

E-ISSN: 2709-9369  
P-ISSN: 2709-9350  
[www.multisubjectjournal.com](http://www.multisubjectjournal.com)  
IJMT 2023; 5(11): 06-14  
Received: 05-09-2023  
Accepted: 09-10-2023

**Fatima Shehu Liberty**  
Ph.D., Department of Political  
Science, University of  
Maiduguri, Nigeria

**Bailey Saleh**  
Ph.D., Department of Political  
Science, University of  
Maiduguri, Nigeria

## **Post-modernism and mechanics of western dominance of international affairs**

**Fatima Shehu Liberty and Bailey Saleh**

### **Abstract**

Since the advent of modern civilization and the creation of modern territorial state structures, through to the periods of slavery, industrial revolution, colonialism, mercantilism up to the nascent age of globalization and globalism; the West has undoubtedly dominated international affairs. The mechanics which, the West employ and utilize in dominating World affairs includes such deliberate activities as: dominance of the United Nations and its sensitive organs (such as the UNSC), dominance of global politics and economy, role of Western Universities (intellectual properties), dominance of the world information system, dominance of international instruments of violence and Western legitimacy on international issues. The study is a qualitative one where secondary sources were, explored in generating data for the study. Documentary method was, largely adopted where published works such as textbooks, academic journals, magazines, newspapers and internet materials were, scrutinized in generating data. Other data sources utilized in generating data includes unpublished works such as monographs, academic dissertations/thesis, academic essays and conference papers. Concepts/theories of mechanics, dominance, international affairs/relations, hegemony, interdependence and global political economy; have been defined and clarified that served as frameworks for the study. The data generated was, analyzed through critical discourse and explanatory methods. At the end of the study, alternative solvents to western dominance in global affairs have been proffered; among which is the need for the ascendancy of a strong multilateralism to be guided by a rotational leadership of world affairs for a fixed one-term tenure not exceeding the period of two years.

**Keywords:** Mechanics, dominance, international affairs/international relations, hegemony, globalism, interdependence

### **Introduction**

The history of humankind from hunting and gathering stage to stone age; through metal age to machine age up to the nascent digital age have been characterized by struggles for survival and dominance. It is based on these complex struggles for survival and dominance/supremacy by one civilization or the other that have resulted into many kinds of wars that have bedeviled humankind throughout his existence on planet earth. Such that most of the international peaceful settlements/resolutions of global crises have ended up creating more advanced forms of crises than the ones solved. The cycles of these crises and crisis-resolutions as nations struggle to outdo each other; have been the main catalyst for the continuous innovations, ingenuity and invention of more techniques and technologies for the further productions of machines and weapons of war. All these mechanics as instruments of the post-modern era, are deliberately fashioned out to perpetuate Western dominance of international affairs more especially in the economic spheres. The comparative advantage, with which the West had been successfully prosecuting the wars of colonization throughout the world, was because of the superior firepower of their instruments of violence. Hence, it has continued to improve on, and invent new weapons of violence ahead of other countries in order to sustain this dominance through subtle intimidation (Wallerstein, 1989; Saleh & Bailey, 2014) [30, 25].

The West has employed and is still employing more, diverse mechanics to dominate the World perpetually (on continuous basis). Such mechanics includes dominance of the United Nations and its sensitive organs (more especially the UNSC), dominance of global politics and economy, role of Western Universities, dominance of the world information system, dominance of international instruments of violence, Western legitimacy on international issues, dominance of international organizations (WHO, UNODC, INTERPOL, etc) which are of course the creation of the West. Previous efforts by other regions/countries of the world to wriggle themselves out of the clutches (shackles) of this western dominance have been unfruitful and out rightly counter-productive.

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Fatima Shehu Liberty**  
Ph.D., Department of Political  
Science, University of  
Maiduguri, Nigeria

It is because of this perpetual logjam that the study is, embarked upon to unearth the realistic causes of this perpetual dominance and of the futility of other regions/countries to break away from this detrimental asymmetrical and diametric international relationship (Gilpin, 2001) <sup>[8]</sup>.

### Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

The concepts of mechanics, international affairs/relations, dominance and the theories of hegemony, interdependence and International Political Economy Theory or Global Political Economy Theory are hereby, defined and clarified as strong anchors on which the study is situated:

#### Mechanics

This simply means interacting bodies that causes equal and opposite forces and moments on each other. It refers to force deformation and motion as well as the relations between them. It involves momentum, force and acceleration of mass (variables - matters, individuals, groups, nations and trans-national organizations). All these bodies are constantly interacting with each other in unbalanced and dynamic ways. The unbalanced interaction represents deformation (exploitations) and dynamism; which ultimately represents motion and change. Whenever these interactions ceases, it marks the end of entire human life forms. As such, the principles of mechanics is not only limited to locomotives via machines; but more applicable to humans, societies and nation-states that are constantly in motion and interacting with each other with regularity, consistency and continuity in a dynamic way (Pratat & Ruina, 2001) <sup>[22]</sup>.

#### Dominance

To dominate is to control or have a lot of influence over somebody/something especially in an unpleasant way. Domineering attitude is the act of trying to control other people without considering their wishes, opinions or feelings. While, the act of dominance is to achieve or assert dominance over somebody, a group or an entity in terms of political, economic, military, etc. The dominant group (domineer) often and usually dictates its wishes to the dominated group, and demands unconditional compliance and conformity with them. This dominance could be coercive (as was the case during slave trade and colonialism) or subtle (as was the case during mercantilism and now in the period of globalization and globalism). The West has employed and still; utilizes the two unofficial means to dominate the World since the inception of industrial revolution to the nascent post-cold war era (Wallerstein, 1989, Saleh & Bailey, 2014) <sup>[30, 25]</sup>.

