

# FROM COLONIALISM TO GLOBALISATION: HOW HISTORY HAS SHAPED UNEQUAL POWER RELATIONS BETWEEN POST-COLONIAL COUNTRIES

IRENE LODIGIANI

*King's College London (United Kingdom)*

*irenula3@hotmail.com*

*Abstract:* This paper examines the ways globalising initiatives have been used to mirror neo-colonial practices and foster unequal power relationships between countries in the Global North and Global South. By taking a historical perspective, this paper points to the ways inequality is structured over time and highlights how many globalising mechanisms such as the spread of free markets, foreign lending, and the myth of development theory have favoured growing inequalities. To clarify how globalisation creates neo-colonial relations in modernity, two examples shall be used: the Green Revolution in India and the effects of the Newmont mining corporation in Peru.

*Keywords:* globalisation, colonialism, cultural hegemony, development theory, foreign lending.

## INTRODUCTION

Globalisation is often presented as an endorser of development and a powerful counter to world poverty and hunger, yet this is a highly simplistic and historical interpretation. A number of economists claim that during the 19<sup>th</sup> century a majority of the world population lived in conditions of extreme poverty (Dollar, Kraay 2002), while today, following successful development programs, only about 10 per cent of the global population lives below the poverty line (Howton 2020). At first glance, this may appear to be an impressive demonstration of the success of these programs (imported from the First World to the Third) however, this statistic masks the political, economic, and cultural relations of violence that globalisation has fostered between countries in the Global North and

ISSN 2283-7949

GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION

2020, 2, DOI: 10.12893/gjcp.2020.2.12

Published online by "Globus et Locus" at <https://glocalismjournal.org>



Some rights reserved

Global South. Indeed, many mechanisms which promote globalisation and free trade may be seen as methods to maintain the relations of dependence set up during colonialism. In this context, former colonising powers employ their hegemonic influence to push disadvantageous economic policies on ex-colonies with the implicit intention of maintaining the economic and power balances set up at the time (Osha 2011). In this essay, I shall provide an analysis of globalisation through a colonial lens in an attempt to explain how these hegemonic and economic power dynamics are maintained in modernity. Firstly, it shall discuss colonial rule and provide some examples of the ways hegemonic, economic, and State power were used to maintain dominance over the colonies. Secondly, it shall examine the links between the decolonisation project and the rise of globalisation. Finally, this essay shall analyse development theory and the proliferation of transnational corporations in the Global South, providing two examples of how cultural hegemony and financial policies are used to maintain these unequal power relations alive today.

## COLONIAL POWER DYNAMICS

The colonial period began with the accidental “discovery” of the American continent and continued until about the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Jones 2012). The first wave of colonisation began in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and involved the dominion of European powers such as France, Spain, and England over countries in the Global South. At this time, colonial relationships between countries varied largely: some were settler colonies where indigenous populations were wiped out in favour of European immigrants, others were seen as extractive states where natural resources were exploited and exported, and still others were planter states where slaves were imported to cultivate large monocultures of lucrative crops (Lange 2006). These differences were largely due to the variations in natural resources and labour forces present in the various colonies. In the words of Gray: “sharp contrasts in colonial policy and accomplishment were due partly to economic and politi-

cal differences in the colonizing nations, but even more to wide differences in the natural environment and native populations of the countries colonized” (Gray 1973: 303). Indeed, settler colonies such as Australia avoided systematic resource exploitation because they had fewer local populations to enslave than extractive states such as Peru, and not because of fundamental differences between the British and Spanish (Frank 1982).

As European countries increasingly occupied territories across the globe, they began to control them politically and economically, forcing their development and engaging in unequal trade relationships (Lange 2006). Indeed, the largest difference between Spanish and British modes of dominance was linked to their modes of production: while Spain engaged in a mercantilist system of trade supervised by the State, England granted more economic freedom and allowed for individuals to capitalise upon the colonial wealth encountered abroad (Frank 1982). These differences may be observed in their policies: while the Spanish crown adopted a centrally directed imperial strategy leaving little freedom to the colonies, the British preferred the creation of local colonial societies with some degree of independence from Britain (Elliott 2006). This distinction was reinforced with funding: while Spanish exploration was funded solely by the crown with the aim of accumulating wealth for the royal family, British exploration was led by private companies. Revenue from the colonies did not go exclusively to the State, but mostly to stakeholders and investors in private companies (Elliott 2006). Thus, British colonisers were granted more economic and political freedom while overseas than their Spanish counterparts, leading to the creation of a number of joint-stock companies (such as the East India Trading Company) which began engaging in the first forms of capitalist global trade (Blaut 1989). British capitalist expansion began with the proliferation of private companies in the colonies who blindly extracted natural resources, refined them, and then sold the products back to the colonies, effectively creating a global trade which allowed for the development of the colonising power at the cost of the colonised (Elliott 2007). Spanish colonisers on the other hand, created the *encomienda*



