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Abstract

The world, no doubt is polarized into two economic blocs; and the struggle is between the north developed countries and the south underdeveloped countries. The present globalization bug, rather than villagizing the world, it has succeeded in broadening the gap between the two blocs. The paper examines “the north and south dichotomy in a “global village.” It provides an overview of the politics that exist between the north and the south and factors that contributes to the disparity between the global north and global south. The secondary source of data collection was explore -such as the use of text books, journals, government publications, conference and seminar lecture materials and internet. The paper adopted the neo-Marxist theory to advance the argument. The findings pointed out that that the state of disparity between the North and the South has continued to be a problem facing North-South relations. And as far as globalisation is an offshoot of liberalism and capitalism, the gap will continue to widen. The study advanced the following recommendations: with the debt burden and incessant external borrowing that characterized the South, their leadership must learn to look inward, by utilizing the God’s given human and natural resources available in the country.
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Introduction

The third world (also refer to as the global south), may arguably be an inferior player in world politics. Globalization may have further contributed in thwarting third world countries’ aspiration to be an equal player, or at least a respectable partner, in the worlds of politics, science, technology,
industry and media (Tar and Ukhami, 2016). No doubt, the world has shrunk into a panorama of “connected space” and a time capsule; no nation state can be in a state of autarky anymore. There is a binding force that has kept the nations of the world together. The force is globalization. In the current era of globalization, there is a dynamic interaction between and among nation-states and individuals (Agaba and Ukhami, 2015); hence, the buzzword, “global village.” According to Aginam (2000), since the Westphalia Treaty of 1648, the issue of multilateralism has contended with the numerous dimensions of the social, environmental, health and economic aspects of international interdependence, interconnectedness and interrelations. A plethora of globalization developments have arisen in the form of flows of foreign direct investment, international airline networks, religious pilgrimages, eco-tourism, international sports festivals, free-trade and regionalism. The dislocating implication of the present globalized world have led to series of upsurge such as refugee crisis as a result of civil wars, intractable conflicts within regions, natural and man-made disasters, outbreak of infectious diseases that have wide spread capacity like the present COVID 19, among other humanitarian crisis. All these emerging problems created by globalisation, has led to several international cooperation intended to finding solutions to the global emergencies.

Most essentially, it is not arguable that globalization has broken national barriers through the speed of technology, proliferation of international organisations, international economic relations, among others. Indeed globalization is a game changer. It has magnets the wider world into a complex whole and a holistic picture through easy accessibility, networking, communication, knowledge sharing and acculturation, political and socio-economic interaction. Be that as it may, the reality of globalization has contradicted the perspective of a “village” because of the increase
wide gap between the global north and the global south. The phenomenon called “globalization,” is what the global north said it is. For instance, during the World War I of 1914 to 1918 and the World War II of 1939-1945, a bullet was not fired in Africa, yet, it was called “World Wars.” Characterizing the world as a “global village” is questionable because of the many characteristics that divides the north and the south, than the ones that binds them together.

The global setting is characterized by relations that cut across states, regions, and the wider North-South divisions. Gap in socio-economic, political and military developments between the North and the South has attracted reactions and dialogues seeking to address the prevailing imbalances existing between them. Persistent North-South inequality and factors responsible for it have been of immense intellectual dispute within the international scholarship. Scholars also seek to know the driving forces that trigger the relationship that exist between the North and South. The argument within the Marxist school is that the inequality that exist between the North and South, is as a result of the structural imbalance. This imbalance is not unconnected to the prevailing exploitation of one class (the South) by the other (the North). For the Marxist, for this abnormality can only be corrected through the fundamental change of the present capitalist order. For scholars in the liberal school, the North-South developmental dichotomy is as a result of the inability of the disadvantaged South to advance its developmental strategy to a significant level and this can be achieved if the South can imitate the North. Whichever this argument goes, the inequality between the two divides has put a question mark to the relevance of the North-South dialogues of the early 1970s (Agbaenyi and Oddih, 2012). The influence of globalization in the internationalization and structuring of the world system brings to the fore that the north is actually the city, while the south in reality is the village.
The paper therefore examine the north and south dichotomy in the contemporary “global village.” It is divided into seven subtitles which include introduction; conceptual and theoretical framing; the reality of the “global village” and the politics of north and south divides, factors that contributed to north-south inequality; and conclusion.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framing on Globalisation, The Politics of North and South Divides, Globalisation of the world and the Neo-Marxist Perspective

What is Globalisation?