#### International Affairs and International Relations

Increasingly international affairs is associated with how citizens of the world conduct themselves and carry out activities within their countries and internationally. These activities could be, directed at attaining individual, group/corporate, national and regional interests. However, it should be, noted that the world is not a weird system, but a very organized one that is guided by national and international laws. This brings us to sovereign governmental powers for regulating these affairs through foreign policy instruments as nations relate with each other (international relations).

Hence, international relations has been defined by Holsti (1978) <sup>[10]</sup>, as “all forms of interactions between members of

separate societies whether government sponsored or not”. He went on to add that international relations would include analysis of foreign policies or political processes between nations; but with its interests in all facets of relations between distinct societies.

For Legg and Morrison (1971) <sup>[18]</sup> the subject of international relations is concerned with all forms of interactions between members of separate entities across national boundaries of nation-states. These interactions cover political, economic, cultural, social, technological, environmental, security and military dimensions. It could be peaceful contact or violent contact and must involve at least two entities, and must take place across national boundaries. Ofoegbu (1985) <sup>[21]</sup> on the other hand defines international relations as all interactions between actors in the international system. He categorizes international relations into four groups namely: (i) International Political Relations – which is concerned with political issues only, such as competition, compromises, and every form of struggle aimed at the allocation of values. (ii) International Economic Relations – which covers economic issues only. It reflects on international economic order, trade, loan issues, debts, aids, sanctions etc. (iii) Cultural International Relations – comprising issues like cultural and intellectual exchanges etc.; and (iv) Private International Relations – embracing contacts between individuals at a private capacity, but which cuts across national boundaries such as maintaining a pen-pal friend abroad. The emergence of powerful social media via the internet such as facebook, twitter, youtube, instagram, 2go, whatsapp, and other instantaneous means of interactions across the globe have increase the tempo and magnitude of private international relations on an unimaginable level. Here the involvement of the State is minimal, and can be restricted only to the issuance of passports and visas where physical movements of private actors are involved.

The division of international relations by Ofoegbu above is only a matter of convenience as most of them do overlap. For instance, economics and politics cannot be, separated in international relations. After all, almost all cross-national relations have economic undertones. Likewise, private relations which though personal to the individual, but it now have both political and economic linkages. Furthermore, Taylor (1979) <sup>[31]</sup> defines International Relations as a discipline, which tries to explain political activities across state boundaries. Taylor’s definition is not only simplistic; but also narrowed down to political issues. This presents an incomplete view of international relations because it has grown so large and wide beyond Ofoegbu’s and Taylor’s typologies to include; international economics, international business, international finance, international security, international wars, technological, environmental, etc. While, Joseph (1999) <sup>[12]</sup>, on his part views International relations as the study of all forms of interactions that exist between members of separate entities or nations within the international system.

International relations, is thus concerned with every form of interactions between and amongst nations. Such cross-national interactions can also occur between corporations, social, sub-regional, regional and trans-national economic groups. Examples are interactions between member states of the OPEC, D. 8, International Human Rights Commissions, BRICS, G. 7, etc. The moment such interactions crosses a state’s boundary it is of interest to the study of International Relations. International relations recognize and respond to

the fact that the foreign policy goals that nations pursue can be a matter of permanent consequences to some or all of the other nations. Brown (1988) <sup>[2]</sup> thus defines international relations as the process of investigating and studying of patterns of actions and reactions among sovereign states as represented by their governing elites. Just like Taylor, Brown's definition is limited to governmental officials; which also present an incomplete view of the concept. Some scholars see power as the key to international politics. Thus, they define international relations as the subject that deals with those relations among nations, which involve power status. Hoffman (1973) <sup>[9]</sup>, on his part states that the discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and activities, which affect the external policies and power of the basic units into which the world is divided. Thus, international relations is concerned with all the exchanges, transactions, contacts, flow of information and the resulting behavioral responses between and among separate organized societies. International relations could encompass many different activities - social, economic, religious and so forth; in so far as, they have implications for international political relations.

In stressing on the strategic role of international relations in the international system, Deutsch (1968) <sup>[34]</sup> emphasized that an introduction to the study of international relations in our time is an introduction to the art and science of the survival of humankind. That if civilization is, killed in the nearest future; it will not be, killed by famine or plague, but by foreign policy and international relations. His view of international relations implies the inevitability of the concept in the survival of the international system itself. The point expressed here is that we can cope with hunger and pestilence, but we cannot deal with the power of our own weapons and our own behavior as nation states. It is important to note that since the end of World War I, nation states have possessed unprecedented instruments for national action in the form of ideologies and weapons. They have become even more, dangerous vehicles of international conflict; carrying the potential for its escalation to mutual destruction and ultimate annihilation. The nation state holds the power to control most events within its borders, but few events beyond them. It is thus decisively important for the student of political science with specialization in international relations to understand that the world of today is, marked by two factors. One factor has to do with the nature of power in the age of the atom; the other concerns the interdependence of humankind in an age of the rising importance of the humanism (individual human being) in international interaction. Therefore, international relations is increasingly becoming the light bearer and a very important instrument for moderating the behaviors of state-actors and other non – state-actors alike towards the attainment of a sustainable global peace; where it ensure the convergence of interests, impotence of the atom and the ascendancy of interdependence of humankind.