system (following the abolition of slavery) where local populations were made Spanish subjects, converted to Christianity, and then assigned to a Spanish “patron” to which they had to pay contributions (Elliott 2006; Frank 1982). By creating the *encomienda* system, the Spanish were effectively setting up modes of production which would inhibit domestic capital accumulation in favour of foreign accumulation in the hands of the colonising power. By importing Catholicism to the American continent, Spain was actively erasing local culture and tradition and asserting the dominance of their culture over that of the indigenous populations (Elliott 2006; Frank 1982).

These fundamental differences may help explain two very important imperial tools utilised throughout later phases of colonialism<sup>1</sup>, imperialism<sup>2</sup>, and globalisation<sup>3</sup>: cultural imperialism and accumulation through dispossession. Despite the various types of colonial relationships, a common method employed to assert control throughout the Global South was accumulation through dispossession, where the colonial State evicted local inhabitants in favour of exploitative extraction projects (Neves, Igoe 2012). By displacing indigenous populations from their land in favour of foreign management, a wide number of highly productive natural resources were centralised under state supervision, for state exploitation (Bryant 2013). Dispossession of local inhabitants was usually achieved through legislation and governmental policies, such as the 1865 Indian Forest Act, which allowed the British colonial government to appropriate forests from indigenous populations and manage them in a “scientific” manner (Shiva 1993). Shiva writes: “when the British colonised India, they first colonised her forests” (Shiva 1993: 61) as these represented untapped natural wealth, which was highly lucrative and commercially viable in the fast-emerging global trade. The 1865 Indian Forest Act claimed to manage the forests in a “scientific” manner, however the science behind their management was how to exploit the most timber without depleting the original resources for the longest time (Shiva 1993). By “scientifically” managing Indian forests, British private companies were able to capitalise upon resources they had accessed free-of-cost (but would later sell for high profits) highlighting how



the development of the First World advanced at the cost of Third World natural resources (Bryant, Bailey 2005).

The colonial relationship between Spain and Peru and the creation of the *encomienda* system perfectly exemplifies these dynamics. Following the abolition of slavery, the Spanish crown required a new way to create an extractive workforce to exploit and consequentially began converting local populations to Christianity thus inserting them into the *encomienda* system. In the words of Frank: “the *encomienda* institution assigned the Indians of designated communities to Spaniards, who did not receive ownership of their persons, land or other property, but were authorised to exact tribute in personal services, goods and money from them” (Frank 1982: 45) highlighting the ways land, property and resources were accumulated by the colonial government at the cost of local populations. Although slavery had been abolished, the *encomienda* system allowed Spain to continue capitalising upon labour and natural resources free of charge as the colonising power demanded tributes from local populations. This *modus operandi* worked particularly well in Peru as the land offered both natural resources in the form of gold and silver, and a large labour force available to extract those resources (Frank 1982). By authorising the free extraction of natural resources, services and capital, the Spanish coloniser was thus effectively dispossessing local populations of their assets, accumulating and capitalising upon favouring modes of production where lucrative commodities were exported in exchange for nothing.

Colonial rule involved political and economic domination of one State over another. Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, a third element of control was systematically introduced. Later phases of colonialism turned to imperialism, where cultural power became a central tool in maintaining dominance not solely by force, but also with structured narratives employed to create and maintain hegemonic power over the dominated populations (Said 1978; Scott 1995). Similar to the Spaniards in the American continent, most colonising powers adopted the narrative that their culture was superior to that of the colonised to justify their sovereignty. By devaluing local knowledge systems, the imperialist power was thus able to im-



port their own cultural hegemony<sup>4</sup>, asserting control over both the bodies and the minds of the colonised (Fanon 1967; Shiva 1993). This shift was central in the dominance and control of the Global North over the Global South, and gave rise to decolonial thought, where Latin American scholars such as Escobar highlighted the problem of knowledge production and the erosion of place-based local cultures in favour of neo-liberal globalisation and Western ways of life (Escobar 2006). Western powers systematically depicted themselves as civilising forces there to help and educate the local populations (Hamblet 2008). Porter writes: “the feeling that Europeans should, or were destined to pass on the seeds and fruits of their success – their laws, institutions, and Christian religion – was married to the belief that the merits of European ways were self-evident” (Porter 1994: 20). Indeed, cultural dominance was propagated through the narrative of “civilising savages” which permitted for the devaluation of local knowledge, deemed “unscientific”, in favour of Western views (Shiva 1993). In the words of Nandy: “a colonial system perpetuates itself by inducing the colonized, through socio-economic and psychological rewards and punishments to accept new social norms and cognitive categories” (Nandy 1982: 3). These cognitive categories and new social norms were none other than Western capitalist values, which changed local ways of knowing nature from a holistic view to a use-value view (as in the case of Indian forests). Indeed, what was previously seen as a public entity offering sustenance became private property for colonisers to capitalise upon. All around the world, the myth of “civilizing the savages” was used to justify Western intervention into foreign affairs and management in an attempt to mask the true reason driving colonial conquest: the exploitation of natural resources for profit.

