Name of author: P-J Ezeh
Affiliation: Department of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka
Title of paper: GLOCALIZATION AND THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF POST-COLONIAL SOCIETY IN AFRICA: SOME NIGERIAN EXAMPLES

Glocalization and the Anthropology of Post-colonial Society in Africa: Some Nigerian Examples

By: P-J Ezeh
[University of Nigeria, Sociology & Anthropology, Nsukka, Nigeria
pitjazi@yahoo.com] A paper presented at the Fourth European Conference on African Studies, 15 – 18 June 2011, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala, Sweden

ABSTRACT. In a globalizing world there is the need for reconciliation of the knowledge systems of pre-colonial and post-colonial Africa, or put differently the indigenous and exogenous knowledge systems. After the disruption that has been caused by slavery, Muslim/Christian proselytisation, and colonisation, African and other societies that have had similar experiences may not effectively compete in the contemporary world unless they reconcile the two knowledge systems: the local and the global. The mistake that is being made with the current efforts at globalization is that it seems to be based on the assumption that Africa can somehow make a cultural quantum leap into the unified global system. At best, what is being witnessed is a misapplication of the acceptance of the material aspects of the new system. No progress is being made in adaptation to the epistemics that underpins or drives the new system. There is disconnect between the knowledge systems of the old and the new systems. Knowledge being a cultural product, its increment or modification must proceed from what is already known to what is expected. The strategy that appears to be advisable is what has been termed glocalization. Glocalization has been described as globalization of the local and localization of the global. My proposition is that the two systems can be reconciled instead of attempting the impossibility of jettisoning home-grown systems that societies have been used to for millennia. The global system can make a speedier progress by incorporating the local system, and the local system may end up being stronger by adapting to the global system. I have been trying to use ethnographic models to investigate this proposition. My case studies have been the Orring and the Igbo of southeastern Nigeria and so far my experience seems to support this position.

Preamble

There is no doubt that globalization has had immense impact on the everyday life of many

African societies. Thanks to the international and social media, which it has made possible, much

of this effect may easily be gauged whichever part of the world one might be. The political

perturbations in northern Africa and the neighbouring Middle East that began in December last

year, what journalists have named *jasmine revolution*, are only recent examples that are still

fresh in mind.

On 17 December 2010 an unemployed graduate in Tunisia, Mohammed Bouazizi, attempted suicide by setting himself on fire after police seized the fruits and vegetables he was selling for his subsistence. Sympathizers launched into a spontaneous demonstration. Those initial events snowballed into massive long-drawn-out popular uprising targeting the government of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali (or simply Ben Ali) who had stayed for twenty three years as president and blamed for a comatose economy, cronyism and corruption at the expense of the populace. After scores of deaths the unrelenting protesters rejected all pacifications short of outright vacation of office by the President. Three days shy of a full month that the demonstrations began, Ben Ali quit power and went into exile. The rest of north Africa and the Arab world picked it up from there and all the countries that rated their heads of government as having overstayed in power replicated the Tunisia-style uprising, which the mass media in the meantime had given the name, Jasmine revolution. It spread to Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Morocco and Jordan, with varying consequences.

This narrative depicting what another sociologist has described as "globalisation of discontent" illustrates the effect of globalisation on diverse human groups in the world today (Obono, 2011).

How Africa Sees Globalization

At least for purposes of this paper views of globalization may be divided into two: globalization as presented by its proponents, and globalization as seen by the recipients. In Africa the former are regarded more or less as coterminous with industrialized nations of the Northern hemisphere. The latter are more or less the so-called developing countries or the former colonies of the Western powers. I should add that apart from the mainstream views, there are on both sides critical positions that deviate from the more familiar, or even reflect the views on the other side.

It is important to outline these positions to be able to place the concerns of this paper in perspectives. Such cross matching of ideas is more prevalent in the positions that are informed more by objective data about cross-cultural relations than by determination to conform to prevailing political climate. Onyeneke (1995), a sociologist and Catholic priest formerly teaching in my Department in University of Nigeria, is an early advocate of the danger of ignoring sociological and anthropological facts or adopting the instant-coffee approach in handling cross-cultural relations or in search for social change. Dike (1979, 1985), an anthropologist and former head of that Department, has worked on acculturation using Nigerian groups as examples for a period spanning four decades. He began in the period before globalization as it is now known but his conclusions are still valid in the study of current globalization.