From the few definitions given above, several elements have been, sieved as follows:

- That international relations involves actors who are the participants and determinants of the complexion and flares of interactions in the international environment. These actors can be sovereign (state actors) and non-sovereign (non-state actors) actors. The sovereign actors are the core participants because they have monopoly of the power to conduct international relations through their foreign policy instruments. Non -

state-actors have not, got that power; where they serve as peripheral actors. Their roles in foreign policy formulation, is advisory where they often lobby to get their inputs onto foreign policy agenda setting.

- That there is an international system and this is the environment, arena and theatre where the interactions take place.
- That international relations at whatever level must go beyond the boundaries of nation-states. That is, no matter the proximity of one country to the other; once interaction between the two has transcended beyond each other's boundary, then international relations has taken place.
- That international relations also involves non-state actors like: international governmental organizations (IGOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), trans-national business organizations (TNBOs), multi-national corporations (MNCs) or even individuals.

Therefore, a working definition will be attempted at this juncture. Thus, the concept international relations can be defined as the sum total of all interactions, contacts, and transactions that take place between the different international actors across national boundaries in the international system. It is multi-dimensional covering economic, political, social, cultural, security, environmental, military, financial, humanitarian, technological, climatic, demographic, gender issues, business, etc. No matter what, state-actors have remained the major determinants of all international interactions because of monopoly of foreign policy and instruments of coercion.

### Hegemony Theory

Hegemony refers to that form of behavior associated with the use of capabilities by nation states to create, construct or sustain structures of cooperation and influence whose goal could result in the emergence of public good defined in terms of shared common values, such as economic, security or the sustenance of cultural traditions. The pursuit of the ideals of hegemony could, at times be accompanied by predatory side effects such as the plunder of the resources of other states (Calleo, 1987) <sup>[4]</sup>. Gramsci in James Joll (1977) <sup>[11]</sup> espouses two ways to hegemony: one based on persuasion or consensus building and another based on the use of force (which represents point of interjection between hegemony and the realist theory).

The bottom-line of hegemony theory is that; the hegemonic nation and its people; imbued with sense of mission to bequeath to the world or in their area (sphere of influence), a legacy that echoed the rhyme of their own notions of themselves in relation to others. It as well reflects the extent to which the resources at their disposal allowed the accomplishment of those tasks. The springboard for the nurturing of this disposition could well be psychological which constructs images in the psyche of an individual, groups or even nation states bordering on the debunked concept of 'big-man chauvinism' in the distribution of power based mainly on class and economic status (Mazrui, 1995) <sup>[32]</sup>.

Nevertheless, the propensity for the occurrence of hegemony, especially with regard to the construction of international structures of cooperation has been associated with nation states, which for over four hundred years has persisted as a context within which capabilities could be,

legitimately and easily mobilized to support foreign policy behavior based on those sentiments.

**Interdependence Theory:** The 'Interdependence Theory' was, first introduced by two American Psychologists Harold Kelley and John Thibaut in 1959 but it was completely formalized as a Theory in 1978. In their two works: *The Social Psychology of Groups* (1959) and *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence* (1978); they see Interdependence Theory as part of a large scale of social exchange theories. Whereas, social theories look at how people exchange rewards and costs in a relationship.

Interdependence is the manner in which, and the degree to which interacting individuals (organizations or state actors) act upon or influence one another's experiences with reference to the fact that the preferences, motives and behavior of the individuals (organizations or state actors); are relevant to those of the interacting partner(s). The defining feature of interpersonal (inter-group) relationships is the interdependence between partners (be it individuals, corporate groups or even nation states). Interdependence is an elemental feature of social experience. Interdependence theory identifies interaction as a core feature of all interpersonal (inter-organizational or inter-state) relationships. Like all social exchange theories, outcomes can be, conceptualized in terms of rewards and costs. Rewards equal positive consequences of an interaction; and costs refer to negative consequences. Individuals (organizations or state actors) are, assumed to be, goal-oriented; implicitly seeking to obtain good outcomes and avoid bad outcomes in their relationships (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) <sup>[13]</sup>.

Keohane and Nye (1977) <sup>[14]</sup> were among the pioneering scholars who adapted a hitherto psychological theory of interdependence to serve as a framework for the analysis of phenomena in international relations. This was further, hinged on their perceived limitations of behaviouralism in international relations, which they believe is, clouded in large intuitive judgment that is often; brought to bear in the analysis of phenomena whose background conditions to use Nye's words, "were in a state of flux". They were of the views that state actors armed with sovereign power; can effectively utilize economic relations instrument of foreign policy to earn greater economic reward in an interdependent and competitive international system. Here, the use of force occasioned by high cost in international relations is, downplayed. Building on their work of 1977, Keohane and Nye (1987, p.730) <sup>[16]</sup>, stress that from the foreign policy standpoint, the problem of individual governments is how to benefit from international exchanges while maintaining as much autonomy as possible.

They further maintain that in an increasingly interdependent world, persuasion which is the hallmark of interdependence, is the ability of state actors to get desired outcomes in a competitive international environment. Nye (2004) <sup>[33]</sup> went further and cited such events of the late 1980s and early 1990s, which witnessed the end of cold war, the collapse of the Soviet Union and most significantly the resurgence and ascendancy of international economic relations. He envisages the challenge under which, that has imposed on the need to develop appropriate paradigm and insight into the conditions under which it could evolve, succeed or even fail. He went on to add that economic interdependence engenders mutual multilateral cooperation among state actors. While stressing on the nexus between globalism and

interdependence, he went further to state that globalism is a state of the world involving networks of interdependence (involving economic exchanges) at multi-continental distances.