## FROM COLONISATION TO GLOBALISATION

It is important to draw attention to how colonial powers asserted dominance in the past, because similar methods were employed to maintain the established hierarchy during the

subsequent decolonisation and globalisation phases. Following the Second World War, a number of independence movements forced the colonising powers to grant independence to their former colonies giving way to the decolonisation period which began in the 1940s and stretched to the 1960s (Memmi 2006). During this time, a number of colonies gained political and economic independence as the military forces formally withdrew. This, however, raised the problem of how to continue exercising dominance once open political control was prohibited opening: “a new phase of imperialism, that of the adaptation of colonialism to the new condition of the elimination of political over-lordship of colonial powers: the phase in which colonialism is to be maintained by other means” (Nkrumah 2004: 41). By this the author means that the former colonising powers had no intention of relinquishing the economic and hegemonic powers consolidated during colonial times, rather, new techniques needed to be employed to maintain similar relationships of dependence and control (Nkrumah 2004; Osha 2011).

It is in these circumstances that the United States began consolidating hegemonic power and started building a form of *Pax Americana* linked to the idea of the creation of a “free world” in opposition to the communist bloc (Wallerstein 1993). Following the Second World War, tensions between the USSR and the USA began intensifying as the two ideological systems rivalled one another leading to the militarisation of a number of territories across the globe (Solarz 2012). Consequentially, in 1952, Alfred Sauvy coined the term “Third World” in reference to the third block of non-committed nations caught up in the mounting Cold War tensions between East and West (Wolf-Phillips 1987). In his paper *Three Worlds, One Planet*, Sauvy linked the Third World to the Third Estate, as both demanded freedom, equality, and brotherhood within the established hegemonic order (Solarz 2012). Indeed, post-colonial countries began uniting in circles of Pan-Africanism, Pan-Asianism, and Pan-Americanism to discuss the ways colonial rule had suppressed national culture and pride, ways in which they could rebuild it, and possible pathways for future development (Van Dinh 2015). Ex-

colonies began to be known as non-aligned countries, or those countries which had recently gained their independence from European control and had no desire to be caught up in new hegemonic conflicts (Worsely 1990). The non-aligned movement was deeply linked to anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, as former colonies were adamant not to support their former colonisers, preferring to consolidate their newly gained independence. Indeed, in 1961 the non-alignment summit in Belgrave stated that all countries were allowed to pursue their own cultural, political, and economic pathways of development, clearly delimitating their sovereignty as newly formed states (Van Dinh 2015).

The unity of non-aligned countries became increasingly important, due to the establishment of a number of international bodies following the Second World War intended to structurally redevelop the ex-colonial countries. Bracarense writes: “the development theory and Cold War grew up together” (Bracarense 2012: 377) highlighting the ways the two concepts are intertwined. Indeed, in order to counter communist expansion during the Cold War, the United States wanted to create a system in which democratic governments were installed across the globe which would engage in free trade with other liberal democracies (Bracarense 2012). In order to achieve this goal, the United Nations, the International Money Fund, and the World Bank were created with the intention of helping non-aligned countries “develop” (Bracarense 2012). Although these bodies were meant to be neutral and mediate amongst global conflicts, their ideology reflected that of the United States, and their implicit goal was to transform the newly independent states into democratic, consumerist, and capitalistic societies. By framing the struggle between the USA and the USSR as a struggle between good and evil, the West successfully used their cultural hegemony to influence the development of non-aligned countries, pushing them to accept Western pathways of development as natural and beneficial (Bracarense 2012). In the words of Osha: “it is always convenient to associate decolonisation with political liberation, but reality tells us otherwise” (Osha 2011: 171). Indeed, from the perspective of ex-colonies, the decolonisation





period is not viewed as a time of political liberation, more likely, it is equatable to a continuation of Western dominance. Following decolonisation, the Global North continued to use its hegemonic power and unrestricted freedom to promote systems of unequal exchange and dependence using global institutions such as the World Bank and IMF (Nkrumah 2004; Osha 2011; Shiva 2000). Unsurprisingly, these systems are not so different from the methods of dominance employed during colonial rule. In the following paragraphs two examples shall be used to illustrate the ways colonial power structures are used to maintain unequal relations amongst States in modernity.

