PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS: GLOBALISATION AND THE PROBLEM OF THE OTHER

Malachy Igwilo, Ph.D
Center for Foundation Education,
Bells University of Technology, Ota, Nigeria,
migwilo@gmail.com

&

Philip Edema, Ph.D
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies,
Augustine University, Ilara-Epe, Lagos
philip.edema@augustineuniversity.edu.ng

Abstract

Globalisation has become a commonly used word to the extent that its meaning has become fluid and often misused. The mainstream description of globalisation seems to miss the point indeed when it is believed that globalisation is about international exchange and interactions. However, the flow of the global interaction does not give credence to this idea so widely held. Globalisation has become Euro-American to the extent that there is an "other" within the politics of globalisation. There is a branch of humanity that receives the products and all the mentalities of globalisation without really participating in it directly. These non-participants, mainly from the countries of the South are indeed the global "other". This paper, using philosophical analysis, traces the trajectory of thoughts embedded in globalisation, pointing out its Euro-American dimension and how this Euro-American dimension creates a binary, bifurcating humanity into us and them. This binary ontology affects the other adversely in the global contest.

Keywords: Globalisation, Hermeneutics, Western hegemony, North-South dichotomy, Global contest

Introduction

Globalisation has become difficult to define because of the complexities that have arisen in its dimensions worldwide. A definition needs to take into cognisance the various areas where globalisation is palpable. This is why many scholars talk about economic globalisation, cultural globalisation, and political globalisation (Fotopoulos, 2001; Al-Rodhan. R. F and Stoudmann, G., 2006). Despite these fragmented approaches, it is critical to say that globalisation is a single continuum, imbued with the same spirit, with a single mission and then armed with a single cognitive scheme. Central to the movements of globalisation is the Western domination of the world which arose from the initial conquering of the Ocean to reach alien cultures, which were then dominated with the use of gun powder. This domination remains in globalisation today in as much as all the world are not equally harvesting the supposed gains of globalisation but those dominated are harvesting losses on daily basis mostly without knowing it. Many of the definitions given do not consider the Western domination of global activities. They simply view globalisation from the point of view of free exchange. According to Salin (2004),

> Globalisation means free exchange. It is in fact more or less synonymous with the traditional term, free trade, but it is more fashionable. In reality, one may consider that there is a slight nuance between both expressions: When speaking of free trade, people have mainly in mind trade in commodities and services, whereas globalisation may have a broader meaning, including free exchange not only of commodities and services, but also of factors of production, knowledge, culture, ideas, laws and rules, etc.

This definition pretends to view globalisation as something value-free, something that is describing the exchanges between countries of the world. Many other scholars defining globalisation view it as a mere description of an activity and is never a conscious movement designed to achieve set objectives. For instance, Wolf, (2013), “suggested that globalisation is a fact and not a policy option”. In other words, globalisation is what happens in the realm of fact, not

controlled by anyone and not a policy decided by anyone's policy. Many other authors follow this line of thought. Giddens 1990, Castells 2000, O'Rourke and Williamson 1999, Xu 2013, Garret 2010, all view globalisation from the matrix of an ontological fact. However, globalisation is not just a fact, it is a fact arising from a particular agenda, an agenda of ostracism and exclusion. This means that globalisation has set objectives which are to use Western influences garnered over time to dominate the world and create dominated spaces. This domination has become global in scope resulting is what is properly called globalisation. According to Albrow (1990), "globalisation is actually incorporating the world into a single society or a global society". This incorporation shows a systematically conscious exercise that was created at the congresses of the West after the Second World War, which emphasises the Western economic principles and politics namely, liberalism and democracy. The domination of these concepts in the world is what is aptly called globalisation. This paper is intended to show the true nature of globalisation and its actual effects on 'the other', that is on other non-Western peoples who are not capable of creating any domination zones in the world but who are dominated by the hegemonic West. Indeed the concept of 'the West' is indeed Europe and America and sometimes described as Euro-America.