While, making his contribution to the interdependence theory, Adeniji (2007, pp.97-98) <sup>[1]</sup> states that the world today is a network of exchange of goods and services; and that it is valid to say that we today live in an interdependent world in which hardly any nation can be said to be totally independent of others in respect of its needs. He went on to reiterate that interdependence put in the hands of state actors a major weapon with which they can manipulate other states to attain desired policy objectives. This the West is doing to, perpetually dominate the World.

Therefore, with the right political leaderships who are desirous of the economic development of their countries; other non-Western countries stand to benefit more from this new paradigm of international economic interdependence among state actors in the years ahead. They can do it by evolving their own semi-local content economic development strategies that are independent of western prescriptions in their economic relations with the West. This is necessary because in a competitive World where success depends on your ability to get desired outcomes because others want what you want; it is highly unlikely that your co-competitors would sell to you development ideas that will make you surpass and outdo them in the global economic contest. Thus, the need for a re-course to local content strategic thinking will enable you come up with unique products that you can market with ease in the international market under the interdependence paradigm.

### **Global Political Economy Theory (International Political Economy Theory)**

The Global Political Economy also called International Political Economy Theory was, popularized by Robert Cox (1987) <sup>[5]</sup>, and Robert Gilpin (2001) <sup>[8]</sup> who, treaded on the path of David Ricardo and Adam Smith (1776). The theory looks at how power relations, international economics and politics interact in the international environment. They maintain that there are three main strands of International Political Economy, which include Economic Liberalism, Mercantilism and Marxism. However, economic globalization is the fourth strand, which they omitted.

- Economic Liberalism, following in the tradition of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, stresses the value of a capitalist market economy that operates according to its own laws and, when freely allowed to do so, maximizes benefits for individuals, companies and nations. The World Trade Organization (WTO) embodies the values espoused by this strand of International Political Economy.
- Mercantilism holds that the economy should be, used to enhance state power, and thus be subordinate to politics. Protectionist and other policies that minimize dependence on other states are, promoted, as are policies of state-led development.
- Marxism sees the economy as a crucible of exploitation and inequality between classes, one in which the dominant economic class also dominates politically. It holds that capitalist development contains contradictions that will eventually produce crisis conditions affecting both social classes and nation states. Within International Political Economy Theory, "world system theory" describes the capitalist

international economic system as consisting of core, peripheral and semi peripheral areas defined by their modes of labour control and specializations. In doing so, these theorists promote greater recognition of how underdeveloped countries are exploited by those with the monopoly of global capital.

- Economic globalization is the fourth strand of the nascent international political economy, which the western worlds have devised through the New Global Agenda. The economic liberalization agenda was so fashioned by the industrialized north to, further entangle the unfortunate underdeveloped countries by perpetually incorporating them into the traps of international finance and capital. With this subtle global economic policy, it will further opened-up the economies of third world countries to more exploitation by the industrialized countries. This will further exacerbate the entanglement of their economies to International Finance Capital and of their perpetuation to the shackles of dependency (Gilpin, 2001, Saleh, 2008) [8, 23].

As such, as it was with economic liberalism and mercantilism, economic globalism shielded by convergence theory, is an advance form and a more lethal instrument for the plunder and exploitation of the resources of third world countries. This is because the formulation of these NGA, are exclusive to the Northern hemisphere. The unfortunate countries of the South were not, consulted at the formulation stage; but were, forced not only to accept, but also to domesticate these NGA at their perils. This is to further increase Western prosperity and their perpetual dominance of international affairs (Wallerstein, 1989; Saleh, 2008) [30, 23].

### **Mechanics Employed By the West to Perpetually Dominate International Affairs**

As briefly stated earlier under the introduction, the Western world since the evolution of industrial revolution has created one kind of mechanic or the other towards consolidating and perpetuating their dominance of international affairs. Such mechanics are as outlined and critically discussed below:

### **Dominance of the United Nations and its sensitive organs (more especially the United Nations security council [UNSC])**

Though the task of maintaining a sustainable global security traditionally rest with the UN-Security Council(UNSC), the West through their dominance of veto power, has found it expedient to bulldozed her way whenever her interest is at stake in any region of the world. The UN had been stampeded by the West into giving approval for most of the international coalition wars fought by the Western countries throughout the world in the post-cold war era; more especially those of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003. This dominance in the UN-Security Council is, played out where out of the five permanent members, three are Western countries that comprises of the United States, Britain and France. While, the remaining two non-western countries are Russia and China. Russia is an East European country; while China is an Asian country. Each of these five permanent members can veto the decision of the UNSC on sensitive international security issues; where the interest of parties in conflict or those of the non-permanent members

are of no relevance. Thus, with three powerful members, the West through lobby or coercion of any sort can influence and sway the decision of the UN and UNSC in its favour towards the perpetual domination of international affairs (Taureck, 2006; Saleh, *et al* 2012) [27, 24].