The concept of globalization is one that has attracted considerable attention from both scholars and analysts alike. Hence, volumes of literature, albeit with considerably divergence and a labyrinth of perceptions, analyses, prognoses and panaceas which existed on it. These divergent and often opposed positions reflect the inherent contradictions in many social science concepts. More importantly, they manifest the defining role of values, beliefs and ideologies in the intellectual interpretations of social phenomena which have rendered reaching of consensus a serious problematic (Alabi and Aruna, 2016). The diverse nature and interconnectedness of the world has made the concept of globalization perhaps the most popular buzzword used by both western and non-western countries alike. It is a bug that cut across individuals, family, religion and society (Tar and Ukhami, 2016).

Symonides (1998:28) opined that globalization is simply the process of increasing interconnectedness and interdependence in the contemporary world. It is spawned by increasing economic, socio-cultural and political cooperation, as well as the demand to respond to global challenges which can be resolved only on a global scale.” To Shodunke (2010), “globalization de-
emphasises national boundaries thus engendering greater movement of people, goods, capital and ideas. Globalization is like moving towards living in a borderless world.” The foregoing definitions reveal that globalization is a networking process that is self-propelling. Actors only belong by understanding that it is not a neutral process and the need for networking strategies by, first, the application of the intellect by a country or region to analyse the movement of forces and the peculiar local constraint and challenges. Networking strategy into globalization is largely a function of the possession of high-tech productive culture, the adoption of strategic trade policy by national governments for their multinational corporations (MNCs) (Mucchielli, 1998). Luke Martell view Globalisation as the incorporation of deprived countries into a world economy of open competition (Martell, 2017, 148).

Globalization is driven by the agency of human beings and vice versa: that is, as man shapes the world around him, he is equally shaped by the changing dynamics of the world. One of the imports of globalization is that, cultural diversity has become obsoletes, promoting homogenized culture that serves the needs of the transnational corporations. Hence, the world drinks Coca-Cola, eats tinned food, works in industry, watches European champion leagues, World Cup, African Cup of Nations, among others, whilst the importance of African and other countries in the south traditional values decline. Such global goods and services promotes the emergence of global culture, modernisation and westernization. The socio-cultural heritage that used to bind members or entities together, for instance in Africa have been weakened by the forces of globalization (Yankuzo, 2014:4).

Putting the many interpretations of globalization together, certain generalisations are vital. The first is that, globalization assumes the emergence of a single market system, dominated by
international capitalism. It implies changes in the way production is organized and the integration of national economies into the global market. The second touches on the mechanism of globalization, is that in a spectacular way, technological development in the sphere of information science has been one of the basic vehicles for speeding the process. Revolution in transportation and electro-communication technologies is so ubiquitous that it affects in a large way the global level of production, distribution and consumption between the rich and the poor countries (Akpuru-Aja, 2001:145-146). The foregoing definitions show how small the world has become through the shrinking of time and space; even though the world is becoming increasingly vast in terms of population, size, locations, stratification and fragmentation. Globalization in its entirety is multi-dimensional as it comprises of cultural, economic and political relations within and across national boundaries in the international system. The world is now a “global village”, whose members are familiar with each other and interact, albeit “virtually”, on presumably regular and equal basis. In reality, so-called global village is not as equal or egalitarian as presumed; it is analogous with George Owell’s Animal Farm where some members are more equal than others: globalization appears to have solidified inequality (Tar and Ukhami, 2016:254). In summary, according to Akpuru-Aja (2001:143), in many ways, globalization has been disharmonic, asymmetric and inequitable within individual countries and between countries. The prospects of the rich advance countries are very bright compare to their poor underdeveloped counterpart which is gloomy.