The Nature of Globalisation

There is no doubt that globalisation is a controversial issue. The controversy arises from the lack of complete theoretical articulation of what it is, its origin, scope and effects. The controversy simply borders on how globalisation operates and who benefits from it and who does not. However there is a full myth created by some scholars who write about globalisation. They mostly treat globalisation as a fact that has no fixed ontological scheme, a fact that is value free having nothing to do with any government in the world. In other words, globalisation is seen as a description of the state of the world and which has benefited many people making them live longer lives and better lives (Stiglitz, 2002). Those who do not agree simply went the other way and argue that globalisation is a fact of life that has not benefited others and has led to inequality (Firebaugh, 2003; Wade, 2004).

However, given the nature of globalisation and how it operates, it is important that we go back to the idea of empire and imperialism, which has almost disappeared from mainstream discourses, but whichshould really be at the center of the globalization debate. According to Hardt and Negri, (2000), quoted in Fuchs (2010), global imperialism is rife in the world.

> Imperialism was really an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their own boundaries…in contrast to imperialism, Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a decentered and deterritorialising apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers.... First and foremost, then, the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or really that rules over the entire "civilised" world.

Working from this view, we see that the idea is to dominate the world for the benefit of the Euro-American worldview. The economic misery in today's most non Western societies and the unimaginable riches created in Western dominated areas is a clear sign of the true nature of globalisation, at least as far as the content of globalisation is concerned.

Fuchs, (2008) submitted that "the developed world accounts for approximately 25% of the world's population, but has accounted for more than 70% of the world's wealth on a continuous basis since 1970. The least developed countries share of wealth has dropped from above 3% to just over 1% since 1980. In 2008, the total sales of the ten top-selling worldwide companies (US$2533.5 billion) were 2.3 times as large as the total gross domestic product (GDP) of the 22 least developed countries (US$1081.8 billion)". These figures really show a zone of domination created and which is represented here by the 22 countries mentioned whose fortunes have dwindled and who have no way of countering the trend since they are the dominated group. So while the dominating force of Western hegemony prospers by taking up the global wealth, the zones of domination created wither away under

the weight created by the dominating force namely, globalisation forces. So globalisation is truly a system of domination since it opens up the borders of the nations in the zones of domination, making them vulnerable and open to trade, a trade whose content is almost entirely owned by the dominating force. According to Mills, (2009), "a central engine of globalisation is the internationalisation of markets and subsequent decline in the importance of national borders for all kinds of economic transactions. This includes changes in laws, institutions, or practices that make various transactions (in terms of commodities, labour, services, and capital) easier or less expensive across national borders, including trade". This is truly the state of affair in today's world and the West has developed a new historical narrative that favours them.

Fukuyama (1989), drafted an extensive historical analysis showing that the West, with its ideal, has triumphed over all the other historical and social categories found in the world. He was writing in the aftermath of the collapse of communism in that year. This collapse showed that the last real challenge to Western hegemony is out of the way. This was indeed a statement of fact. According to Fukuyama, "what we may be witnessing in not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalisation of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government". He went ahead to point out that the "universalisation" is not limited to politics and governance. He said, "but this phenomenon extends beyond high politics and it can be seen also in the ineluctable spread of consumerist Western culture in such diverse contexts as the peasants' markets and color television sets now omnipresent throughout China, the cooperative restaurants and clothing stores opened in the past year in Moscow, the Beethoven piped into Japanese department stores, and the rock music enjoyed alike in Prague, Rangoon, and Tehran". Here we see clearly that Fukuyama was acknowledging that "universalisation" (globalisation) was an effort at enthroning Western ideals above any other ideal in the world. This is not to say that globalisation started in 1989, but it is to say that globalisation triumphed globally in that year and became the new

acknowledged conceptual scheme for the understanding the relationships in the world.

In order to entrench this Western hegemony, a hegemony that is truly American in content, the global media controlled by America are used to foster the neo-liberal ideas inherent in globalisation. In other words, there is a push toward creating a homogenous culture that is expected to permeate the world and which fosters American/Western ideas of neo liberalism. According to Warde, (2000), quoted in Shimemura (2002):

> Much of the discussion about cultural effects of globalisation has centered on the extent to which increased cultural communication tends to produce a homogeneous global culture. The perils of the diffusion of American culture throughout the world, and its potentially destructive effect on the local cultures of the periphery, remain a major concern, though few scholars currently envisage the imminent entrenchment of a homogeneous global culture.