### **Dominance of international organizations (who, UNODC, Interpol, etc.).**

Apart from the fact that the headquarters of most international organizations are located in western countries, the WHO (WHO), UNODC and INTERPOL are effectively being utilized by the West as instruments for the perpetuation of their hold on world affairs. The WHO in particular which is largely financed by the West, often rolls out drugs and other medicament to unfortunate countries of the third world as aids towards fighting scourges of life-threatening diseases. These aids and assistance are, always accompanied by strings of conditionalities. These requirements are deliberately, fashioned out by the West to arm-twist the recipient countries to live in perpetual abeyance to the donors. The setting up of the International Police Organization (INTERPOL) is, meant to share intelligence information among countries that will further protect the economic interest of the West. The UN-Office on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC), which is setup by the United Nations; is *ab-initio* a Western project for fighting illicit drugs, narcotics and criminal gang activities throughout the world more especially where western economic interest is at stake (Gilpin, 2001; Saleh, 2008) [8, 23].

### **Dominance of global politics and economy**

The post-cold war western victors are simultaneously utilizing both politics and economy as forerunners of their New Global Agenda (NGA) for the perpetuation of their dominance of international affairs. In the pursuit of the political mechanic for the consolidation of their dominance of international affairs, the West relies heavily on the imposition of the NGA of democracy and democratization on non-western countries (the study limited this agenda to these categories because the West is keeping blind eyes on Europe's last dictator, Alexander Lukashenko of Belarus). In pursuit of this democratic agenda, the emergent western powers with centrality and harmony of purpose, attached the strings of democracy and democratization to all bi-lateral and multilateral aids and technical assistance to transiting economies of Europe, third world countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America, Pacific & the Caribbean regions and all the defunct Soviet Republics. Most of these countries, which found themselves in webs of leadership and structural crises, are under pressure by the inevitable exigencies of the New World Order, with its number one agenda of democracy and democratization to patronize these aids and technical assistance by abiding with the democratic conditionality (Saleh, *et al*, 2012; Saleh, 2016) [24, 26].

The pursuit of the NGA of democracy & democratization (core global goal) by the West is tilted towards 'Global Corporate Governance' whose main feature is good governance (that is accountable, equitable, fair, efficient, lawful, representative/pro-people and transparent). Global corporate governance whose emphasis is on the empowerment of the Organized Private Sector (OPS) and Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) is inclined towards the provision of global public goods. The multiplicity of these, interactions tend to erode and

undermine the system, authority, legitimacy, policy-making capacity and policy implementing effectiveness of more especially non-western countries. Apart from the aids and technical assistance, which the west imposed on the rest of the world to democratize; it has through coalition, used force to remove undemocratic regimes as evidenced in the sacking of the Taliban government in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussain in Iraq between 2001 and 2003. Even when these two wars were initially targeted against terrorism; but the ulterior motive of the West is to enthrone democratic governance in the above two countries (Taureck, 2006; Saleh, 2008) <sup>[27, 23]</sup>.

Economic liberalization as one of the western mechanics for the dominance of international affairs, made the western donor countries to tailor yet another program aimed at liberalizing the economies of unfortunate non-western countries. Through the free market economy, the West has been the greatest producer of consumer goods, which are continually being, fostered on the rest of the world; the price of which is according to their terms.

The centrality of the western economic interest, which of course translates into the basic philosophy behind the western economic liberalization conditionality, is to open up the rich but under-utilized third world economies for western investment. As such, the principle of good governance, which goes hand-in-hand with liberalization conditionality, are so emphasized to create liberalized political and economic system throughout the world. Alluding to this position, Don D. Marshall in his analysis of the Caribbean development crisis mainly attributed it to the subjugation of the country's economy to the claws of the West. He in addition stated that the recent application of newer technologies to the industrial base of the world economy and the parallel changes taking place in the ideological sphere is shaping the backdrop against which current Caribbean development planning must take place. He also agreed that restructuring global capitalism (marked by changing production, technology and increasing capital mobility) and the ideological ascendancy of neo-liberalism have together shaped a new development paradigm (Marshall, 1996, p. 447) <sup>[19]</sup>.

General Agreement on Trade and Tariff (GATT) and World Trade Organization (WTO) are western instruments fashioned out to provide favorable conditions to expand their economic domination of the world through trade and commerce. In addition, the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) entered into force on January 1, 1995 at the end of Uruguay Round with binding rules was to promote liberalization of services, trade, and investment flow. Over one hundred and sixty-five countries have so far ascended (signed as members) of the WTO. The WTO Ministerial Declaration of Doha of November, 2001 particularly agreed to negotiations on the reduction or elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers for environmental goods and services as part of the negotiations on trade and services within the GATS framework. The Seattle and Cancun Ministerial Conferences did not alter the status-quo. In addition, individual Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) by western countries, were entered into with more especially unfortunate third world countries to further provide favorable climates for western goods, services and values to be exported more easily and cheaply to these virgin regions. The Trade Policy Review (TPR), which is the 'policeman' of the WTO, plays a fundamentally important role in auditing and surveillance of national trade

policies (Thomas, 2001; Saleh & Saleh, 2014) <sup>[29, 25]</sup>.

Apart from the GATT, GATS and WTO, the monopoly status of the West over the World Bank/IBRD and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), made the two powerful global financial institutions (GFIs) serve as very effective instruments for perpetuating the economic dominance of the world by the western countries. As the most- inevitable apex lending financial institutions in the world, the West utilizes them optimally to further 'cow' and exploit countries of the Southern hemisphere through high and criminal interest rates as well as inextricable conditionalities. The unprecedented successes of these western economic mechanics for the domination of the world, made Saleh *et al* (2012) <sup>[24]</sup> to conclude that if there is a period in the history of humankind that the West has enjoyed trade boom, it is now. That new global items such as the computers (and accessories), GSM, internet, digitization soft and hardware are dumped in the markets of third world countries who; not only have high appetites for them, but also sees all these compacts as a vogue.