Ritzer (2008: 573) has defined globalization as "the spread of worldwide practises, relations, consciousness, and organization of social life". Seen in this light, globalization is an international system where institutions are increasingly homogenised aided by the advancement in information technology. In Africa we noticed the spread of globalization in its present form after the end of the ideological rivalry between the former communist bloc of the East and the capitalist societies of the West in early 1990s. But it was not the very first time Africa had something like it. In principle that was also what colonisation, and even proselytisation of the scriptural religions of the Middle East; Christianity and Islam, had done in their own ways and without the name. The principle of globalization predates the name.

The effects of current globalization can be seen whether one looks at politics (just as in the example I began the paper with), economy, culture, or social institutions. Ritzer (2008: 573) has suggested that analysis of the phenomenon should take those lines. The impact of globalization is such that writers such as Macionis (2003: 640 – 646) now recommend a branch

of sociology to be known as global sociology. In other words, the study of particular societies is no longer enough, there is also the need to examine each society at the level of its place in the wider world.

Sociological theories are also emerging to explain the phenomenon. Marshall's entry on globalization is notched with globalization theory and most comments that the entry contains are on the latter. But there are writers who contrary to this position see globalization as a process and seek to explain it from the perspectives of the existing theory, e.g. the world systems theory that Latin American scholars had proposed earlier. It is a theory that see the global systems in terms of a centre, semi-periphery and periphery and hold that the dominant nations of the world's North constitute the centre and countries of the Third World, the periphery. The semi-periphery consists of such emerging powers as Brazil, China, India, and so on, of intermediate economic statuses. According to this theory, the centre has always exploited the periphery for its own advancement while keeping the disadvantaged groups of the periphery dependent on the exploiters. This is not the appropriate forum to debate the merits or lack of it of this theory. The purpose of citing it here is just to make the point that some sociologists of globalization deny that this theory is appropriate in explaining globalization. Instead, like Marshall (1998: 258), they prefer to explain globalization in the light of developments in the technology, the economic or political systems.

> Marshall (1998: 258) merits being quoted in full here,
>> Global culture is brought about by a variety of social and cultural developments:
>> the existence of a world-satellite information system; the emergency of global patterns
>> of consumption and consumerism; the cultivation of cosmopolitan life-styles; the emergence of
>> global sport such as the Olympic Games, world football competitions and international tennis
>> matches; the spread of world tourism; the decline of the sovereignty of the nation-state; the growth
>> of global military system; recognition of a world-wide ecological crisis; the development of
>> world-wide health problems such as` AIDS; the emergence of world political systems such as the
>> League of Nations and the United Nations; the creation of global political movements such as
>> Marxism; extension of the concept of human rights; and the complex interchange between world
>> religions.

Globalization described in the foregoing terms is not the same as globalization that is encountered in everyday life in some parts of the world, not least Africa. That is precisely the problem, and sociologists have been trying to make sense of this.

The view is pretty well known in Africa that globalization amounts to a new strategy by the centre to continue to hold down the periphery. Outside Africa it has also been suggested that the principle of globalization predates the name has been supported by some of the theorists who write on the current situation. Ritzer (2008: 230, 231) notes that aspects of the sociologies of Karl Marx and Max Weber dealt with such a problem. This is also the point that Schuftan (1999) made in an article at the turn of the century. He credited the emergence of globalization to a meeting in Switzerland that he said was called to strategize for a new way of strengthening the control of the world systems by the West following the end of the Cold War.

According to him, capitalism in a shape that it could be used by Western industrialized nations to subjugate the rest of the world economically was the subject of a meeting of experts at Lugano in the Swiss Alps at following the collapse of communism.   It was sponsored by those countries to deliberate on the system. The result was a 213-page book that was published in London in 1999, *The Lugano report: on preserving capitalism in the twenty-first century.* Globalization of the open-market economy was reported to have been recommended as the Hobson's choice for all countries despite warning on such drawbacks as its severe unfairness in distribution of wealth and the tendency of this to lead to social trouble. "The 'Commissioning Party' of the Report," Schuftan states,

> sees Capitalism as a social construct of
>   cumulative human ingenuity: 'the
>   most brilliant collective invention of
>   history'; it must therefore be preserved.
>   The task of the twenty-first century will,

in their eyes, thus be to create the
legitimate, universally recognized global
political structure to support it. This,
because the Market, at its broadest and
most inclusive, is the closest we are likely to
come to the wisdom of the Almighty'.