**The Concept of Development and Underdevelopment**

There is no gainsaying the fact that the world is divided into two - the rich and the poor, the advanced and less advanced countries. It is a societal reality. Unfortunately, the gap between the
advanced and less advanced world continue to widen. Three-quarters of the world’s population in Africa, Latin America and Asia “live” in a state of poverty and penury (Akuru-Aja, 1998). What is development and underdevelopment? The conception of development is one that is widely contested and ambiguous, thus making a generally acceptable definition difficult to come by. This is because what constitutes development differs from people to people, so also the benchmark for measuring differs. Kanbur (2001:5) opined that “since development depends on values and alternative conceptions of the good life, there is no uniform or unique answer”. A group of scholars, referred to as post-modernists, view development as “a set of ideas that shape and frame reality and power relations, by valuing certain things over others” (Hickey and Mohan, 2003:38). This suggests that valuing of economic assets over other things will make countries that do not possess economic assets to be viewed as inferior compared to those that do.

Development constitutes a process. The concept is usually used at a wide-ranging level. It includes a variety of changing characteristics. It is likened to improvements. The word, ‘development,’ thus, has a positive meaning irrespective of how it is defined. Brookfield (1975) took this position when he defined development as the total process of transformation brought about by the creation and extension of an interdependent world system. The United Nations Development Decade (1960-70) described development as “… growth plus change”. Change, in turn, is social, cultural, as well as economic; qualitative as well as quantitative… “the key concept must be improved quality of people’s life”. There are different dimensions of development – social, economic, political, institutional and legal structures, the environment, technology, religion, arts and culture. Bellu (2011:25) viewed development as an occasion constituting a new phase in a changing situation. He emphasises that development is multi-dimensional. This suggests that it can happen in
diverse ways, at different degrees and impelled by different causes. According to him, there are various types of development, which include, among others, economic, human, sustainable and territorial developments.

For Tucker (1999), development is a conception of the west used to define the procedure by which the West control other people and influences their destinies in line with their (west) view of the world. He argues that development is an element of the imperial process, where the advanced industrialised countries manage, regulate and even create the Third World sociologically, economically, politically and culturally. According to Onah (2005), development is not still but is a nonstop improvement in the ability of the individual and society to control and influence the forces of nature for the improvement of the standard of living of the people in a society. This definition introduces another dimension to the meaning of development; it analyses the human aspect of development, that is, the individuals who reside in a given state. Adamolekun (2005) emphasised that development has to do with improving the living standards of people. He pointed out some elements of development, which include; an advanced quality of life, income, education, health and nutrition, reduced poverty, a cleaner environment, equal opportunities, better individual liberty and wealthier cultural life of citizens of a given state.

Underdevelopment is an opposite of development. It is not absence of development, because every people have developed in one way or another and a greater or lesser extent. Underdevelopment make sense only as a means of comparing levels of development. It is much tie to the fact that human societal advancement has been uneven and from a strictly economic view-point, some human groups have advanced additionally by producing more and becoming wealthier. Furthermore, underdevelopment expresses a specific relationship of exploitation, namely, the
exploitation of one country by another. All the countries termed “underdeveloped” in the world are subjugated or exploited by others; and the underdevelopment with which the world is now preoccupied is a product of imperialist, capitalist and colonial exploitation (Rodney, 1972:15).

**The Concept of North and South Divides**

The expressions “North and South” is a political discourse and reality that describes the social, political, economic and cultural relationship that exist between the rich and industrialized countries on the one hand and the poor, less industrialized countries on the other hand. Their specific level of development can be measured using indices such as productivity, gross domestic product (GDP) per head, unemployment, infant mortality, illiteracy rates, life expectancy, poverty, among other (Krüger, nd).