## DEVELOPMENT THEORY

During colonial times, Western powers consolidated dominion over knowledge production by creating a cultural hegemony which still continues today and was used to shape the development of newly independent states during the decolonisation period. Colonising powers positioned themselves as active and dominant as opposed to the passive and submissive colonies. By devaluing local culture and glorifying European ways of life, the colonising power left a cultural legacy which is still extremely influential in regulating current global power dynamics (Nandy 1982; Said 1978). Supporters of globalisation claim that shared global cultures enrich everyone, glazing over the links between knowledge and power and the fact that knowledge production is concentrated in the Global North who export their consumerist and capitalist culture abroad (Galbraith 2002). In the words of Scott: “a hegemonic ideology requires, by definition, that what are in fact particular interests be reformulated and presented as general interests” (Scott 1995: 326). This is exactly what happened as intergovernmental organisations began to promote development and modernisation theories across the Third World. As Cold War tensions grew, the United States fortified this ideological and cultural hegemony and, through the creation of international bodies such as the United Nations, was able to produce specific pathways of development for ex-colonies (Bracarense 2012).

Consequentially, development theory may be seen as a form of cultural imperialism, similar to the myth of “civilising the savages” propagated during colonial times. Indeed, both narratives devalue local knowledge as “unscientific” and attempt to replace indigenous culture with foreign ideals with the aim of centralising economic power in the hands of the dominant knowledge-producing society (Nkruma 2004).

During and following the Cold War, proponents of neo-liberalism such as the World Bank and other international bodies began circulating the theory that globalising the world into a single unified capitalist market would allow for the equal development of all countries (Hours 2007). Development theorists such as Rostow and Wallerstein claimed that by creating a global market where each State was free to trade with whom they chose, all countries would advance upon Rostow’s Model for Stages of Economic Development. Over the course of time, this would supposedly allow all countries to reach the “final phase” of development: a high mass consumption society similar to the United States (Rostow 1964). This narrative is problematic on many levels. Firstly, this theory supports the forceful incorporation into capitalist systems which trades in dollars, penalising Third World commodity exporters: with a strong dollar, commodities will be more expensive for other countries deterring trade amongst former colonies. With less demand, the price of their commodities will fall, and in this way Western powers with currencies of about the same value of the USD can buy up a large number of exports for low prices (Agarwal 1989). Secondly, it presupposes that there is a single pathway of development which all societies must follow in order to become “developed”: in other words, Westernised high consumption societies in a capitalist world-system (Jameson 1996).

These assumptions display how particular interests of the West (such as maintaining economic power and creating a capitalist global market) were presented as general interests, supposedly allowing Third World countries to develop, highlighting the subtle but pervasive power of cultural hegemonies. Incorporating newly formed states into a capitalist global market traded in dollars was in the interest of former colonis-



ing powers as this would allow them to buy up natural resources at extremely competitive prices, penalising the exporters (Agarwal 1989). This mechanism was beneficial to former colonisers as it trapped former colonies in disadvantageous trade relationships of dependence. In this way, development programs sponsored by Western bodies like the IMF are reduced to a continuation of the colonial process in which local culture is devalued in favour of foreign ideologies. By devaluing local knowledge systems, international involvement shapes the economic development of post-colonial countries in their favour (Shiva 1993). Thus, far from benefitting former colonies, development theory was used as a method to maintain unequal trade agreements between the First and Third Worlds.

## DEVELOPMENT THEORY AND THE GREEN REVOLUTION

The Green Revolution is a perfect example of how development theory, knowledge production, and the forceful incorporation into capitalist global markets are used by international bodies to maintain neo-colonial relationships of dominance between the Global North and the Global South. The Green Revolution was a strategy of agricultural development which was intended to solve Third World hunger and allow developing countries to participate in the global trade farming of lucrative crops such as soy, sugar, and tobacco (Shiva 2016). The Green Revolution promoted Western agriculture as highly efficient and productive, and declared other forms of traditional farming as “unscientific”. Global institutions such as the WTO and the World Bank provided Third World countries such as India with large loans, allowing them to buy the GMO seeds needed to kickstart the Green Revolution (Shiva 2000). These seeds were supposedly pest resistant and grew larger than non-modified organisms, thus helping to solve hunger issues. These genetically modified organisms, however, came with strict “intellectual property rights” and were created to be sterile: this forced Indian farmers to buy more seeds at the end of each season – an expense which was previously inexistent.

ent as farmers traditionally replanted the best seeds collected from previous harvests (Shiva 2000). Furthermore, these new seeds required more fertiliser, more water, and led to widespread monocultures of crops to be traded on global markets destroying diverse sources of food (Shiva 2017).

