade and finance, and with university academics and at private and quasi-government think-tanks helping to obtain information and map policies
and strategies. They also have well organized associations’ and lobbies associated with their corporations and financial institutions, which have great influence on the government departments. The developed countries also have institutions and mechanisms helping to coordinate their policies and positions for example the European Commission, the OECD and the G7” and their subsidiary bodies and agencies.

In contrast, the developing countries are not well organized within their own countries. The government departments dealing with the interface with the global economy are understaffed especially in relation to the rapid developments in globalization and in global negotiations. The academic sector and the few think-tanks which exist are not geared up to obtain and assess information on globalization trends, and less still to formulate policy proposals that governments can make use of. The link between these intellectual sectors, the NGOs and governments of third world states are also often weak. The business and financial community is not organized well enough to monitor global trends or to lobby governments on global issues. At the regional level, there is increasing collaboration among the countries through regional groupings.

However, cooperation is still not as sophisticated as in the European Union. At the international level, the Third World states are organized through the Group of 77 and the Non-Alignment. These groupings often perform reasonably well within the UN framework and at UN meetings. However, they are not adequately staffed and are unable to keep adequate track of events and developments, or to formulate longer-term policies and strategies. At the WTO, IMF and World Bank, the collective strength of Third World states is yet to be manifested in a strong way, although there are encouraging signs of more collaboration, for example at the WTO.

Conclusion
It will be out of place to argue that globalisation has not contributed anything to the development of the Third World countries as improvement in communication technology, transportation, currency convertibility etc combine to sing glories of the phenomenon. However, there is no doubt also that globalization may well have the potential of making Third World Countries grow economically, technologically, educationally, politically and otherwise stronger than they are at the moment. It is no secret that there are several risks
engrained in it which at one point or the other, tend to turn one or the other Third World country into the Third of the Third World if due care is not taken. It is indeed an open secret that most often, the structural reforms that the lending organizations (IMF and the World Bank) ask the borrowing nations to embark upon do actually aggravate their poverty. Unfortunately, based on advocated benefits that would accrue from the globalization process, Third World countries embraced the process with initial enthusiasm without taking a critical look at the composition of the social economic and political situations of their various states. It was discovered that the relationship between the Third World states and their developed counterpart is a dependent one and to a great extent has militated against them in the globalization process.

There is no doubt that the expected benefits are in two major areas; first, in the area of improvement in Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) in developing countries, and second, was the greater integration of Third World countries into the world economy through trade and capital flows which would have afforded the developing countries the avenue to partake in the opportunities and benefits of globalization; to develop their comparative advantages and gain access to newer, more appropriate technology; permitting them to realize much higher rate of economic growth. But as it was pointed out above, these benefits were short-lived due to the various impediments emanating from the one-sided relationship between them.

Nevertheless, for developing and Third World countries to harness the benefits of globalization, they are required to operate within the framework of strong regional and sub-regional economic groupings such as AU, ECOWAS, SADC etc, as a credible response to the powerful forces of globalization and regional trading blocs that exist in Europe (European Union), North America (NAFTA), and Asia (ASEAN). It is only when this is done that some sort of hope would be restored in the continent in the face of current wave of globalization.

REFERENCES