One view is that everything that is recognized as the characteristic of globalization fits into the capitalists' view of this world and ultimately serves the interest of the world's North. As the next section shows, the term, globalism, has been proposed by those who see globalization as a way of dominating the rest of the world with an ideology that in reality is designed for the convenience of only one part of the world. Another view denies globalization as an imperialist agenda and sees it instead as a well-meaning way to bring in equitable improvement of all parts of the world.

Analysing Globalization

The terms, globalism and globality, have also been coined to refer to some of the realities that globalization has made possible. Ritzer (2008: 576) sees globalism as referring to the dominance of the world economic order by a particular system, namely that of capitalism. Globality refers to the social effects of globalization where exclusivities heretofore associated with particular societies are being dismantled. The fluidity inherent in these discourses can be seen in the fact that while some other writers recognize these terms, their glossings of them are different. Marshall's (1998: 258, 259) view of globalism is more or less what has been called globality in Ritzer (2008). But he also recognizes the attempts by sociologists to make analyses that factor in the changed circumstances in cross-cultural relations.

What Marshall listed as being responsible for globalization will be seen as products of globalization instead. If we take a few of these, for lack of space, we will find that in each case the condition emerged because there was already some supra-national powers that had global

ambition and needed such condition or establishment as a tool to achieve the objective. League of Nations was created as a result of the decision by the victorious side in the First World War to put in place a world system that would discourage a repeat of the War that lasted from 1914 to 1918. When that strategy failed and the Second World War was fought, the United Nations was set up for the same purpose. The main criticism against such systems has always been that the interests of the less powerful nations are not adequately represented. Whether it is in the domain of technology, economy, or in sports, those are such activities as reflecting the interests of the powerful nations, and the less powerful ones are merely co-opted at the cost of their own autochthonous variants.

Non-sociologists who are critical observers are aware of this fact. When the globalized version of legal practice that is known as multi-jurisdictional practice was mooted in Nigeria, a senior lawyer took the opportunity to lament the corrosive effect of globalization on the institutions of the less powerful societies. "Globalization in my humble view," he argues, "is a journey to utopia, a lotus-eater kind of world far away from reality. But the danger is that it is taken seriously by the people who control the resources of the world" (Daudu, 2011). Referring to the perturbations in the Arab world that this discourse started off with, one commentator in *Time* warned, "They should keep in mind, though, that nirvana can be elusive." (O'Neil, 2011)

In principle, globalization is supposed to remove or at least blur the boundaries between all groups in terms of their culture, economy, politics, and social institutions. From what anthropologists know about human groups, this may amount to a pipe dream in reality. What seems feasible is increased adaptation of local strategies in reaction to the realities of the changed world. The reason is that any hurriedly imposed change cannot make one society become exactly like the other. For example, Nigeria cannot become like America simply because

it watches the CNN or access *The Wall Street Journal* on line. Nigeria, even if it wants, cannot de-learn millennia of autochthonous ways and metamorphose to America overnight. But it has also been found that adaptation is possible, and in any case had worked before.

As I said in Ezeh (2008), Anya (1995) had reported that by 1963 a global survey of the world economy by the Americans in University of Michigan rated Eastern Nigeria the fastest industrializing economy in the world. Nigerian leaders are still nostalgic about that period and some make suggestions on how to recapture it. Where they differ with anthropologists is on where the causes of the progress and decline are located (Edukugho, 2011). Elsewhere (Ezeh 2002: 171) I have also suggested that such a great performance can be traced to a sound application of the benefits of cultural relativity, which includes a people's knowledge systems: how a people produce and manage knowledge, or what in sociology is called epistemics. Because of an extensive ethnological investigation of the indigenous strategies, the autochthonous structures of the post-contact Eastern Nigeria met the challenges of the plural modern nation-state and the international community relatively well grounded. To a level, such was also the case for the rest of Nigeria. Comparison of that and the current free fall into post-Cold War globalization will reveal a disaster.