This is no surprise as the global culture is indeed neo liberalism piloted by globalisation and sometimes called the new world order. So, globalisation becomes a bringing about of a neoliberal world and creating a new world order promoted by big media based in the Euro-American axis. 'Neo-liberalism' has become a word used in a large variety of ways to describe American economic and social worldviews (Martinez and García, 2000). Hudson (1999) submits that "neo-liberalism can be defined as the belief that the unregulated free market is the essential precondition for the fair distribution of wealth and for political democracy". In other words, 'the basic doctrine is built on the belief that the market is the best instrument for assigning resources and meeting human needs. According to this neo-liberal thesis, the market would implicitly constitute a self-regulating mechanism, with the state playing little or no role in the system' (Heneles and Edwards, 2002: 121). Within this logic of economic liberalism, the public is the state and the private is the market, and if the market can be freed from unnecessary state intervention then democracy automatically follows' Bruner, (2003, p. 690). These ideals have been vehemently promoted by

American media, which avoid using the word 'neo-liberalism' and instead favour words like 'privatisation', 'free market economy' and 'deregulation'. These define the new world order. The new world order is the American understanding of the set of new codes of international relations that will incorporate American neo-liberal worldviews (Lazar and Lazar, 2004, p. 230). Understood in these terms, neo-liberalism has become the choice framework for American definition of the 'new world order'. Pieterse, (2004) submits that there is a tendency in the American neo-liberal world order to assume a character of an empire by 'forcing' the nations of the world to adopt the neo-liberal framework. Schiller (1993) had submitted that the conglomerate media in America is furthering this world view of neo-liberalism in a manner that supports the idea of an empire and therefore globalisation. This the American media does by employing what Ungerleider, 2006: 72) describes as a special rhetorical strategy.

Despite the global reach of these American media conglomerates, there is increasing resistance to neo-liberalism across the world (Larmer, 2005). The condition of the other (poverty, corruption, political instability, incessant conflicts), provides the impetus for questioning the political economy of neo-liberalism in terms of the availability of capital for the development of a free market economy and the fragile nature of the state. Despite this, the American conglomerate media showcase the other as a bad economic case unless she adopts neo-liberal market policies and liberal democracy. The opposition is limited since the world economy as a whole is swallowed up more or less by an interconnected praxis making it impossible for counties in the axis of domination to put up firm resistance. Also, given the fact that there is an increasing effort among certain Western scholars to diminish the side effects of globalisation in order to limit resistance towards it (Grazie La Spada 2010), globalisation marches on, thus making globalisation to become a philosophy that is sealed and accepted by the nations.

This pervasiveness of globalisation showcases it as a demagogue that decides everything that happens in the world not based on any diffuse rational arguments but based on an agenda of total domination presented with benevolent rhetoric. This is clearly seen in globalisation's destruction of aboriginal cultures of the countries in the

axis of domination. These countries' cultures suffer a global shock arising from over exposure to Western ideas and ideals. These ideals are presented as the good way of life which quickly obliterate traditional cultures and create Western mentalities in non-Western peoples. According to Jeremy (2004, quoted in Kwame, n.d):

> Globalisation eclipses, or at least subordinates all previous ways of answering need and of dealing with vicissitudes of human life. All other ways of life are diminished and marginalised at a stroke. Globalisation is a declaration of war upon all other cultures. And in cultural wars, there is no exemption for civilians; there are no innocent by-standers. It has also been described as a confrontation between global civilization and local cultures.

Here, global civilisation is Western civilisation. This agrees with Akande (2002 quoted in Kwame n. d) when he said:

> It has been observed that the rapid and aggressive spread of market economics and communication technologies under the influence of western multinationals brings new impediments to local cultures and values, particularly in Africa and non-western societies at large. Africans are cultivating the materialistic and individualistic habits and values previously associated with western culture. This has come as a result of the structural change in the world economy: globalisation and the alarming increase of goods dumped on African countries that are marketed by mass seductive advertisement which is blatantly superficial but nonetheless successful in creating desires in peoples of traditional societies.

The direct effect of this Westernisation of non-Western cultures through globalisation is a disappearing of diversity. Proponents of globalisation have long suggested that globalisation centers diversity. But what is called diversity is really a regurgitated Western cultural domination of others masquerading as diversity. What is really created in all spheres is

a homogeneous culture that buries the other forms of life making it impossible for a reversal to take place. The citizens so dominated begin to construct a social reality based on their dominated mentalities.