These conditions led to chronic debt amongst farmers in some of the poorer and dryer regions of India such as Punjab, causing widespread suicide amongst small-scale farmers (Dutta 2012; Shiva 1993). Although the Green Revolution began in the 1960s, its consequences may be still be felt: suicides were ongoing and in 2012 “out of the total 230 farm households in Chaina (Punjab), 189 households were highly indebted in which 100 households belonged to small and marginal farmers” (Dutta 2012: 240). These conditions demonstrate how the Green Revolution was not carried out in the interest of solving Third World hunger, or helping ex-colonies modernise and develop, but rather in the interest of maintaining neo-colonial trade agreements amongst States (Shiva 2000). The cultivation of GMO seeds of lucrative crops led to the spread of monocultures in India, while destroying the diverse sources of food local inhabitants had consumed for generations. This was a direct consequence of the intervention of global actors such as the World Bank, which encouraged Third World countries to follow a specific development theory by shifting their priority from a “food-first” to an “export-first” mentality (Shiva 2000). This policy has heightened competition amongst agricultural States in the Global South, who have been forced to lower the prices of their commodities, allowing Western powers to buy up large quantities of food for low prices. Furthermore, endorsing cultivation for commerce rather than consumption has rendered India dependent on foreign imports for food, as they are no longer self-sufficient in terms of food production. Shiva writes: “the myth of ‘free trade’ becomes the means for the rich to rob the poor of their rights of food” (Shiva 2000: 7). Indeed, the cultural hegemony and power relationships installed during colonial times were used to push small-scale farmers from the Global South to accept to cultivate huge monocultures of GMO crops which benefitted Western buyers. Far from helping India develop, this approach has helped



Western interests, allowing for Western hegemonic powers to continue acquiring natural commodities for low prices – just as they did during colonial times.

#### FOREIGN LOANS, STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND TRANS-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Cultural hegemony and development theory are tightly linked to foreign lending and structural redevelopment. Indeed, without a strong cultural hegemony justifying development theory, international bodies would have been unable to legitimise their involvement in creating pathways of development, and without providing Third World countries with liquidity to implement these reforms, former colonies would never have been able to “develop”. After World War II, many colonies gained independence and organised themselves into States, which required economic power in order to tackle widespread poverty and stimulate industrialisation. In this context, international actors such as the United Nations began promoting development pathways which reflected American values, and the World Bank and IMF began offering ex-colonial countries large loans which were intended to help them grow (Luxemburg 1971). Luxemburg writes (1971: 401):

Though foreign loans are indispensable for the emancipation of the rising capitalist states, they are yet the surest ties by which the old capitalist states maintain their influence, exercise their financial control, and exert pressure on the customs, foreign and commercial policies of the young capitalist states.

Here the author is highlighting the ways international loans were used by countries in the Global North to maintain dominance over the Global South. Indeed, by allocating more buying power to the newly born States, industrialised countries were actively creating a global market. During decolonisation, Westernised economies were highly dependent upon exports, as they were large manufacturers of a number of commodities refined from natural resources imported from

the colonies. By allowing new States larger buying power, First World countries were securing themselves buyers for their exports (Luxemburg 1971).

Furthermore, by loaning large sums of money, old capitalist States were in a position to dictate what the new capitalist States should cultivate and produce, thus structurally redeveloping the economic direction these States would follow (Clapp, Dauvergne 2005; Luxemburg 1971). Indeed, structural adjustment programs “require that States promote economic activities consonant with a give countries comparative advantage” and is tightly linked with development theory (Bryant, Bailey 2005: 58). This policy highlights how developing countries were pushed to exploit their natural resources such as minerals, timber, and oil in order to repay their mounting debt. Another way in which ex-colonies have been structurally redeveloped regards their environmental regulations. Indeed, in order to attract transnational corporations to extract resources and increase economic gains, many of these countries have avoided regulating pollution, emissions, or exploitation of natural resources (Bryan, Bailey 2005). During the 1960s, the majority of Western countries modified their regulations, making them more stringent in order to protect the environment. Because of this, many TNCs and multinationals began relocating overseas, where regulations are nearly inexistent and labour costs significantly lower (Dicken 2014). This desire to operate overseas reflects neo-colonial practices where foreign investors relocate abroad to take advantage of cheap local labour and lax environmental regulations.