The North and South divide from a general perspective, are viewed as a socio-economic and political divide. In a wider sense, the Global North (also can be referred as the First World) refers to the richer, advanced and industrialised countries like the United States, France, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, among others. While the concept, Global South, refers to poor, less industrialised and underdeveloped countries like the African countries, Latin America, Asian countries and the Caribbean (Odeh, 2010). The idea of North and South in this paper is from the perception that the two divisions is anchored on economic, political, socio-cultural, and overall developmental status of states. Though, greater number of states of the north are from the northern hemisphere and on the other side, underdeveloped and dependent states are mostly, in the southern hemisphere. The division is not total in geographical sense. This is because while some underdeveloped states can be found in northern pole, some countries of same developmental status fall within the northern divide. Development based on the Gross National Product and the general
standard of living of the people is the major yardsticks for measuring the status of states in north-south categorization.

Grouping of countries on the account of their economic and developmental prominence started during the Cold War era with the classification of the West and the East. The United States and their allies represented the developed west, while the Soviet Union and their allies (mostly China) represented the developing east. Eventually, the classification of the world into three classification emerged immediately after the independence of some countries under colonialism. Hence, the west was classified as the first world, the east as the second world and the less developed emerging countries were referred to as the third world. Eventually, most countries in the second world developed and joined the first world while others who could not advance their development slide into the Third World. This led to the division of the world into two – The north developed and the south underdeveloped countries. The North comprised of the following countries: US, Canada, France, Japan, Demark, Netherland, Italy, Greece, Finland, Spain, Vatican City, Portugal, Norway, Russia, Taiwan, Israel, Singapore, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, China, Hong Kong, Oceania and other developed countries. Others, which do not qualify for the category, fall within southern divide (Agbaenyi and Oddih, 2012).

The North is characterized by high standard of living, high level of literacy, improved security of lives and property of the people, improved infrastructural facilities, provision of better social welfare, ability to stimulate the movement of international socio-economic and political orders, strong immunity against vulnerability to external forces and powers, political stability, high science and technological prowess among others, high production capacities and availability of industries. On the other hand, the South is characterized by common historical ties (like
colonialism and neo-colonialism) subjugation and exploitation, low productivity, dependence on western capitalist economy, debt crisis, overpopulation, external manipulation of their sovereignty and right to governance, lack of control over the trend and issues in international system, vital political and socio-economic of the South are shaped by international organizations, multinational corporations and foreign government interfere and influence their governments, majority of their population live in abject poverty, they have poor economic bases that produce only few primary agricultural products, low technological skill, low standard of living, political instability among others; poor leadership, corruption and mismanagement of resources, as well as absence of strong socio-economic and political institutions.

Globalisation of the World: The Neo-Marxist Perspective

The neo-Marxist theory which is an offshoot of Marxism considered the dynamics of social-economic and political relations from a wider perspective, considering that exploitation is not just between individuals within a society in the process of production, but exploitation of states by other states. The present era of globalisation has been considered by the neo-Marxist, as an era of domination of the south by the north. The south represents the Third World impoverished and dependent countries, while the north is the advanced capitalist exploiter (Agaba and Ukhami, 2015). Aja, in Ejiofor (2006) points out that level of development in some countries and the underdevelopment in some other countries has led to global class struggle. The struggle explains the continued dichotomy between the North and the South because the dominant North continue to exploit the South. The theory is viable instrument in explaining the root of inequality between the North and the South and reason for constant existence of this inequality.
Immanuel Wallerstein (1930-2019) who represents the neo-Marxist school, developed the World System Theory in his book *The Modern World-System (1974)* to categorise the world economic relationships and to describe the exploitation between the *core* capitalist countries and the *periphery* underdeveloped countries. According to Mingst, Wallerstein carefully and systematically examines the emergence of capitalism in Europe since the sixteenth century. At each stage of the historical process, he identifies *core* geographic areas (not necessarily states) where development is most advanced, the agricultural sector being able to provide sustenance for the industrial workers. Wallerstein recognises *peripheral* areas as well, where raw materials are excavated for the advanced core and where unskilled labour is mired in less-productive activities. These areas are prevented from developing by the developed core, which maintains its position at the expense of the periphery. In between the core and the periphery lies the *semi-periphery*, where a mix of different activities occur (Mingst, 1999). The semi-periphery have the tendency of moving to the core or sliding back to the periphery. For example, in the 1980s/90s, semi-periphery countries like South Korea and Taiwan moved into the core and periphery countries like Thailand and South Korea moved up to the semi-periphery.