The Igbo and the Orring under Globalization

The Igbo is one of Nigeria' three largest ethnic groups along with the Yoruba and the Hausa. The Igbo number about 40 million and have a record about their culture dating back to the days of the trans-Atlantic salve trade. Olaudah Equiano, one of them that was captured and sold into slavery in America had the rare privilege of being manumitted, following his resourcefulness. In 1789, he went on to write his much valued autobiography that told the story of his native country to the

then European and American peoples (Equiano, 1996). We read in Equiano's account a people who were satisfied with their autochthonous institutions and social structure. Historians record the initial resistance of efforts of the Christian missionaries and later the British colonizer until they were compelled, and in some cases cajoled into submission. But it was the introduction of the Western-style schools that finally did the trick. The missionaries introduced schools ostensibly to teach literacy but the design was actually to spread the European ways and Christianity (Isichei, 1995: 270, 271). The colonizer built on that strategy but there was something about his strategy that is very relevant to the concerns of this paper. Probably because he took anthropological insights seriously, the British colonizer in Nigeria made sure that he relied on what might be called cultural symbiosis. He drew from reports of career anthropologists that carried out independent researches as well as commissioned official ethnographies of his own. Anafulu (1981: 276-286) has listed 135 of such official investigations carried out among the Igbo alone in the 11 years between 1925 and 1936 among the Igbo alone by 72 researchers working independent of each other. In the end their findings were given to the colonial authority.

Frederick Lugard (1942: vi) as the first Governor-General of the country that he created underlined such interest in anthropology on the part of officialdom. He said in his foreword to the ethnography of the Nupe of northern Nigeria by the Austrian anthropologist, Sigfried Nadel, "It has been said that modern anthropology is destined to be of great assistance to colonial governments in providing the knowledge of the social structure of native groups upon which a sound and harmonious Native Administration … should be built … I for one firmly believe in the possibility of such co-operation" (Ezeh, 2011).

For his purpose the colonizer used his knowledge of the social systems; his own which he saw as the one to be internationalised and spread to the colonies everywhere in the world, and the indigenous one of the host society. For our purpose in this paper what is relevant is that he recognized that it was some form of symbiosis of the indigenous and the extraneous cultures that might make the latter effective in the host society. Precipitate suppression of the host culture would produce ineffective results. His deliberate cultural dialogue led to a prosperous amalgamation of more than 400 ethnicities into of the world's potentially successful newly independent nation-states by the time the colonizer left in 1960. A global survey of the world economy by the Americans in University of Michigan rated Eastern Nigeria, where the Igbo was the largest ethnic group, the fastest industrializing economy in the world (Anya, 1995). Overall for Nigeria, the economy was growing at nearly three percent after the first postcolonial, democracy had come into office (Stappleton 1967: 24). John Eppstein (1976: 188) and his friends looking at that period call Nigeria "the model of British-inspired democracy in Africa".

After the initial attempt to continue with the cultural relativistic strategies of the colonizer, the nationalists soon abandoned those and began swinging at two extremes. One of the extremes was to abandon the reality that Nigeria is a multiethnic conglomeration that the colonizer has contrapted primarily for his own convenience. The nationalists at that point began to put loyalty of their ethnic origins before the interest and mutual accommodation of the new plural society. The ill-advised tactic of ethnocentrism culminated in a bitterly fought civil war in which 2 million died between the middle of 1967 and early 1970. The gains of the early post-Independence years that were anchored on cultural relativism and ethnic mutual accommodation were lost. The other extreme has been to try to copy models of plural society organisation from foreign sources, usually Euro-American or Arabic ones. Sometimes these two strategies are

mixed. It is important to stay focused on the title of this discourse, so that I do not veer away from the two ethnic groups that I have chosen as examples.

The case of the Orring is intertwined with that of the Igbo. To a great extent the cases of practically all the other Nigerian groups are comparable with that of the Igbo as far as the concern of this paper goes. I have chosen to ties it up with that of the Igbo on two main grounds: 1. I am an Igbo and I have done participant-observation-style fieldwork among the Orring continually since 1995. 2. It can be shown from my own studies and from documentary accounts relating to the two groups that the Orring and the Igbo present a curious case of power relations whereby the former take cues from the latter and the latter take their own cues from extra-African exogenous powers with globalization ambition. The Orring see itself as Igbonizing its social strategies as a form of modernization strategy, while the Igbo globalizes. The vitiating effects on the cultures of both societies are the same.