## TRANS-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

Since newly independent States began adopting a capitalist political economy, foreign loans have been used as a method of structural development, which has favoured environmental deregulation in the hopes of attracting TNCs in many countries across Latin America and the Global South in general. However, far from furthering their development, these mechanisms have entangled those involved in relationships of



exploitation and dependence (Dicken 2014). Indeed, as the world globalised and free trade expanded, transnational corporations began operating in many Third World countries, and today the global economy is dominated by more than 63,000 of them (Bury 2008). Due to slack environmental and health and safety regulations coupled with low labour costs, many TNCs began relocating in the Global South where they mimic neo-colonial relationships. For example, the Newmont Mining Corporation in Cajamarca Peru was founded in 1921 and invested in a number of resources such as copper, petroleum, and coal before eventually switching to gold in 1961 (Bury 2008). The opening of the Newmont enterprise was initially depicted as a positive event which would increase incomes and job access for local populations. However, in order to cut costs, the multinational opted for open pit mining: a highly contentious method of mining which is considered dangerous as it affects miners' health, is highly pollutant, and drastically modifies the land (Bury 2008). In the short term, inhabitants reported an increase in income as they were able to sell plots of land to the multinational and were granted the possibility to receive temporary employment, but after several years, the mine had accumulated over 10,000 hectares of land, dispossessing local inhabitants of their means of sustenance. Furthermore, in the year 2000, a large mercury spill affected over 100 households drawing attention to the fact that many company health and safety measures were not being enforced, adding to the mounting tensions between Newmont Mining and the local populations (Bury 2008).

In an attempt to address these issues, Newmont began sponsoring small-scale economic programs like jewellery cooperatives to integrate locals into the gold mining business, however this did little to support the inhabitants. Due to mining activities in the area, household access to natural resources had been transformed: decreased land for livestock and agriculture negatively impacted food security in the region. Furthermore, land-use intensification led to soil erosion and rising land prices not to mention mounting health issues (Bury 2008). These changes impacted local livelihoods in a number of ways: decreasing their autonomous way of life while simultaneously



increasing integration into regional markets for artisanal products. At first glance, the incorporation into capitalist markets and the proliferation of TNCs in Third World countries may appear to be a positive thing (bringing development and increased economic gains) however these benefits are felt by the multinational rather than local inhabitants, similarly to colonial times (Clapp, Dauvergne 2005). Indeed, “transnational corporations affect not only economic development, technology, skills, trade and employment, but also the living conditions and natural environments of billions of people” (Bury 2008: 308). Sadly, both livelihoods and the conditions of the natural environment deteriorate by the presence of transnational corporations in the region, and these conditions mirror neo-colonial relationships, in which a foreign body buys up land, displacing local inhabitants for increased economic gains which are shipped out of the region.

## DISCUSSION

Examining current global power balances through a colonial lens helps us see the ways these power balances are not a result of chance, but rather are actively construed. Farmer writes: “those who look only to powerful present-day actors to explain misery will fail to see how inequality is structured and legitimated over time” (Farmer 2004: 309) highlighting the fact that structural relations of violence between nations have their roots in past relations of structural violence. The shifts from colonialism, to decolonisation, to globalisation have maintained Western cultural dominance and have created a capitalist world system in which most countries are unified by free trade (Worsley 1990). The turn from colonial imperialism to American imperialism during the Cold War period went largely unnoticed due to the framing of the liberal and communist conflict as good versus evil. Indeed, during this time the United States painted themselves as the heroes of the globe as they pushed former colonies to adopt liberal democracies and capitalist economies. These events promoted foreign lending with the creation of international bodies intended



to help ex-colonies develop, structural redevelopment of weaker economies and the expansion of multinationals and TNCs on the global economic stage (Bryant 2005). Such dynamics have eroded the political, economic, and cultural sovereignty of the Third World, reinforcing their neo-colonial relationship with Westernised countries, rather than allowing them to develop independently (Frank 1982).

American liberal and imperial expansion may be equated with a continuation of colonial domination by part of the Global North over the Global South, and unsurprisingly used similar tools to consolidate its authority and control. Development Theory reflects the cultural imperialism that was used during colonial times to reinforce the power of the coloniser: by delimiting strict pathways of development, the Global North is once again asserting the dominance of their culture, their way of thinking, and their priorities over those of the Global South (Jameson 1996). Indeed, after decades of domination in which local cultures were systematically destroyed, degraded, and devalued, it is relatively easy to replace the original cultural thought with a top-down Western substitute, as in the case of the Green Revolution. The Green Revolution was exported from the United States across the globe, where it was forced upon a number of ex-colonies such as Brazil, South Africa and of course India (Shiva 2000). Interestingly enough, no European country accepted the innovations promoted by the Green Revolution, rather European countries such as Italy and France actively fought against GMO crops, which must be labelled in the common European Market (Gasnier 2009). The fact that European States were strong enough to oppose the Green Revolution points to their consolidated power in producing knowledge and culture, as they rejected American farming ideals and continued with their own highlighting how the dissemination and acceptance of development theory would not have been possible without a neo-colonial cultural hegemony which allowed for it to be accepted as beneficial for all (Shiva 2000). Furthermore, the Green Revolution pushed the countries that adopted it to switch from a food-first to export-first mentality displaying the true reasons for its widespread promotion: far from promoting food security in the



Global South, the Green Revolution was used to push Third World countries to begin farming large monocultures of lucrative crops for commerce in the global trade. This would benefit First World countries, as the harmful farming methods are conducted on foreign soil, while the global trade is conducted in dollars which allows countries in the Global North to gain a large buying power. Consequentially, First World countries are able to acquire cheap food without any of the negative health and environmental consequences that GMO farming produce (Garner 2009).