The Group of Seven most industrialized countries of the world (G. 7) that is largely dominated by the West is set up to dictate the tone of international economic direction of the world. Membership of the G. 7 which includes; Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United States of America and United Kingdom shows that only Japan is a non-western country. It is therefore, another western initiated economic instrument of dominance of international affairs. The annual World Economic Summit often held in Davos Switzerland is in furtherance of this course (Saleh & Saleh, 2014) <sup>[25]</sup>.

### **Role of Western Universities**

It is disheartening to note that even in this 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the curriculum of most third world universities are still tailored strictly in conformity with those of western universities. The styles of teaching and learning as well as style of writing projects, thesis and research are still religiously tied to western format of more especially American Psychological Association (APA) styles from the first to the current 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. This is a deliberate intellectual ploy by the west to subjugate the intellectual thinking of the rest of the world to their claws and of ensuring perpetual dependence. This is consciously fashioned and carried out to ensure their monopolistic intellectual dominance of global affairs. Furtherance to this, the West has arrogated to itself the control of world intellectual property where it alone dictates the standard of right or wrong. Whatever it decides in this regard is binding on the rest of the world, who had no prior knowledge of how these decisions are made because of lack of prior consultations. Moreover, these decisions are, meant to serve western interests better. Whereas, what is required of the rest of the world is acquiesces (Saleh & Bailey, 2014) <sup>[25]</sup>.

### **Dominance of the World Information System**

The evolution of miniaturized circuitry equipments have given birth to communication revolution of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries. The rise of the computer, GSM, internet, digitization and cable TV and Radio channels have enabled instantaneous communications among millions of people across the world simultaneously. All these are effective instruments or channels for the hegemonic west to advertise and market their products (goods and services) and unfortunately their culture. More specifically, the dynamics of social networking enabled by the development of high-

tech such as the internet facilities has introduced a highly faster means of spatial interactions among global citizens of the world. Information about people, products, opportunities, goods and services are disseminated to millions of global citizens simultaneously and instantaneously (at the same time within seconds) via twitters, face-book, you-tube, 2 go, whatsapp, instagram and other social network media. Accessing of such products, goods and services can be, done with minimal contact between origins and destinations thereby saving costs, time and efforts. It means the availability of the same information to many and different people from different parts of the world at the same time. Here the Line that is, employed to connect people within Points in vast areas with great distances is the internet facilities. The Points are made-up of origins and destinations. Other similar modern means of spatial interactions (Lines) include international radio & television channels and the Global System of Mobile communication (GSM) (Taureck, 2006; Saleh & Saleh, 2014) <sup>[27, 25]</sup>.

Improved transportation system as one of the Lines, has simultaneously improved communication across the world. Spatial interactions are on the increase where the mode of transportation is highly improved between Points. Improved transportation system such as good networks of roads and railway lines; fast moving steam-engine cargo ships and boats; as well as aircrafts and large cargo airlines enhances faster and easier movements of humans, goods, services and information from areas of surplus to areas of demands. Most of these means of transportations have by-passed physical distance and other barriers to connectivity and accessibility in spatial interactions. The air services in particular enable goods and services to be, delivered to destination points within hours across greater physical distances often covering thousands of kilometers. The transportation of fresh flowers from Kenya (origin point) to Europe (destination point) within hours without losing their freshness is a function of improved transportation (Lines) between origins and destinations. Whereas, capital goods: such as heavy machineries and equipments are still being conveyed by larger and fast moving cargo ships from places of origin to destination points. In addition, there is an increasing interplay between social networking and the employment of Lines where goods ordered through internet services are actually delivered to customers either, by road, rail, water or air services with minimal physical contact between the buyer and the supplier (Kessides, 2006, Saleh & Bailey, 2014) <sup>[17, 25]</sup>.

### **Dominance of international instruments of violence**

The ideological rivalry that existed between the West and the East during the cold war period resulted into unprecedented manufacture and stockpile of varieties of arms and weapons. This led to the indiscriminate proliferation of arms/weapons across the world. Weapons were almost freely, given by each of the two superpowers either to loyal governments or to rebels fighting enemy regimes. The era also witnessed the emergence of black missiles popularly called MANPAD. The development of Weapon of Mass Destruction (MAD) such as nuclear and biological weapons in the third world countries was, blindly carried out by the two big powers to serve as deterrence strategy. Being the major producers of weapons of violence globally - the west had to consolidate their dominance of global affairs through the formation of the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization (NATO). United Nations-backed arms/weapons limitation and nuclear non-proliferation resolutions and treaties are mostly at the prompting of the hegemonic western countries. These resolutions and treaties are deliberately, initiated and fashioned by the west to stop other countries from acquiring nuclear capability that will put them at parity (Saleh, 2008) <sup>[23]</sup>.