The Orring are an ethnic group that speak the language, Korring, and live in several discontinuous territories in Benue, Cross River and Ebonyi States of Nigeria's southeastern districts. My study focused on those of them in the two communities, Okpoto and Ntezi, actually alteronyms for what the culture-bearers themselves call – respectively – Lame and Eteji. Okpoto and Ntezi are sandwiched by communities of the numerically superior Igbo. The Orring are of immense ethnographic importance for diverse reasons one of which is the focus of this study, namely their autochthonous governance. Unlike their populous acephalous neighbours, the Orring are traditionally centralized under a powerful monarch that one early British visitor described as "a deified personage" (Cook, 1935).

In the pre-colonial days they fought to retain their identity in the face of encroachment by their Igbo neighbours. Indeed the initial attempts by the British colonial officers to set up

European-style administration were difficult partly due to the fact that the Ntezi Orring were at war with an Igbo group known as the Ezza. The colonizer tried to solve the intra-Nigerian acculturation by setting up a complementary government at the grassroots to cater to matters of customary nature. At that level one of such governments known as Native Courts was established exclusively for the Orring. Usually only members of the ethnic group or the communities whose customs apply in the localities could be members of the native courts. However, the colonizer and the colonial officialdom were directly in charge at four higher levels: district, provincial, region, and central, which were not necessarily, ethnic-sensitive in their composition.

The situation changed after Independence from Britain. The nationalists who took over directly from the colonizer attempted recognizing the cultural diversity of the country that was based on some form of ethnic equity. But that changed following the putsch and a long interregna by successive juntas. Minorities like the Orring paid huge cultural prices in the context. Finding themselves in the same administrative structure with the overwhelmingly numerically superior Igbo, the Orring saw assimilation as a viable political strategy. About fifteen years afterwards following an initial attempt by Nigeria to re-democratise, the Orring tried to re-assert their identity by re-questing the regional legislature at Enugu to give a formal directive that their language and culture should be recognized in official communications. They did not fully realize their objective before yet another series of military interregna began in 1983.

Instead of focusing on the post-colonial political vicissitudes of the Orring, which is a very valid area of inquiry in its own right, it is methodologically advisable to focus on how those bear on the concerns of the current paper, which simply put is that having been politically browbeaten locally to assimilate to the Igbo, the lot of the Igbo vis-à-vis international cross-

cultural relations also became that of the Orring as well. Both fare badly in the prevailing misapplication of the globalization concepts. The Orring look up to the Igbo and the Igbo in turn see a model in the ill-imbibed Westernisation presented as globalization. In the two societies the drama is re-enacted among individuals in power relations with the underdogs in various social spaces, e.g. the political, educational and religious. While the underdogs see those in authority as their local models, they are indeed indirectly copying the Western culture in a miserably ineffectual way that amounts to nothing more than a servile acceptance of cultural jamming. Writing on the cultural agenda-setting of the media of the powerful nations of the West, Hannerz (2002: 65) has used the more apt term, "globalization of consciousness".

Globalization has done more in vitiating their culture than had any other form of attempt at internationalization of a foreign practice since the trans-Atlantic slave trade. Globalization succeeded among these African groups on two main grounds. 1. It demonized all non-material non-Western cultural traits. 2. It employs the use of theocentricism or religiosity which has been found to be very effective in the traditional culture but this time around it turns the strategy against the host society. This could provide one of the world's most notorious case studies in culture jamming. 3. It uses indigenous agents to accomplish these stratagems.

One view is that globalization is really designed to work the way it does among the Igbo and the Orring of Nigeria. Instead of an exercise in cultural equity that it is taunted as being, it is in truth a project of cultural imperialism, according to such view. It is designed to sell the western cultural standpoint, and dismantle or at best vitiate cultural traits of non-Western groups (Alvesson, 2002: 38, 44). But to see the theoretical underpinnings of such a position it is important to note the conceptual interconnection between globalization as a process and postmodernism as a social theory.