Marxists view the global system as a unified capitalist structure in search of capital accumulation. Thus, colonialism brought in sources for raw materials and captive markets for exports, which decolonialisation brought new opportunities in the form of dependence (Singh, 2019). Neo-Marxist scholars who discussed exploitation of the core against the erstwhile colonised states of Africa, which has led to dependency and underdevelopment includes Franz Fanon in his *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), Nkrumah – *Neo-colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965), Andre Gunder Frank – *The Development of Underdevelopment* (1966), Walter Rodney - *How

The central idea behind the neo-Marxists perspective is that, exploitation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has become more complex, that it is now an exploitation, not just within societies but at a global scale (an exploitation between the advanced capitalist economies and the underdeveloped countries). The industrial revolution culminated into colonialization of most states in the Third World countries. This extended to the maximisation of profit and weighing international economic influence. Till date, the Western capitalist economies have continued to dominate the peripheral nations through unequal production process, technological differences, profit accumulation, activities of the Multinational Corporations and the International Financial Institutions (Agaba and Ukhami, 2015). The attention is not only on how the state and also non-state actors carry out economic exploitation, but also how the exploited states can fight against this exploitation, and free themselves from this control. The way to do this is to abolish economic divisions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (Buecker, 2003). For instance, according to Agbaenyi and Oddih (2012), in spite the deliberate unwillingness by the North to limit the inequality that exist between them and the South, some states in the South are striving hard and making impressive developmental progress outside the North-South dialogue. For instance, China, South Korea, Indonesia, Taiwan, Saudi Arab Emirate are good example of countries in the South who are making conscious effort to develop unlike some other countries whose level of corruption has hindered their developmental processes. In other words, the South should also emulate some of the successes of the North, shun corruption and unnecessary conflicts within in order to bridge the gap between them and the advanced counties of the north.
The Reality of the “Global Village” and the Politics of North and South Divides

The question of unequal development between the northern and southern hemispheres is an important challenge facing the world throughout the evolution of international history. Structural disparity in global political economy marked by unequal allocation and distribution of scarce resources between the poor countries of the south and affluent countries of the north have compelled the industrialised countries to device such balancing strategies as New International Economic Order (NIEO) in the 1970s (Tar, 2016:102). The global village is already an international elite structure, where the selected few elites are in the global north/developed countries while the vast majority are in the global south/underdeveloped countries. The global north elite are the decision makers who determine “who gets what, when and how.” While the global south are the dependent and underdeveloped nations. According to Tar (2016:103-104), the global economy is controlled and managed by a handful of wealthy states, multinational corporations and governing elites located in the global north. A close look at the workings of the World Bank, IMF and WHO, etc, that are all under the effective control of G8 member states, may reveal this bitter reality. This is the reason why, despite the west’s illusive attempt to address the developmental disparity between the north and the south, income disparities in the global economy have been growing wider. These disparity are reflected in the distribution of the world’s Gross National Product (GNP) over the last 30 years. For instance, between 1960 and 1989, the countries with the richest 20% of the world population increased their share of global wealth from 70% to 82.7%. The country with the poorest 20% of the world population saw their share fall from 2.3% to 1.4%. These disparities become even starker when one examines real consumption level. The global north with about one fourth of the world’s population consumes 70% of the world’s energy;
75% of its metal, 85% of its wood and 60% of its food. Contrast this affluent situation sharply contrast with the nasty condition of the global south, where over one billion people live in absolute poverty, one and a half billion people are deprived of primary healthcare, and about a billion adults are illiterate.

The debt that nations in the global south owed the IMF leaped from $9.5 billion in 1986. This was only a part of the $1.2 billion that the global south owed the north in 1986. Indeed, the servicing of external debt alone swallows up a huge chunk of the budget of countless countries of the global south. It has been estimated that in 1988, $132 billion was bled out of the global south in debt repayment and servicing of interests. The UNICEF points out that as many as 650,000 children die across the third world each year because of debt. And in the Philippines, government’s failure to limit debt payment has led to the premature death of one child every hour. The foregoing realities show that no western agenda can reverse the north-south, development-underdevelopment gap (Broad and Landi, 1996).