The total eclipsing of the other is indeed at the heart of globalisation. Systematic studies of globalisation as something beneficial are only beneficial from the point of view of the Euro American civilisation that feeds globalisation. Those dominated through the activities of agents of globalisation only obtain marginal benefits from this demagogue and these benefits are obtains at the great of cost of loss of self, mentalities and culture. The continued oppressive activities of globalisation only bears witness to the submissions of the present author that globalisation are indeed a construction of, and a foisting of Western ideas and ideals on the entire world.

The Construction of the Other

The dominant ideas in the world today are Western in character and these are spread through globalisation. Other non- western cultures, in particular Africans or black people, with no dominating powers are aptly called 'the other', that is the hidden other, the unknown, the marginal. In a single univocal culture, any other existing culture becomes "the other" and usually the other is shrouded in mystery, never fully understood or known but is counted as part of the global culture as such. This counting as a part of global culture is only at the periphery. According to Michlic (2004, quoted in Esparza, 2010), "in general, 'the Other' has usually been understood only in one way, as a negative entity upon which the individual, groups, ethnic communities or nations construct their identities: 'we' are different because we are not like 'them'. In this sense, 'the Other' is perceived as an enemy or threat". Globalisation constructs 'the other' by imposing a particular culture, which is Western culture as "The Culture" of the world. This is done in the midst of thousands of other cultures and so the globalisation culture thus created perceives the other cultures as palpable threat and so seeks to dominate these other cultures. If there is no domination of the other cultures, globalisation will not take hold hence a "we" and "them" situation is created. So, globalisation's identity is seen from an identity construct that arises from ostracising 'the other' in the creation of a global culture. This is true since a look at globalisation shows a single

univocal and dominant culture which is Western, with other cultures on the periphery couched with Western categories. The true character of 'the other' is in a dominated zone. There is always the tensions arising from either the ostracisation of the other through domination as in the case of globalisation or appropriating the other to adapt it to self as in the case of colonisation.

The concept of 'the other' is also linked to the idea of nation-state or nationalists' ideas. Nation states necessarily emphasise the binary opposition "we" and "them". These nations were created to cater for a particular people and these people will have to compete for resources to stay alive or disappear. According to Triandafyllidou (2010), "the notion of the other is inherent in the nationalist doctrine itself. For nationalists (or simply for those individuals who recognises themselves as members of a national community) the existence of their own nation presupposes the existence of other nations too. Moreover, as history and Ernest Gellner (1983: 58), teach us, the course of true nationalism never did run smooth. Thus, most of the nations existing today had to fight to secure their survival and to achieve their independence. For most national communities, there have been and there probably still are significant others, other nations and/or states, from which the community tried to liberate and/or differentiate itself". The globalisation culture concerns the activities of nations in constant opposition to each other. It is the triumph of the Western States that has enthroned globalisation as the currency of engagement for the whole world.

The construction of 'the other' on which globalisation rests started long time ago as soon as the West perfected ocean going vessels to reach the whole world. This daring invention created a sense of the other and perfected the Western march towards domination of the whole world through globalisation. By 19th century; a systematic raping of the other, full with grandiose methods has been perfected. According to Pereze de cuella (1995, quoted in Lere, 2014), by the early decade of 19th century, these *European powers, that is Western powers* (emphasis added) had begun to lay claims over the areas of their new markets. Britain, one of the Western dominating powers began to preach the gospel of "free trade" and "open borders", following her emergence as the first industrialised capitalist power. This she did with the aim of

removing the mercantile barriers to her manufactured products that are exported to other countries. In the last quarter of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century, France, the United States, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and Japan joined the industrialist capitalist race. The resultant effects of this race were the industrial share up of the world which began a new phase of globalisation encapsulated in the colonisation of Africa, Asia and Latin America. All this suffered a setback following the great depression in the First and Second World War.