It may be easier to appraise the situation that I describe among the Nigerian groups with regard to globalization if a social domain is taken as an example. I take the religious domain because of its central position in shaping of a group's knowledge of the world and in social control in traditional societies. Three periods may now be identified in the recent religious history of the two societies:

(a) the period before Christian missionary activity in the 19th century when the autochthonous African religions were the only option,

(b) the time from late 19th century to 1980s when Christian churches have been fully introduced but a symbiosis with the autochthonous African religions was encouraged

(c) the time from early 1990s until the present when Christianity, driven by globalization, has been postmodernized in Nigeria.

For two principal reasons, my concern in this paper is the last period. First it is what lends itself to effective ethnographic investigation. Secondly, it is what effectively illustrates my fears of dangers of distortion of a group's worldview in a futile attempt to impose a common model on all groups everywhere. In the two earlier periods the tactic of the missionaries where the traditional belief systems of the host societies were concerned was Fabian. Although the goal was to vitiate the traditional belief system or even abolish it the missionaries employed much patience so that they might implant the versions of their faiths that might be the same as what was obtainable in Europe or America. The wholesale change into Christianity was expected to be a future possibility when the generations that were Westernised through school-style education would through natural process replace the ones that were too strongly enculturated in the autochthonous ways to change easily. Basden (1983), one of the most successful of the proselytizers could therefore say in 1917, "It is part of the missionary's business to understand

the mind of the native, just as much as it is the soldier's aim to reconnoitre the enemy's position. The missionary cannot be the indiscriminating, unsympathetic person." There are also historical sources to show that in general such was the preferred strategy of Christians in Nigeria in the two early periods (Afigbo, 1985, Isichei, 1995: 270 – 272).

The third period that is driven by globalization is the reverse of the earlier periods both in principle and in execution. Where propagators of the foreign religion were patient, their counterparts in the globalization project are desperate and precipitate. Where the former aimed to implant Christianity that is comparable with the models that are found everywhere else, the latter has invented Christianity that is such only in name but the worldview of the traditional society in essence. Or put the other way, Christian motifs are sprinkled on what are decidedly traditional epistemics and processes.

Early ethnographers noticed that belief in supernatural agencies underpinned how all social institutions in the two societies, which to a large extent is also how most traditional societies are organized (Forde, 1954; Lambek, 2002). Contrariwise, the Enlightenment project which provided the epistemic engine for the emergence of the Euro-American post-traditional social institutions are based was agnostic where in the sense that only reason and science were admissible (Featherstone, 1995: 72). Every social system must have the type of knowledge appropriate to it in order to thrive. In the case of globalization in the Nigerian societies, only the social innovation is being foisted upon them, but not the requisite knowledge. What happens here is like running old computer software with a brand new hardware.

There is a resurgence of theocentricism in Nigerian social life. Old beliefs in witchcraft, sorcery, magic and denial of ability of humans to make a difference in their society based on their efforts. Not surprisingly, there is also institutional decay and in some cases outright failure.

Krinsky (2007) has studied this as it affects Nigeria as a whole. The postmodernist Christian sects have found that while threatening traditional kin structure in favour of their religious organizations, members of new Christian sects nevertheless promote a thaumaturgy worldview that is easy to see as a repackaging of the belief in magic in the traditional belief systems. What is achieved is at best only mere psychological palliative that cannot in any way solve the problem of a globalizing world, because the effectiveness of religion itself as an institution must also have been seriously vitiated, if not destroyed (Ezeh, 2011).

Among the Orring, the thinning population of elders who have not been coerced into joining the Church complain of the negative effects of the new form of Christianity on public morals and social control. Teenage pregnancy is rife, armed banditry hitherto unknown is now common, juvenile delinquency nearly non-existent before is everywhere, as is marital instability, and so.

Theorists looking at the cultural aspects of globalization posit two possibilities. One has been called cultural convergence, and the other called cultural hybridization. The situation being described for the Nigerian groups amount more or less to cultural hybridization. Cultural convergence anticipates some kind of symbiosis or give-and-take relationship instead of the one-sided imperial propensities implied in hybridization. The key drawback in hybridization is that in the end none of the parties in the relationship is the winner. Everyone loses where the party aspiring to impose its cultural preferences or any other social domain fails to allow for proper and epistemic underprops. Knowledge being a continuum new ways may only be learnt through the old ways; learning of course; not imposed. Bedell (2005: 57) looking at the matter from economic perspectives has reached similar conclusion.