### **Western legitimacy on international issues**

The increasing and unfettered multi-polar responsibility which the West arrogated to itself after the cold war; propelled it to play a dominant role in international affairs from 1992 to date (2017). After the end of the cold war, the West considers itself as victorious having displaced the USSR (now Russia) from global political relevance. Basking in the euphoria of this victory, the triumphal Western powers represented by USA, Canada, France, Britain, Germany, Italy and by extension their strong Asian ally – Japan; now sit on top of global affairs and dictate specific sets of agenda to all countries of the world in line with their historical capitalist interest. This gave birth to a New World Order (NWO), which is under the hegemonic control and dictate of the western block spearheaded by the United States of America. The victorious west constituted themselves into an informal global directorate; where they execute all these New Global Agenda (NGA) in consonance with the broader aspirations of the liberal philosophy they practiced throughout history. The unilateral control of the nascent global affairs by the West is, based on the fact they contribute the largest share of the total funding of the United Nations. This consolidated standpoint made them to be the ultimate determinants of global norms and values. These values (agenda) are, vigorously pursued by the West and imposed on weaker and less developed countries of the world without respect for sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, cultural practices and international equality as enshrined in the noble Charters of the United Nations (Brown, 1988; Saleh, *et al*, 2012) <sup>[2, 24]</sup>.

The issue of human right is one of those global norms which the West arrogated to itself the power of enforcement globally. The pursuit of this agenda by the West is so carried out unilaterally without due consultations with other countries. Intricately interwoven with the logic of democratization as preached by the west is the conscious agenda of accelerating the tempo of consolidation of liberal political systems that respect human dignity and guarantee human rights and freedom (Gilpin, 2001) <sup>[8]</sup>.

In order to ensure smooth enforcement of this western-culture based human right, the West established the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC) at The Hague as well as the International Police Organization (INTERPOL) as strong legal instruments to ensure the restoration/redemption of violated rights of citizens across the world. The western-dominated United Nations Security Council (UNSC) often rely on these instruments to ensure the promotion, protection and enforcement of the philosophy and principles of fundamental human rights under international law at the international level. The ICC has been empowered to arrest and prosecute leaders or persons indicted for war crimes or crimes against humanity. Though the ICC under its former Chief Prosecutor Louis Moreno Okampo has succeeded in arresting former Bosnian warlords, former Liberian warlord - cum leader-Charles Taylor, former Congolese warlords, some Rwandan key players in the war of genocide and the

perpetrators of 2007 post-election violence in Kenya who are undergoing trials; there are still gray areas for international law in this regard. The blind eyes paid to Europe's last dictator – Alexander Lukashenko of Belarus and the massive denials of human rights in Communist China and Russia by the international community, are still major challenges before international law towards the protection and enforcement of the philosophy and principles of fundamental human rights. In addition, the inability of the ICC and member-countries to arrest and prosecute President Hassan Omar Al-Bashir of Sudan over gross human rights violations against the people of Darfur, still leaves much to be desired on the effort towards guaranteeing individual rights. The unwillingness of countries that are signatories to ICC to arrest and handover Al-Bashir to the Court when he visited them; serve as a very huge drawback to international law towards the protection and enforcement of fundamental human rights at the international level (Thomas, 2001; Saleh, *et al.*, 2012) <sup>[29, 24]</sup>.

Even when the doctrine of human rights has been upheld and justified under international law; the world is increasingly being faced with more serious problems associated with its enforcement more especially in religious and culture-based societies. The genesis of modern human rights is rooted in western culture that is coming into constant clash with the religion and culture of most traditional and closed societies. In trado-religious societies; homosexuality, stealing, adultery, murder, and other deviant behaviors are considered as crimes as well as sins because the norms and rules of these societies have criminalized the committal of such unwholesome behaviors. Most of these norms have been entrenched in the statute books / constitutions of most countries. However, the progenitors of modern human rights (the West), are increasingly justifying the committal of some of such heinous crimes - more especially homosexuality (gay) which they described as the freedom and fundamental rights of those profane criminals engaged in it. If adultery, stealing and murder are punishable offences because they go against the general societal norms, then homosexuality which is the worst pervasive and deviant behavior against the norms of three-quarter ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) of the world's population must be regarded as a serious crime and sin by all societies. This is, backed by the works of Cranston (1967) <sup>[6]</sup> and Obaseki (1992) <sup>[20]</sup>.

Whereas, if the West insist that homosexuality is not a crime but the perpetrator's right; then adultery, terrorism, stealing, murder, drug abuse and other criminal offences should as well be excused as the absolute rights of those that engaged in those acts. It is an undeniable fact that the rise and growth of religious fundamentalism among adherents of both Christian and Moslem religions; were triggered by the growing pervasive and unwholesome practice of homosexuality (Sodomy) as propagated by western governments. A pointer to this is the passing into law by the French Parliament on January 27, 2013 of the "Gay Right Act" making France the twelfth country of the West that has officially approved of Gay Relationship and Marriage (BBC, 2013) <sup>[3]</sup>. This is so because highly religious and traditional societies consider homosexuality as a taboo, a sin and an abominable act. In so, far as homosexuality (gay) and other unwholesome practices are being, shielded by the West under the guise of human rights, it will continue to infringe on the rights of the greater majority of the citizens of the world. Whereas, the ideal practice of human right; should be such that an individual's right stops where another

person's rights starts; to the extent that there is no room for the overlapping of rights. In addition, the collective rights of the greater majority in line with good behaviors must supersede the illegitimate rights of a very few profane social deviants within the society (Adeniji, 2007) <sup>[1]</sup>.

