

Global Shift: Mapping the Changing Contours of the World Economy, 6th Edition, by Peter Dicken. New York: Guilford Press, 2011. ISBN 978-1-60918-006-5. pp. iv + 607.

Reviewed by: Olayemi Yunis Salami *

The basic view of this edition is to provide what is largely and often conflicting arguments about globalization; to show how the global economy works and its effects; to provide a balanced, grounded but emphatically critical perspective of globalization and to provide an insight into how world economy tax works and its effects on people.

Every chapter of the book is clearly and concisely written and well revised. Dicken not only takes into account new empirical development, but also incorporates new ideas on the shaping and reshaping of production, distribution and consumption in the global economy. The book is both a cross disciplinary drawing from a wide range of academic disciplines, including business and management, development studies, economics, economic geography, political science and sociology amongst others. It is organized into four closely related but distinct parts.

Part one focuses on the shifting contours of the global economic map; **Part two** explores the complex and multi various ways on which the actors, institutions and processes that make up the global economy interacts to produce global production networks (GPNs), **Part three** presents six case studies to illustrate the diverse ways in which these processes operate and **part four** is concerned with winning and losing in the global economy.

Dicken builds his arguments around three interconnected processes: Transnational Corporations (TNCs), States and Technology which in

his view are the reasons for reshaping the global economic map. He suggests a very useful explanation to the understanding of how these structures work but fails to analyse how these processes and structures connect with different social strata and classes. The case studies and examples in this book however, support key theoretical arguments, but the primary deficiency is that it does not have real life examples that elaborate on the theories.

Critique

The central theme of the book is globalization, while the core epicentre of globalization lies in freeing a country's economic frontiers to allow unrestricted international trade in goods and services, entry and exit of foreign capital and technology and giving the foreign investors a treatment similar to that given to domestic investors (Narula, 2003). However, globalization has become a phenomenon with disastrous consequences for governments and the peoples of developing countries. Globalization encourages privatization, which is the soul of capitalism. Privatization has intensified the integration of world economies in production and finance.

Globalization subverts the autonomy and self-determination of developing countries; causes low productivity due to lack of governmental incentives to local production; subversion of local production by high imports; exchange rate devaluation and the depletion of foreign reserves. This creates army of unemployed citizens and mass poverty. It also makes it impossible for governments to provide social protection, one of their core responsibilities and the one that has helped many developed nations maintain social cohesion and domestic political support (Majekodumi & Adejuwon, 2012). Furthermore, Globalization is perceived as: slippery, dangerous and important buzzword of the late twentieth century (Wiseman, 1998, p.1).

It can thus be deduced that globalization has two contrasting paradigms: as interdependence and as imperialism. Scholars of globalization as interdependence are of liberal persuasion. They see the concept as a framework of complex and growing interdependence among nations, associating globalization with economic liberalization as a policy option for the development of the south through a process of

free trade, investment and capital flows between countries. They also perceive globalization as “universalization of western values” (Fukuyama, 1992) and argue that globalization is “a new paradigm in international economic relations which apparently signals the triumph of capitalism on a truly global scale” (Rugumamu, 1999). Proponents of globalization as inter-dependency see a better world if nation states would realize and utilize to maximum the opportunities presented by inter-dependency resulting from globalization.

However, advocates of globalization as imperialism are mainly of the radical persuasion who see globalization as a phenomenon representing nothing but capitalism and imperialism alluding it to the impoverishment of the developing nations who are on the fringe of the world capitalism. They argue that if globalization is contributing to the global world order, it is also a significant factor in the global disorder (Suter, 2003). In their view, capitalist globalization does not homogenize the world but on the contrary emphasises more pronounced hierarchies (Amin, 2011). They construe globalization as profit maximization, and the march of capital across the world, in search of profits – a process that is facilitated by the expansion of multinational corporations, and driven by the technical advances in communication (Ake, 1995).

The inter dependency argument to me is a booby trap. It is part of the hegemony of the United States and its allies set for the gullible and greedy leaders of the world who are not proactive and scientific enough to understand the fundamental hiding objective of globalization, which was succinctly exposed by erstwhile U.S Secretary of State Henry Kissinger who described globalization as another word for United State dominance (Kissinger, 1999, cited in Gindin, 2002).

Meanwhile, the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990; the subsequent adoption of economic liberalization programmes by erstwhile Communist States, the efforts of China to join the main stream of Market-led economies of the Capitalist West are factors that propelled the economic globalization process (Babawale, 2006). From this historical understanding of the origin of globalization, it becomes obvious that globalization is an imperialist agenda which has been

described by Lenin as the “highest stage of capitalism” and “permanent phase of capitalism” (Amin, 2003).

The main drawback of the book is the lack of details about how the state and economic structure are grounded in both class and social relations. In the light of this, Spraque (2011) stresses the need to x-ray the social relations between the ruler and the ruled in developing countries which is essential in unearthing why some countries among the developing countries are marching on or catching up, while other are retrogressing or stagnating

We can conclude that globalization is: anti Third World development, widen the gulf between the developed countries and developing countries, the rich North and the poor South, the centres and the peripheries and has further served the objectives of the capitalist which are: monopoly, accumulation, expansionism, profiteering, domination and modern slavery. With all of these, it would be concluded that globalization is a phase in human enterprise with the objective of unifying the world into a single market which is however, detrimental to the developing countries because of the historical antecedents. No wonder there have been protest against globalization worldwide: Seattle, Genoa, etc. The president of the United States Donald Trump is reverting to protectionism and some leaders in Europe also used it as their campaign strategy, if they are voted in; perhaps globalization doctrine would need to be reviewed, taking into cognizance Britain exit from the European Union.

References:

- Ake, C. (1995). The new world order: a view from Africa. In H. Hans-Henrik and G. Sorensen (Eds.), *Whose world order? Uneven globalization and the end of the Cold War* (pp. 19-42). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amin, S. (2003). *Obsolescent capitalism: Contemporary politics and global disorder*. London: Zed Books.
- Amin, S. (2011). The implosion of global capitalism: The challenge for the radical left. Retrieved 20 September, 2017 from: http://www.networkideas.org/alt/apr2013/Samir_Amin.pdf
- Babawale, T. (2006): *Nigeria in the crises of Governance and development retrospective: Analysis of selected Issues and events*. Lagos: Concept Publications Ltd.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Gindin, S. (2002). Social justice and globalization: are they compatible? *Monthly review*, 54.2, 1.
- Kissinger, H. (1999). The basic challenge is that what is called globalization is really another name for the dominant role of the United States. Lecture at Trinity College, Dublin, October 12.
- Majekodumi, A., & Adejuwon, D. (2012). Globalization and African political economy: The Nigerian experience. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 8.
- Narula, S. (2003). Globalisation: India's experience for the African continent. DPMF Occasional Paper, No. 7, Development Policy Management Forum, Addis Ababa
- Rugumamu, S.M. (1999). *Globalization, liberalization, and Africa's marginalization*. Harare: African Association of Political Science.
- Sprague, J. (2011). A review of Peter Dicken's *Global shift: Mapping the changing contours of the world economy*, 5th Edition. *Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved 20 September, 2017 from

<http://jebssprague.blogspot.com.ng/2011/06/review-of-sociologist-peter-dickens.html>

Suter, K. (2003). *Global order and global disorder*. London: Praeger Publishing.

Wiseman, J. R. (1998). *Global nation? Australia and the politics of globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

***Olayemi Yunis Salami** is a PhD student in the Department of Political Science, University of Lagos, Nigeria. His area of interest is International Political Economic Relations.