Older Nigerian studies corroborate the conclusion that left unguided by objective comparative studies by experts that are knowledgeable in the field; in this case anthropologists and allied specialists, the host society seems to run the new institutions with old knowledge that was designed in reaction to different challenges and times (Dike, 1979, 1983; Onyeneke, 1993). Outside Africa, such guided change has been reported among the Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea. War mongering was successfully substituted with sports, notably cricket, that provided the outlet for competition and simulated violence in a creative and non-destructive way (Lee & Searles, 1999: 358). Such transformation is possible in every social institution and every society, once a workable process is applied.

The inability of apologists of globalization to accommodate such epistemic inputs of the local culture-bearers may be due to the provenance of the theoretical underpinning of the project, namely postmodernism. To make globalization in its present form possible, postmodernism has to deny predictability and precision of symbolic systems of which culture is one. In the place of such they put the preference for multiplicity of discourse. In that theoretical position, knowledge and power are interlinked, where knowledge itself is glossed as mere claim to knowledge and not the result of a research that makes the control of reality possible (Alvesson, 2002: 178). One effect of this view has been to also deny the vitality of culture. The title of Featherstone's book on the subject is revealing, *Undoing culture – globalization, postmodernism and identity* (Featherstone, 1995).

Unfortunately mere denial does not ipso facto amount to the non-existence of the thing that is denied. The Nigerian examples show that, in reality, postmodernism is too speculative a philosophy to address the stark human conditions on the ground, especially in non-Western societies. Maybe the picture of the social world that is painted by postmodernists/globalists

capture the situation in the North but the facts are clear that the situation other parts of the globe may be different. To assume sameness of this situation everywhere without making efforts to objectively investigate it tantamounts to imagining the North to be the only part that matter and therefore proceed to impose their preferences on the rest. Globalization in that form is then nothing more than a new Hobbesian state where might equals right. Globalization in that form becomes a disempowering process to the weaker societies whose culture is denied and are constrained to join the bandwagon of the only culture that is deemed to be endorsable.

Deliberate blending of local and foreign knowledge systems has worked in the past as I have demonstrated. However, globalization conceived in its current postmodernism-propelled form will lack a functional room for such, or even sabotage it. At least postmodernism-propelled globalization is not working for the Nigerian societies that have been studied. Yet it is possible that a re-modelling of it may work; a re-modelling in the form that has been called glocalization or even cultural convergence.

Glocalization as an Option

This term, glocalization, is coined from globalization and localization. In its meaning that is adopted in this paper, it recognizes the need for cross-cultural borrowing of processes and structure but it rejects wholesale imposition of strategies from one culture on another culture. Every extraneous proposition must always take the local variant into account and find a way of reconciling the two, if a cross-cultural relationship is intended. Devisch (2008-b: 10) in a different context has coined the term, g*local* (global + local), to describe such a strategy.Such melange is necessary because as Diamond (1999: 237, 238), notes, the basic needs of human groups everywhere are the same. What differ are the strategies for addressing them. In an interdependent world, what is needed is harmonization of the knowledge systems where such

must co-exist. The first step to such reconciliation is to understand the forms of knowledge that are used by each group. Understanding of the local systems will lead to adapting it more effectively for the needs of the changed world.

I have shown that in the Nigerian societies the spread of globalized practices has been a one dimensional. Only the West gives, and the giving itself is half measure. It is only the material aspects that are given. The knowledge aspects are either absent or inadequate. The consequence is that, in real terms, there is no development. In some cases, de-development has set in. Familiar institutions are destroyed, with no viable alternatives in their place.

Progress is necessarily a continuum between the past and the present. The challenge is to find a way to effect such a synthesis. If the world desires a global system, it is also imperative to streamline knowledge systems of the various societies. At the moment, thanks to postmodernism, guesswork is promoted over fieldwork; speculation is promoted over science. In social life, both sides of these binaries are needed.

I recommend the inclusion of more anthropology in globalization. At present notices some small ethnography here and there but not much ethnology and applied anthropology. If the last two are brought in with due rigour there will be glocalization in the sense that I have used the term in this paper.