Unless and until when homosexuality (gay) and other unwholesome behaviors are criminalized by both the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and International Criminal Court (ICC) under international law; the continued promotion and enforcement of the principle of human rights worldwide will not only be counter-productive, but it will open more channels to the abuse of rights of many others. It is the position of this paper that after being, criminalized by both the ICJ and ICC, it should be, domesticated by all countries. This will simmer down religious fundamentalism in all its ramifications across the world.

### Conclusion

From the analysis so far, it has been, established that the West since the period of industrial revolution has deliberately schemed how to maintain a permanent hold on world affairs so as, to perpetuate its economic, political, military and scientific/technological dominance. This, it attained through capitalist mechanics it initiated from slave trade, mercantilism, colonialism, neo-colonialism to globalization & globalism. The study has also established that the authority of the West is increasingly being challenged by the rest of the world more especially religious/culture-based societies who are kicking against the unwholesome western culture of homosexuality. The study discovered that this pervasive act of *gay* is the main cause of insurgencies (or even terrorism) which is puritanical in nature and approach. As such, so long the West does not open wide its windows to receive and accommodate religious and cultural rights of other global citizens; it is certainly heading to its doom.

### References

1. Adeniji A. Introduction to Foreign Policy. Abuja: National Open University of Nigeria Publication; c2007.
2. Brown S. International Relations in a Changing Global System. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press; c1988.
3. BBC. BBC-News Report. London: BBC Broadcasting House; c2013.
4. Calleo D. Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of Western Alliance. USA: Wheatsheaf Books; c1987.
5. Cox R. Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History. New York: Columbia University Press; c1987.
6. Cranston M. Human Rights: Real and Supposed. In: Raphael (ed.) Political Theory and the Right of Man; c1967.
7. Deutch W. The Analysis of International Relations. Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall; c1967.
8. Gilpin R. Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order. New Jersey: Princeton University Press; c2001.
9. Hoffman S. The Acceptability of Military Force. In: Force in Modern Societies: Its Place in International Politics. Adelphi, 102. London: International Institute of Security Studies; c1973.
10. Holsti KJ. The Nation's Roles of Conception in the Study of Foreign Policy. International Studies Quarterly, No. 14. Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge



- University Press; c1978.
11. Joll J. Gramsci; c1997.
  12. Joseph O. The Concept and Practice of International Relations. Abuja: Joe Cyrus Ventures; c1999.
  13. Kelley HH, Thibaut JW. Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence. New York: Wiley & Sons – Inter-science; c1978.
  14. Keohane RO, Nye JS. Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. Boston: Little Brown & Co; c1977.
  15. Keohane RO. After hegemon, cooperation and discord. World Political Economy. Princeton: Princeton University Press; c1984.
  16. Keohane RO, Nye JS. Power and interdependence Revisited. International Organization. 1987;41(4):725-753.
  17. Kessides C. Urban Transition in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implication for Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction. Washington D. C.: World Bank; c2006.
  18. Legg RK, Morrison MJ. Politics and International System: An Introduction. New York: Harper & Row; c1971.
  19. Marshall DD. From the Triangular Trade to NAFTA: A Neo-Structuralist Insight into Missed Opportunities. Third World Quarterly. 1996;17(3):447
  20. Obaseki AO. The Judiciary and Human Rights. In: Awa U. Kalu and Yemi Osinbajo (eds.), Perspective on Human Rights. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Justice; c1992.
  21. Ofoegbu R. Towards a New Philosophy of Foreign Policy in Nigeria. In: Akinyemi, B. A. (eds.), Nigeria's Foreign Policy. Ibadan: University Press; c1985.
  22. Pratap R, Ruina A. Introduction to Statics and Dynamics. Oxford, U. K.: Oxford University Press; c2001.
  23. Saleh B. New Global Agenda and the Role of United States of America in World Politics. Jos: Midland Press Ltd; c2008.
  24. Saleh. Domestication of the New Global Agenda by Nigeria. International Journal of Administration and Development Studies (IJADS); c2012, 3(2).
  25. Saleh B, Bailey AS. A Paradigm for Politico-Spatial Interactions under Globalization, National Development Studies. 2014;8:205-216.
  26. Saleh B. The Dependency Theory and its Pitfalls: A Re: Appraisal, African Journal for Security and Development. 2016 Dec;2(1):83-90.
  27. Taureck A. Securitization Theory and Securitization Studies. Journal of International Relations and Development; c2006, 9(1).
  28. Taylor T. Western European Security and Defense Cooperation. International Affairs Journal; c1994, 70(1).
  29. Thomas C. Global Governance Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links. Third World Quarterly; c2001, 22(2).
  30. Wallerstein I. The Modern World System III: Capitalist World Economy, 1730-1840s. New York: Academic Press; c1989.
  31. Taylor JG. From modernization to modes of production: a critique of the sociologies of development and underdevelopment. Springer; c1979 Sep 5.
  32. Mazrui AM. Slang and code-switching: The case of Sheng in Kenya. Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere: Schriftenreihe des Kölner Instituts für Afrikanistik. 1995;(42):168-79.
  33. Nye Jr JS. Soft power and American foreign policy. Political science quarterly. 2004 Jun;119(2):255-70.
  34. Deutsch F, Nürenberger G, Singer I, Fell HJ, Fridy JA, Granas A, *et al.* B-Analysis; 1968.
  35. Toba Stephen Olasehinde and Idowu James Fasakin. Globalization and income inequality: A panel data analysis of 37 developing countries in Africa. Int. J. Agric. Food Sci. 2022;4(2):47-51. DOI: 10.33545/2664844X.2022.v4.i2a.98