Similarly, foreign lending and structural redevelopment have taken the place of the colonial government in shaping newly independent States' pathways of development and to help maintain relationships of dependency. Environmental deregulation has allowed for the proliferation of TNCs who operate overseas where they are not compelled to respect the stringent environmental policies present in the Global North (Bryant 2005). Overseas companies such as the Newmont Mining Corporation are able to operate as they wish with little regard for population health, local livelihoods, and local soil and river quality, similarly to colonial powers who extracted and degraded local resources leaving little profit behind. Furthermore, when the Newmont enterprise began operating in the region, it started buying up plots of land from local farmers who were willing to sell. By exerting pressure on small-scale farmers, the mining corporation was able to buy up to 10,000 hectares of land which had previously been shared amongst a large number of farmers and families. The concentration of land in the hands of Newmont created a scarcity of land available for sale, thus pushing up acreage prices (Bury 2005). The increase in prices meant that local families could no longer afford to buy new plots of land displaying how the mining operation in the region had effectively dispossessed local populations of their land, similar to colonial times. These mechanisms may be found between corporations and local inhabitants across the Global South: far from helping countries develop, these events have set up relationships of dependence that replicate neo-colonial relations between the First and



Third World in which mining operations behave as they wish, degrading local livelihoods while exporting all profit abroad.

## CONCLUSION

Overall, it is evident that globalisation is a direct result of a number of economic policies and mechanisms which were used to spread free trade following the decolonisation period, thus maintaining the relationships of dependency set up during colonial times. The cultural hegemony established by colonial powers legitimised the “development” initiatives international bodies forced on the Third World, such as the Green Revolution, while today accumulation at the cost of local inhabitants’ dispossession is today carried out by Trans-National Corporations and Multinationals rather than the colonial State. In any case, the results are the same: local knowledge is devalued in favour of Western views, and although natural resources are systematically exploited, few profits are left behind for local inhabitants. Thus, although globalisation is presented as a counter to world poverty and hunger, it is evident that it has been used as a tool to spread capitalism throughout the world, unifying the world in a global trade in dollars. By providing Third World States with large sums of money, the IMF and World Bank gained huge influence on what these young States did with this money thus structurally redeveloping the world and replicating neo-colonial relationships of dependency.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Colonialism may be seen as the direct exertion of political and economic control of one country over another. It may or may not involve settler societies (Nandy 1982).

<sup>2</sup> Imperialism is the indirect exertion of political and or economic control of one country over another. Settlement is not involved (Nkrumah 2004).

<sup>3</sup> Globalisation is the process of interaction and exchange amongst governments, companies and people of information, goods and services (Dicken 2014).

<sup>4</sup> Cultural hegemony is a term coined by Antonio Gramsci. In Marxist literature it refers to the domination of a culturally diverse civilization by the ideology of the

ruling class/group. In this context the ideas of the dominant factions of society are circulated as naturalised laws (Martin 2002).