References

Afigbo, A. (1985) *An outline of Igbo history*. Owerri: RADA.

Alvesson, M. (2002) *Postmodernism and social research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Anafulu, J. (1981) *The Ibo-speaking peoples of southern Nigeria – a selected annoted list of writings, 1627 – 1970*. Munchen: Kraus International Publications.

Anya, O. (1995) "Hope Waddell Institution, a vision and a mission". *Daily Sunray,* 15 March: 12.

Basden, G. (1983) Among *the Ibos of Nigeria*. np: University Publishing Co.

Bedell, G. (2005) *Makepovertyhistory*. London: Penguin Books.

Cook. A. (1935) Intelligence report on Mteze and Okpoto clans of Abakaliki Division of Ogoja Province. An unpublished report available at the national Archives Enugu, dated 5th January.

Devisch, R. (2008) What is an anthropologist? *CODESRIA Bulletin*, 1 & 2: 5 – 11.

Diamond, J. (1999) Race without color. In Rafferty, K. & Ukaegbu, D. (Eds.). *Faces of anthropology* (pp. 73 – 79). Needham Heights: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Dike, A. (1979) Misconceptions of African urbanism: some Euro-American notions. In Obudho, R & El-Shakhs, S (Eds). *Development of urban systems in Africa* (pp. 19 – 30). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Dike, A. (1985) *The resilience of Igbo culture*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Daudu, J. (2011) Multi-jurisdictional practice: the position of the NBA. *Business Day*, 17 March: 37.

Edukugho, E. (2011) Anyaoku: There is strong case to restructure Nigeria. *Sunday Vanguard*, 29 May: 5.

Eppstein, J. (1976) *The book of the world*. London: Wyndham Publications.

Equiano, O., Paul Edward (Ed.) (1996) *Equiano's travels – The interesting narrative of the life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa the Afrivcan*. London: Heinemann.

Ezeh, P-J (2002) Corruption and deviant behaviour in Nigeria: an anthropological perspective. In C. Ugwu (Ed.), *Corruption in Nigeria: critical perspectives* (pp. 153 – 174). Nsukka: Chuka Educational Publishers.

Ezeh, P-J (2008) Globalisation, privatization, and Third World economies: sociological views of some Nigerian examples. In J. Onwuka (Ed.), *The Third World in social science perspective* (pp. 230 – 240). Okigwe: Fasmen.

Ezeh, P-J (2011) Anthropology and postmodern theology: the Nigerian example. A paper presented at the conference on the status of anthropology in Africa, Catholic University of Cameroon, Bamenda, 13 – 16 January.

Featherstone, M. (1995) *Undoing culture – globalization, postmodernism and identity*. London: SAGE.

Forde, D. (Ed.) (1954) *African worlds – studies in the cosmological ideas and social values of African peoples*. London: International African Institute and Oxford University Press.

Hannerz, U. (2002) Among the foreign correspondents: reflections on anthropological styles and audiences. *Ethnos*, 67(1), 57 – 74.

Isichei, E. (1995) *A history of Christianity in Africa*. London: SPCK.

Krinsky, S. (2007) Pentecostal prosperity and the political economy of contemporary Nigeria. *The Nigerian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 5: 1 – 21.

Lee, L. & R. Searles. (1999) *Faces of culture*. Forth Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Lugard, F. (1942) Foreword. In S. Nadel, *A black Byzantium – the kingdom of Nupe in Nigeria* (pp. iii – v). London: Oxford University Press.

Macionis, J. (2003) *Sociology*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Marshall, G. (1998) *Dictionary of sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Obono, O. (2011) The globalisation of discontent. *Business Day,* 15 February: 60.

O'Neil, B. (2011) The revolution generation. *Time*, 21 March: 4.

Onyeneke, A. (1993) *African traditional institutions and the Christian Church: a sociological prologue to Christian inculturation*. Nsukka: Spiritan Publication.

Ritzer, G. (2008) *Sociological theory*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Schuftan, C. (1999) Book Review. *Africa Development,* XXIV (3 & 4): 177 – 183.

Stappleton, B. (1967) *The wealth of Nigeria*. Ibadan: Oxford University Press.