But after the great depressions arising from the two World Wars, the Western nations bounced back and continued to dominate 'the other' through the various institutions created to resuscitate their grip on 'the other'. The first example of this development in the immediate post war period was the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) which was formed in 1947 to liberalise trade, regulate trade policies among nations and resolve trade disputes. It was later renamed World Trade Organization (WTO), the role of the Breton Wood financial institutions like International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank. All these have affected the development of African countries that are at the disadvantaged side which manifest in the form of debt portfolio and the dreaded Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) which contributed to the dependent nature of Africa to the advantage of developed countries, Western countries. Also the liberalisation of the world trade and economic relations has been to the exclusive advantage of the industrialised states. The international division of labour and production is such that the developed countries are industrialised and technologically advanced, the African countries become dependent on the West for technology, capital, goods and industrial consumables and culture (Lere, 2014).

In other to effectively dominate 'the other', an intellectual battle was established in the media in order to properly articulate the nature of 'the other'. To site concrete example, the movie "The gods must be crazy"(Twentieth Century Fox, 1980), sought to create a degenerate nature among Africans who are the acute representation of the 'the other' in European consciousness, emphasising the Conradian conception of the heart of darkness. Majority of those living in Euro-American axis, believed that Africans are of lower nature lacking in

history, philosophy and language. This was clearly expressed in this movie. The resultant effects of this portrayal of Africans as being of lower nature is a mentality that Africans are not "us", they are different from us and therefore do not have what it takes for effective living. So the West assumed the responsibility of reforming them and taking credit for their work by raping of the African continent, engaging in wildcat exploitation of the human and natural resources found therein. According the Fanon (1967: 110), "the black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man. Overnight "the other" was been given two frames of reference within which he has had to place himself. His metaphysics or, less pretentiously, his customs and the sources on which there were based were wiped out because they were in conflict with a civilisation that he did not know and that imposed itself on him".

The central metaphysics of 'the other' as far as globalisation is concerned is prejudice. "The concept of 'prejudice' links judgment to something that precedes judgment, not only to representations, worldviews, opinions received by others, but also to power, authority and to inherited traditions in which humans as social beings endowed with language are always already embedded. The Western nations create a false 'other' to justify their domination of this other, making this domination a global construct as if no one is dominated. So, the dominated person becomes a part of an actual system of 'the way the world is". Fanon (1967: 18) summarises this in suggesting that:

> every [dominated people], in other words, every people in whose soul inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of their local cultural originality-finds itself face to face with the [dominance] of the civilising nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country".

Here the "mother country" means the Western dominating force that has given birth to the inferior "other", and which directs the ultimate destiny of the child, that is the dominated other. The globalisation onslaught is a clear construction of 'the other', an "other" to be dominated and exploited.

Hermeneutics of Globalisation: Towards a Critical Understanding and/or Rejection

Hermeneutics has become one of the alternative voices of contemporary philosophy used in assessing the human intellectual and social conditions. It has long become mainstream in philosophy and has garnered profound influences. Hermeneutics has arisen also as a response to the totalising and perennial nature of epistemology which seeks to assert that knowledge and understanding are indeed a-historical and apodictic entities. But given the rise of post modernism and also the consequences of Gettier's counter examples (Gettier, 1963), hermeneutics has become a viable alternative voice in bypassing the protracted debate about traditional epistemology and Kantian ideas of epistemology which has characterised twentieth century philosophy. According to Maddox (1985):

> The term ' hermeneutics' was originally used to designate a classical discipline that formulated rules for correctly interpreting texts. Early forms of this discipline can be found in biblical studies, philology and jurisprudence. The philosophical discussion of hermeneutics, which began in the nineteenth century, likewise initially engaged in the development of rules for proper interpretation. As the discussion developed, however, its attention shifted to the more basic question of the conditions of the very possibility of understanding. The distinctive characteristic that emerged in this 'hermeneutic' discussion of understanding was a rejection of classical Cartesian and Kantian epistemology. Indeed, hermeneutics has more or less taken the place of epistemology for these philosophers. To be sure, they usually refuse to identify hermeneutics with epistemology, but this is due to the empiricist and reductionist connotations which they sense in the latter term. There are essentially two problems which hermeneutic philosophers have with traditional epistemology. First, they disagree with the reduction of the entire cognitive process to a single model drawn basically from the natural sciences - i.e. empirical observation.

> Second, they reject the a-historical conception of the knower as one who stands outside of that which is known and imposes meaning upon it.