Advances in communication technology have created a vast global communications network which encompasses the entire world. Through institutions such as Cable News Network (CNN), this network has contrived proximity and even an intimacy from which no one can escape. The stage no longer looks like the inevitable political organization of mankind as it yields to fluid regional constellations, geographical segmentation is yielding to one “communal space,” albeit still replete with tension and conflict. Globalization is uneven in its impact. It produces winners and losers (Ake, 1996:6). In the area of socio-cultural activities, globalization of sport in Africa and other third world continent is not only aimed at ensuring sporting competition and global interconnectedness but to enrich the economy of the first world countries that introduced modern
sports into other continent of the world including Africa. The introduction of these sports that have so much influence the third world countries is an avenue for the capitalist nations of Europe to have a fertile ground to produce and market their products; and further their accumulation of wealth. Sporting materials and equipment is now demanded in high quantity because of the increased numbers of fans attracted to the global sport industry (Tar and Ukhami, 2016). Laurent (2008), buttress that Transnational corporations in the sport industry have experience important increases in their profits in recent years. To further buttress the expansion of participation, in the sphere of influence, recognition and members, the world of sport is so powerful; more recognize that the UN. FIFA has a membership of 208 countries while UN’s membership is 192 countries. The IOC is also larger in scope than the United Nations (see Zeigler, 2009).

In the sphere of globalization, for instance, African local football leagues have not yet been globalised; hence, it lack popularity. Africa do not have sophisticated technology to make it sport attractive and inter-continentalised. Modern sport driven by the role of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has also contributed in killing slowly the development of sport in Africa. This is because quality information has a way of influencing the interest of individuals. The complex nature of technology has helped modern sport to spread its recognition like “wide fire.” People now watch satellite television at the comfort of their home and commercial centres. Most football fans in Africa know the names of most clubs in Europe and the name of many of their footballers. This is because of the European high information delivery capacity and methods of attracting fans across the globe. Presently, it is difficult to hear Africans themselves talk about African clubs like the Warri Wholfs in Nigeria, Black Stars of Ghana, Bafana Bafana of South Africa because the European football leagues have dominated their cultural sub-consciousness. It
shows that what you see and hear regularly can dominate your interest (Tar and Ukhami, 2016). The lopsided nature of globalization in favour of the western world made Keohane and Nye (1977:8), to assert that “the more dependent a state is on a great power for trade, aid or protection, the more responsive it is likely to be a pressure.” One could argue that the economy of the south is a clientele one due to the growing influence of multinational corporations, its overdependence on foreign aid, loans and grants and over importation and usage of manufactured consumer goods are some of the harmful ways through which globalization infringes on the south’s economy.

Also, military strength of the north has continued to be a source of threat and intimidation to the south. Southern industrial capability in the production of military wares is nothing to be compared with what is obtainable in the north. The military formation in Pentagon, USA for instance, has been a major element of national military power of the United States in her international relations across the globe. The South is relative nowhere in military technology and as such, depended on the use of obsolete military weapon produced in the north to wage tribal wars, terrorism and insurgency, and coup de’ tat (Agbaenyi and Oddih, 2012). The proliferation of weapons (mostly Small and Light Weapons- SALWs) in the south, especially in Africa, as a result of the diffusion that has trickle down from the north to the south has led to increase insecurity, wanton destruction of lives and properties, deplete economy advancement. This has continually given the north, their multinational producers and their arms dealers’ upper edge in accumulation of profit. According to Mallam (2014), the surplus or left-over arms that were provided during the cold war by the two antagonistic super powers, were proliferated into the third world to serve proxy inter-state conflict. Huge flow of small and light weapons from central and eastern Europe and the loosening control of arms multinational industries, as a result of the disintegration of Soviet Union, led to arms
transfer into Africa. Following the end of the cold war, the arms already in circulation lost their way into the hands of illegal arms dealers, ethnic militia groups, security entrepreneurs, private military companies, and local smugglers thereby fuelling on-going wars and enabling the commencement of new ones in Africa. According to Ukhami and Doumbia (2021), from the conspiracy theory perspective, the trafficking of small arms and intractable conflict in Africa and other third world countries, has only succeeded in making the continents poorer and underdeveloped; while the transnational arms merchandise constantly smile to the bank. Ironically, what makes others cry, make other smile. Through the logic of the capitalist arms industries, as far as conflict strive in Africa, their business will continue to survive. This is to say that, there is every possibility for these MNCs that are specialized in arms production to instigate violence in Africa, in other to get sales from states and non-state actors. More so, the fact that Africa is the highest conflict ridden continent, it becomes easy for the continent to be a large market for the multinational arms industries.