## REFERENCES

- A. Richard, W.I. Robinson (2005), *Critical Globalization Studies* (New York: Routledge).
- M. Agarwal (1989), *South-South Trade: Building Block or Bargaining Chip?*, in “Developing Countries and the Global Trading System”, pp. 189-209.
- J.M. Blaut (1989), *Colonialism and the Rise of Capitalism*, in “Science & Society”, 53, 3, pp. 260-296.
- P. Bond (2008), *Global Uneven Development, Primitive Accumulation and Political-Economic Conflict in Africa: The Return of the Theory of Imperialism*, in “Journal of Peacebuilding & Development”, 4.
- N. Bracarense (2012), *Development Theory and the Cold War: The Influence of Politics on Latin American Structuralism*, in “Review of Political Economy”, 24, 3, pp. 375-398.
- R. Bryant (2013), *Branding Natural Resources: Science, Violence and Marketing in the Making of Teak*, in “Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers”, 38, 4, pp. 517-530.
- R. Bryant, B. Sinéad (2005), *Third World Political Ecology* (London: Routledge).
- J. Bury (2008), *Transnational Corporations and Livelihood Transformations in the Peruvian Andes: An Actor-Oriented Political Ecology*, in “Human Organization”, 67, 3, pp. 307-321.
- J. Clapp, P. Dauvergne (2005), *Paths to a Green World- the Political Economy of the Global Environment* (Cambridge: MIT Press).
- P. Dicken (2014), *Global Shift* (London: Sage Publications).
- T.V. Dinh (2015), *Non-Alignment and Cultural Imperialism*, in “The Black Scholar”, 8, 3, pp. 39-49.
- D. Dollar, A. Kraay (2002), *Growth is Good for the Poor*, in “Journal of Economic Growth”, 7, 3, pp. 195-225.
- S. Dutta (2012), *Green Revolution Revisited: The Contemporary Agrarian Situation in Punjab, India*, in “Social Change”, 42, 2, pp. 229-247.
- J.H. Elliott (2006), *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492-1830* (North Yorkshire: Yale University).
- F. Fanon. (1967), *Black Skin, White Mask* (New York: Grove Press).
- P. Farmer (2004), *An Anthropology of Structural Violence*, in “Current Anthropology”, 45, 3, pp. 305-325.
- A.G. Frank (1982), *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment* (London: Macmillan).
- L.H. Gann (2016), *Rulers of Belgian Africa, 1884-1914* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press).
- C. Gasnier et al. (2009), *Glyphosate-Based Herbicides Are Toxic and Endocrine Disruptors in Human Cell Lines*, in “Toxicology”, 262, 3, pp. 184-191.
- L.C. Gray (1973), *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860* (Clifton: A.M. Kelley).
- W.C. Hamblet (2008), *Savage Constructions: The Myth of African Savagery* (Plymouth: Lexington Books).
- A. Hochschild (1998), *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroin in Colonial Africa* (New York: Houghton Mifflin).



- B. Hours (2007), *The Anthropology of Globalization. A Reader Edited by Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo*, in "Social Anthropology", 15, 1.
- E. Howton (2020), *Poverty. Overview*, by the World Bank, 16 Apr. [www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview](http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview).
- K.P. Jameson, C.K. Wilber (1996), *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment* (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- A. Jones (2012), *Human Geography: The Basics* (London: Routledge).
- M. Lange et al. (2006), *Colonialism and Development: A Comparative Analysis of Spanish and British Colonies*, in "American Journal of Sociology", 111, 5, pp. 1412-1462.
- R. Luxemburg, et al. (1971), *The Accumulation of Capital* (London: Routledge).
- J. Martin (2002), *Antonio Gramsci* (London: Routledge).
- A. Memmi, R. Bononno (2006), *Decolonization and the Decolonized* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota).
- A. Nandy (1982), *The Psychology of Colonialism: Sex, Age and Ideology in British India*, in "Psychiatry", 45, 3, pp. 197-219.
- K. Neves, J. Igoe (2012), *Uneven Development and Accumulation by Dispossession In Nature Conservation: Comparing Recent Trends In The Azores and Tanzania*, in "Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie", 103, 2, pp. 164-179.
- K. Nkrumah (2004), *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (Bedford: Panaf).
- E. Ortiz-Ospina (2017), *Is Globalization an Engine of Economic Development?*, in "Our World in Data", [ourworldindata.org/is-globalization-an-engine-of-economic-development](http://ourworldindata.org/is-globalization-an-engine-of-economic-development).
- S. Osha (2011), *Appraising Africa: Modernity, Decolonisation and Globalisation*, in "Philosophy and African Development: Theory and Practice", pp. 169-176.
- A.N. Porter (1994), *European Imperialism, 1860-1914* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan).
- W.W. Rostow (1964), *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: University Press).
- E. Said (1978), *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (London: Penguin Books).
- D. Scott (1995), *Colonial Governmentality*, in "Anthropologies of Modernity", pp. 21-49.
- V. Shiva (1993), *Monocultures of the Mind: Perspectives on Biodiversity and Biotechnology* (London: Zed Books).
- V. Shiva (2016), *Stolen Harvest: The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky).
- V. Shiva (2017), *Water Wars: Privatization, Pollution, and Profit* (Berkeley: North Atlantic Books).
- M.W. Solarz (2012), *"Third World": the 60th Anniversary of a Concept That Changed History*, in "Third World Quarterly", 33, 9, pp. 1561-1573.
- I. Wallerstein (1993), *The World-System after the Cold War*, in "Journal of Peace Research", 30, 1, pp. 1-6.
- L. Wolf-Phillips (1987), *Why "Third World"?: Origin, Definition and Usage*, in "Third World Quarterly", 9, 4, pp. 1311-1327.
- P. Worsley (1990), *Models of the Modern World-System*, in "Theory, Culture & Society", 7, 2-3, pp. 83-95.