Critical hermeneutics is used to assess tradition in other to correct it based on human interests. In other words, each human idea, in this case globalisation must be examined as a historical process that has arisen to enhance human life. So its contours and dimensions must be examined to show that there are no personal and sectional appeals inherent in it since if there are such flaws, it cannot then serve humans interests. So critical hermeneutics is humanistic in essence and seeks to use philosophical arguments to remove merely pragmatic or existential components from ideas and enshrine in the idea progress for humanity if that is possible. The major hermeneutical theorist of this idea was Jurgen Habermas. Habermas (1971) articulated the fact that not all tradition is acceptable or desirable. So the project of hermeneutics is to correct tradition, in this case globalisation. Correcting it means inculcating emancipatory cognitive interest in it. In some cases due to historical developments, in some concepts or tradition, it is impossible to have an inter-subjective correction of a concept so the concept is discarded as being sectional.

Globalisation has permeated the world unmolested and has become the key concept for the understanding of today's socio economic landscape. But globalisation enthrones the otherness in all its activities since it is necessarily a Western historical development. It was the West that moved out to discover and conquer the rest of the world and then created a system of state craft that augur well with Western intellectual and material conceptions. This in itself marks the beginning of globalisation and which continues today. The conquering spirit of globalisation continues to enrich the West and pauperizing the rest of the world. This pauperisation creates the hybrid stranger who is outside the profitable sphere of globalisation. The hybrid stranger or the other is given crumbs from the table of globalisation since global players decided where the capital and development goes to. These crumbs are used to create a façade as if globalisation is working for all in the world. They sift through country after country looking for any barrier created to better the other and then foil it through dominating policies of the

global state. They then create artificial problems in their own territories to make of show that globalisation is affecting their own territories too. But while they live better lives based on amassing of resources from worldwide, 'the other' diminishes daily. This shows ever clearly that globalisation is truly imperialistic and seeks to sabotage other nations by dominating them and extending Western nations globally. According to Hardt and Negri (quoted in Fuchs, 2010):

> Imperialism was really an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their own boundaries ... in contrast to imperialism, Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a decentered and deterritorialising apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers ... First and foremost; then, the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or really that rules over the entire 'civilised' world.

So, the critical question that arises is: does globalisation serves as a tool for the progress of humanity? Here progress is amoral concept that represents a holistic advancement of humanity based on sound morality. The new and emerging concept that seeks to deal with the obvious ostracisation of 'the other' by globalisation is deglobalisation. De-globalisaion is indeed a concept that has at its core a counter movement away from neo-liberal globalisation towards a diffused global engagement. In other words, the flow of ideas and money is not a top-down model but a more diffused interaction among nations. According to Bello (2002) some of the fundamental principles of deglobalisation include; focusing on sustainable development and having the capacity of self-sufficiency rather than becoming dependent on foreign markets, creating a vibrant internal market and making strategic economic decisions subject to democratic choice rather than leaving them to the market.

De-globalisation is not the only idea seeking to put an end to the domination and imperialism called globalisation. Evans (2008, quoted in Tepeciklioğlu n. d) developed the concept of "counter hegemonic

globalisation" which offers alternative to the dominating force of globalisation by 'eliminating the dominant (hegemonic) global regime and construct a new regime which maximises democratic political control and makes the equitable development of human capabilities and environmental management its priorities'.

These ideas have grown over the years and have indeed become a counter movement. Each of these ideas resist globalisation based on the idea that the primary adverse effect of globalisation is that it destabilises the foundation of the developing countries' economies, culture and society where many cheap and well-made products invade the market negatively transforming livelihoods. As a result, many local products disappear, as they simply cannot rival the cheap prices and high qualities of the foreign products (Campbell, 2004). Also other countries' cultures are changed or transmogrified to look like something that is neither the original nor that of the West, thereby emphasising "otherness at the core of globalisation.

To make matters worse, the continuous expansion of globalisation and the continued adoption of policies that will help global forces by the various countries in the zones of domination, strengthen the inequalities existing in the world, where the trend is showing a complete domination of the globe by a few large Western based corporations who are the arrow heads of globalisation. These corporations are growing larger and larger and their grip is becoming firmer and firmer as more countries fall under the ruse that globalisation has something good to offer. According to Popa (2012) "the trend of globalisation is often described as inexorable, leading to a final state in which a few very large corporations will dominate world commerce under the regulation not of nations but one or a small number of regulatory bodies. These bodies are not run by statesmen, jurists or ecologists but by economists who harmonises according to the multinationals' interests. This deteriorates the local democracy and leads to the loss of local control over the local events. The growing power of multinational corporations and the global connection of financial markets cause regional instability because of resource extinction and rapid geographic shifts of production and financial assets".