In terms of development in politics, it is relatively very high in the North than in the South. One foremost distinguishing characteristics of politics between the two class, is the fact that the North is able to introduce the existing system of politics (democracy) across the globe and as well shapen the system to match its culture. Institutions of politics in the North are moulded in such a way that they are compactable with the people's culture. For instance despite the democratisation of the world, Britain is able to maintain its traditional leadership in the queen of England while the Prime Minister becomes the democratic head of government. Unlike in the south where traditional institution of politics were dismantled by colonial leadership in the name of liberal democracy. The clash between politics and culture in the South is up till this day a fundamental challenge
facing the South. The legal system is not isolated from the challenges, as the methods and patterns in the South are imposed by colonial powers, which conflict with the culture and traditional politics of the people (Agbaenyi and Oddih, 2012).

Factors that Contributed To North-South Inequality

Several factors have been accounted for by scholars as to the factors that contributes to the continuous inequality between the north and the south. Scholars and leaders of the leftist have constantly blamed the inequality of the globe to the imbalance of the economic order to capitalism and exploitation of the south by the north. While the modern school and other western scholars blamed the underdevelopment of the south to internal causes orchestrated by the people themselves and their inability to adopt the strategy of the north to advance their development. All the same, some of these factors are highlighted below.

Slave Trade

The foundation of inequality and widen economic gap between the north and the south (especially the colonised countries) is traceable to the slave trade era. The Atlantic Slave Trade especially, introduced the trade of human that eventually led to the imbalance between global North and South. Forceful transfer of able bodied men and women from the Third World (Africa in particular), prevented these societies of annexing their human labour to their advantage. The rich natural resources in Africa were not excavated for the advantage of the continent, rather, these able-bodied men and women became instrumental on the plantations (and other agricultural production) in Europe to advance western development. The slaves were subjugated and violated into venturing into force labour for the accumulation of wealth in Europe.

Colonialism and Neo-colonialism

Colonialism and neo-colonialism is a veritable instrument for oppression, exploitation and widened gap between the north and the south. The advancement of imperialism through colonialism laid a solid foundation to the grip of the western powers on most countries in the south. During the colonial era, the
political economy of the south were stolen by the north. The resources of the south became vulnerable for excavation, their able-bodied men were retained in their own land for the purpose of exploitation, and the south became a large market for European finished goods. These practices encouraged the transfer of wealth in form of capital and material flights from the South to the North, strengthened the Northern economy and weakened the South’s.

The end of colonialism introduced neo-colonialism which Nkrumah saw as the last stage of imperialism. Neo-colonialism is colonialism in disguise as a result of continuous dependence on western finished goods, grants and loans, multinational corporations, science and technology. All these endanger healthy economic and socio-political competitions among these two different groups.

**Globalization**

The globalisation of the world which ought to be the unifying force that binds the world together and shrink the economic gap in the present “modern village”, is the very force that has widening the gap between the rich and the poor countries. This interconnection, interdependence and interrelations have swiftly enabled the north or economically advanced states to spread their manipulative exploitation to southern economies and make the best drive for wealth accumulation in form of processing of raw materials, production, transportation of goods and services, information and communication technology to ease the integration of southern economies to the metropolitan north. This strategy empowers the north and weakens the south into dependency on the north.

**Multinational Corporations**

Multinational corporations are no doubt agents of development (for the north) and underdevelopment (for the south). They are not charity organisations but established for the purpose of profit maximisation and repatriation of profits to their parent country. The production and sales of goods and services by multinational corporations who are largely the instrumentality of the north within the global system has
further given economic leverage to the north. The sophisticated level of technology in the MNCs continue to improve the level of production and profits repatriated. Unfortunately, the south has no sufficient technology to drive their production, hence the over reliance on foreign multinationals.

**International Organizations**

The initial establishment of the international organisations, orchestrated mostly by the north for the purpose of collective security, to cushion the effects of economic depression is now a mechanism to pursue the interest and the agenda of the initiators. The international organisation is a formidable platform for the north to sharpen vital political and socio-economic policies and practices of the global system to their favour. Control of policies by super powers in these organizations has also helped them to subjugate the southern states to dependence instead of equilibrium association based on cooperation among states for mutual benefits.

**Unfair Terms and Practices of Trade**

The unfavourable trade between the northern and southern countries have simply made it impossible for the south to be at par with their northern counterpart. This is simply because the north are producers and the south are the consumers. The south consume what they do not produce and produce what they do not consume. Trade policies (including the policies of the World Trade Organisation) and practices existing within the global market are not favourable to the states in the southern division. Liberalisation of the economies through the removal of trade barriers as ordered by the Bretton Woods institutions has rendered southern economies exposed to international exploitation and harmful competition and domination of infant local industries. The liberalisation policies have not only made southern states dumping grounds for finished goods produced by industrialized economies but has also made primary products and labour in the South cheaply available to transnational corporations.
**Corruption and Bad Leadership**

One of the reasons for the wide gap between the north and the south is corruption and bad leadership that characterised the countries within the south. Corruption is one of the destroyer of development as it impedes every processes that leads to development and economic growth. The corruption within the southern hemisphere, especially in Africa has propelled the expatriation of the nations’ monies into the hands of foreign capitalists and banks. Ironically, this is no longer the repatriation of profits by the MNCs to their parent countries but the conscious efforts of corrupt leaders to under develop their countries for selfish reasons. Bad governance also have immensely contributed to misdirection of the southern economic and socio-political life. With the enormous resources found in the south, the hemisphere through bad leaderships have not been able to harness these resources for the development of the states. Hence, it has always led to conflicts over resource control, political instabilities, sit-tight-syndrome and oppression of the citizens by their own leaders.

**Conclusion**

It is not arguable that there is a disparity between the north and the south as a result of economic, and socio-political imbalance among them. This has led to the fragmentation of the south. The intractable conflicts in the south (mostly in sub-Saharan Africa), insurgency, and other form of insurrection, crimes and unrest, is simply because of poverty, struggle for scarce resources that have been largely milked by the north, high dependency for consumption and low will-power for production, among other reasons orchestrated by underdevelopment.

Though, the divides between the north and the south is historic, the present globalization bug has further broaden the gap that exist among them. While the northern countries is relatively peaceful, enjoys high standard of living with less natural resources, enjoys other basic necessities and infrastructures of life, the southern countries experiences intractable conflicts, low standard of living amidst enormous national
resources, poor basic necessities and infrastructures of life. These have simply suggest that the fusion of the world through globalisation, is to promote the “survival of the fittest”, make the rich, richer and the poor, poorer. The evidence are seen in the disappearing of states borders which has made the south weaker to withstand competition in the area of science, technology, and telecommunication. How can the South come out from this quagmire of underdevelopment and dependency?

With the debt burden and incessant external borrowing that characterized the South, their leadership must learn to look inward, by utilizing the God’s given human and natural resources available in the country. The countries in the South should concentrate on mechanized agriculture, developing new industries, resuscitating her dead industries and improving her technology, in order for them to be a hub for foreign and local investors in the nearest future. They must learn from China, a country previously characterized as an underdeveloped country, but today, China is a force to be reckon with among the comity of nations. The countries in the South must eschew corruption which is a swift killer of development, avoid external borrowing and policies that does not favour them.
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