These realities call for a critical rethink on the part of those outside the core of globalisation. These are "the other", those who are the receiving ends of globalisation who are just the dominated. The ongoing push towards globalisation by governments who continue to pursue open door policy in their economic policy and media policy should be resisted and called to question. The ontological destiny of every human society is to ensure progress for the people. The creations of internationally agreeable zones of domination necessitated by globalisation negates this principle and so no true humanistic government can allow itself to cooperating with the global forces of domination to bring about progress for the dominating forces at the detriment of own peoples.

Conclusion

This essay critically engaged contemporary theories of globalisation found among various scholars to first understand the scope of globalisation and its effects on the other. The other here means those cultures that lie outside the hegemonic Western forms of life that have enveloped the world and the use of Western categories in the analysis of other marginal cultures. Drawing from philosophical hermeneutics, this chapter contribution takes steps towards formulating a critical denunciation of globalisation as a demagoguery designed to obliterate the other or a view towards conforming the other to the center or creating zones of mental and material exploitation for the benefit of the Western hegemony. In contradiction to existing romanticisation of globalisation, this chapter concludes that globalisation empties the human spirit of its diversity and enthrones a univocity of culture masquerading as diversity with the view towards gaining global influence and material exploitation of 'the other'. It shows therefore that globalisation is indeed Westernisation. Westernisation creates "zones of domination" through binary articulation of the world. This means, necessarily creating an otherness one can play with. Looking at the economic conditions in the world with its huge inequalities and looking at the cultural hegemony of the West over the rest of the world, globalisation cannot be used to actualise human interests rather it is used to sustain a world that benefits only the dominating forces. To this

extent, this chapter contribution has been an attempt to show what globalisation is in itself and how it creates an otherness for exploitation. For proper global human interest and progress to be achieved, globalisation cannot be supported despite pretensions to the contrary. A more diffuse global relationship will be more appropriate.

Bibliography

Albrow, M. (1990) "Introduction" in Martin Albrow and Elizabeth King (eds), *Globalisation, Knowledge and Society* (London: Sage).

Al-Rodhan. R. F and Stoudmann, G. (2006) Definitions of Globalisation: A Comprehensive Overview and a Proposed Definition, Geneva Center for Security and Policy, June (no publishers).

Castells, M. (2000) "Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society." *British Journal of Sociology*, 51:1, 5–24.

Evans, P. (2008), "Is an Alternative Globalisation Possible?", *Politics Society*2008; 36.

Fanon, F. (1967) *Black Skin, White Mask,* New York: Grove Press.

Firebaugh, G. (2003). *The New Geography of Global Income Inequality,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Friese, H. (2001) "Pre-judice and identity", *Patterns of Prejudice*, 35:2, 63-79.

Fuchs, C. (2008), "Deconstructive Class Analysis: Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Examples for the Analysis of Richness and the Class Analysis of the Media and the Culture Industry." *ICT&S Research Paper* No. 4. Salzburg, Austria.

Fuchs, C. (2010) "Critical Globalisation Studies: An Empirical and Theoretical Analysis of the New Imperialism", *Science & Society*, Vol. 74, No. 2, April 2010, 215–247.

Fuchs, C. (n. d) "Critical Globalisation Studies and the New Imperialism", *Critical Sociology* 36(6) 839-867.

Fukuyama, F. *(1989) "The end of History/" The National Interest, Summer*

Garrett, P. (2010) "Meanings of 'Globalisation': East and West", in N Coupland (ed.) *The Handbook of Language and Globalisation*, Maldden, Oxford, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 447–474.

Gettier, E (1963) "Is Justified True belief Knowledge", *Analysis,* Vol. 23, pp 121-123.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, Mass: Policy Press.

Grazia La Spada, M. (2010) "Globalisation and Its Effects on Diversity: Some Economic Aspects" *Eurodiv Paper* 76. April, 2010, Global Challenges Series.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Hartwich, O. M. (2009) "Neoliberalism: The Genesis of a Political Swearword", The Centre for Independent Studies, Occasion Papers. http://www.cis.org.au/temp/op114_neoliberalism.pdf. Assessed 17 June 2009.

Henales, L. and Edwards, B. (2002)"Neo-liberalism and educational reform in Latin America" *Current Issues in Comparative Education,* Vol.2, No. 2, pp. 120-129.

Holsti, O. R. (1969) *Content Analysis for Social Science and Humanities,* Reading: Addison Wesley.

Hudson, M. (1999) "Understanding Information Media in the Age of Neo-liberalism: The Contributions of Herbert Schiller", *Progressive Librarian,* No. 16, http://libr.org/pl/16_Hudson.html. Accessed 28 June 2009.

Joanna, M. (2007) "The Jews and the Formation of the Modern National Identity in Poland." *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism,* Ed. A. Leoussi and S. Grosby, Edinburgh: Edinburgh, pp. 129–42.

Kaplan, A. (1943) "Content Analysis and the Theory of Signs", *Philosophy of Science,* No. 10, pp. 230-247.

Kellner and Kahn (n.d)

Kwame, Y. (n.d) **"**The Impact of Globalisation on African Culture" seen at www.csus.edu/yeboah%2520kwame.pdf **,** 1st May 2016.

Larmer, M. (2005) "Reaction & Resistance to Neo-Liberalism in Zambia", *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 32, No. 103, pp. 29-45.

Lazar, A and Lazar, M. (2008) "American hegemony in the post-Cold War era", *Journal of Language and Politics,* Vol.7, No 2, pp. 228–246.

Lazar, A. and Lazar, A. (2004) "Discourse of the new World Order: 'Out Casting' the Double face of Threat", *Discourse and Society,* Vol. 15, pp. 223-242.

Lere, I. B. (n.d) "Globalisation and Development, the Impact on Africa: a political Economy Approach" *Journal of Sustainable Development, Seen* at http://www.ssrn.com/link/OIDA-Intl-Journal-Sustainable-Dev.html, 1st May 2016.

Maddox, R. (1985). "Contemporary Hermeneutic Philosophy and Theological Studies", *Religious Studies,* 21, pp 517-529.

Martinez, E. and García, A. (2000) "What is Neo-Liberalism?, A Brief Definition" http://www.globalexchange.org/campaigns/econ101/neoliberalDefined.html. Assessed 26 July 2009.

McChesney, R. W. (2001) "Global Media, Neo-Liberalism and Imperialism", *Monthly Review,* Vol. 52, No. 10. http://www.monthlyreview.org/301rwm.htm. Accessed 20 June, 2009.

Mills, M. (2009) "Globalisation and Inequality" *European Sociological Review,* Vol. 25, No. 1, pp 1-8.

O'Rourke and Williamson (1999) Globalisation and History, Cambridge, Mass: MIT

Okere, T. (1983) *African Philosophy: A Historico-Hermenueutical Investigation of the Conditions of its Possibility,* Boston: University Press of America.

Popa, C. D. (2012) "Is Globalisation a Necessary Evil? Side Effects of the Globalisation" *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences* Volume 2, Special Issue 1 (2012), pp. 243-250.

Salin, P (2004) "Classical Liberalism in a Global Context", *Mont Pèlerin General Meeting*, Salt Lake City, August 14-19, 2004.

Schiller, H. I. (1993) "Transnational Media: Creating Consumers Worldwide", *Journal of International Affairs*. Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 47-58.

Shimemura, Y. (2002) "Globalisation vs Americanisation: Is the world being Americanised by the dominance of American culture?" *Comparative Civilizations Review*, No. 47, Fall.

Stiglitz J.E. (2002) *Globalisation and Its Discontents,* W.W. Norton &Company,

Tepeciklioğlu, E. (n.d) “Is Globalisation in Crisis? The Rise of Anti-Globalist Critique”

Ungerleider, C. (2006) “Government, Neo-Liberal Media, and Education in Canada”, *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 70-90.

Wade, R. H. (2004). “Is globalisation reducing poverty and inequality?” *World Development*, 32, 567–589.

Warde, A. "Eating Globally: Cultural flows and the Spread of Ethnic Restaurants," in Don Kalb et al. (ed.), *The Ends of Globalisation* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield