Abstract
In the history of human societal development, imperialism referring generally to the practice of exercising obvious or subtle political or/and economic control over a weaker human society, assumed various dimensions. The reality of neo-imperialism is one of such dimensions. The imperialists’ activities contributed significantly to developmental status of the current global south society, formerly identified in the global ranking as ‘third world’. This paper examines neo-imperialism in relations to the global south with a philosophic view of exposing the products of the interaction as well as identifying the underlying principle that informs the imperialist tendencies. The paper identifies quest for domination and man’s uncontrolled egocentric passion as foundations of imperialism in the global south and the entire human society.
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Introduction
The expression ‘Global South’ is a currently trending term for what used to be known as ‘third world’ countries in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The third world in prevailing global ranking approximates the attributes of underdeveloped, developing and less developed world facets. UNDP posits, “The term “South” or “Global South” refers to developing countries, which are located primarily in the Southern Hemisphere.” (UNDP, 2017). A bit of detail shows that:

The Global South is a term that has been emerging in transnational and postcolonial studies to refer to what was called the "Third World" (i.e., countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America), "developing countries," "less developed countries," and "less developed regions."[1] It can also include poorer "southern" regions of wealthy "northern" countries.[2] The Global South is more than the extension of a "metaphor for underdeveloped countries."[3] In general, it refers to these countries' "interconnected histories of colonialism, neo-imperialism, and differential economic and social change through which large inequalities in living standards, life expectancy, and access to resources are maintained (Wikipedia)

The global south countries by above inference share existential factors of colonialism and imperialism, though economic poverty remains foundational in their bracket of commonality. This is against the backdrop of torrential global south scholars’ argument of misconstrued notion of development which persuasively equates development with modern
science, technological advancement and overall socio-political cum economic height underpinning the status of global north countries. For instance, Berberoglu citing Manning Nash’s (1963, 3) ideal typical mode of attacking the problems of social change and economic development states that … the general features of a developed economy are abstracted as an ideal type and then contrasted with the equally ideal typical features of poor economy and society. In this mode, development is viewed as the transformation of one into the other...

The second mode is the acculturation view of the process of development. The West( taken here as the Atlantic community of developed nations and their overseas outliers) diffuses knowledge, skills, organization, value, technologyand capital to a poor nation, until over time, its society, culture and personnel become variants of that which made the Atlantic community successful. Thus, the North-South divide considered widely as political and socio-economic split is limited in the frame of totality.

**Imperialism in the Global South**

Imperialism generally stands for “…the policy of extending the rule or authority of an empire or nation over foreign countries, or of acquiring and holding colonies and dependencies.” (Dictionary.com) Historically, two models of imperialism are significant. In its ancient Greek model, imperialism assumed a world unifier engendering Alexander the Great’s vision of “… the cosmopolis, in which all citizens of the world would live harmoniously together in equality…”(Britannica.com)The modern stance of imperialism presents it as a divisive instrument where, “The nations arising from the ashes of the Roman Empire in Europe, and in Asia on the common basis of Islamic civilization, pursued their individual imperialist policies.”(Britannica.com)

The latter consideration threw up Portugal, England, Spain, France as key actors whose imperial subtle moves inadvertently affected the Global south in the guise of colonialism. Thus within the scope of Global South imperialism:

Imperialism is excused as the means of liberating peoples from tyrannical rule or of bringing them the blessings of a superior way of life. Imperialism results from a complex of causes in which in varying degrees economic pressures, human aggressiveness and greed, search for security, drive for power and prestige, nationalist emotions, humanitarianism, and many other factors are effective. (Britannica.com)

Furthermore:

Three periods in the modern era witnessed the creation of vast empires, primarily colonial. Between the 15th century and the middle of the 18th, England, France, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain built empires in the Americas, India, and the East Indies. For almost a century thereafter, relative calm in empire building reigned as the result of a strong reaction against imperialism. Then the
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decades between the middle of the 19th century and World War I were again characterized by intense imperialistic policies.

As the forces of socio-political liberation broke the grips of the colonialists, another form of imperialism surged with the rise of capitalist economy. To this development, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1963, 265) noted that:

Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a definite and very high stage of its development, when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres. Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly. …If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism.

Lenin’s capitalist imperialism concept found initial expression when “Russia, Italy, Germany, the United States, and Japan were added as newcomers among the imperialistic states, and indirect, especially financial, control became a preferred form of imperialism.” (Britannica.com)

America’s imperialist move in the Global South was flavoured with a slight different agenda. Although containing the popular intent of economic expansion, the US was more interested in the overthrow of ‘prevailing’ communist system in quest of her ultimate objective of hegemonic world power dominance. In his “U.S. Imperialism in the Asia-Pacific”, Walden Bello (1998, 369) writes:

Projection of strategic power continued to be the central impetus behind U.S. policy in the Asia – Pacific after the Second World War. "Forward Defense" and "Containment of Communism" were the articulated rationales, but the imperative was strategic extension of the power of the U.S. state…Projecting U.S. strategic power necessitated the creation of a network of more than 300 bases on the territory of seven Asia – Pacific countries.

The viable way to achieve that was to sell democracy with every available coercive apparatus to the world. For the global South particularly, the sway of capitalism and liberalism were crucial strategies. Bello further posits:

The idea that the mission of the United States was to build democracy around the world had become a convention of American politics in the 1950’s. Among certain circles, it was more or less assumed that democracy, that is, electoral democracy combined with
private ownership and civil liberties, was what the United States had to offer the Third World. Democracy provided not only the basis for American opposition to Communism but the practical method to make sure that opposition worked. (371)

In Africa, neo-imperialism in form of colonialism saw mainline European powers use the partitioning of Africa or what Thomas Pakenham referred to as The Scramble for Africa to settle their stringent economic and political rivalries around the end of 19th century.

Even as late as the 1870s, European states still controlled only ten percent of the African continent, with all their territories located near the coast. The most important holdings were Angola and Mozambique, held by Portugal; the Cape Colony, held by the United Kingdom; and Algeria, held by France. By 1914, only Ethiopia and Liberia remained independent of European control. (Wikipedia)

The stated rivalry was coupled with European wide interest in Africa’s promising market. Thus:

During a time when Britain’s balance of trade showed a growing deficit, with shrinking and increasingly protectionist continental markets due to the Long Depression (1873–96), Africa offered Britain, Germany, France, and other countries an open market that would garner them a trade surplus: a market that bought more from the colonial power than it sold overall.[4]

In addition, surplus capital was often more profitably invested overseas, where cheap materials, limited competition, and abundant raw materials made a greater premium possible. Another inducement for imperialism arose from the demand for raw materials unavailable in Europe, especially copper, cotton, rubber, palm oil, cocoa, diamonds, tea, and tin, to which European consumers had grown accustomed and upon which European industry had grown dependent. Additionally, Britain wanted the southern and eastern coasts of Africa for stopover ports on the route to Asia and its empire in India (Wikipedia, 2017)

In “Imperialism and socialism in the context of Africa”, South African History Online collaborated the above position:

Imperialist ambitions in Africa were boosted by the expansion of competitive trade in Europe. The main aim was to secure commercial and trade links with African societies and protect those links from other European competitors. Europe established trade relations with African rulers and encouraged them to trade with them exclusively. European traders were at first not interested in expanding into the interior of Africa. As long as African rulers
assured them of a supply of slaves from the interior, they felt no need to expand into the interior. The rapid expansion of industries made European countries look to African for a supply of cheap raw materials and (slave) labour. West Africa was particularly important for the development of industries in Europe. The production of African palm oil used as industrial oil was in high demand for European industries. Greed for ever-greater profits meant intensifying and expanding industrial production. European countries realised that by taking control of African territories they could secure a very cheap supply of raw materials that would ensure industrial success and overall economic prosperity. Colonial governments organised agricultural production in the colonies to match the demand for raw materials in Europe.

To achieve the objectives of economic and political holds, Europe deployed the strategy of assuming civilizing cum development missionaries. Africa was savage and requires the redemption of civilized Europe! Africa is consequently undeveloped and requires the development apparatus of the West! Hence:

Technological advances facilitated European expansion overseas. Industrialisation brought about rapid advancements in transportation and communication, especially in the forms of steam navigation, railways, and telegraphs. Medical advances also played an important role, especially medicines for tropical diseases. The development of quinine, an effective treatment for malaria, made vast expanses of the tropics more accessible for Europeans.(Wikipedia)

The damn consequence of such move is the gradual dilution of African cultural, political and economic values and their gradual replacement with Euro-western models. Crankshaft submits to this effect that:

During the independence movements, the colonial powers sought to bind their possessions through economic, political, military, and cultural ties. Great Britain formed the Commonwealth of Nations and France formed the Francophone Association to perpetuate their influence in the former colonies. However, many colonial powers found that the Western-educated elites formed the core of independence movements.

European culture continued to exert an enormous influence in terms of language, educational systems, and religion; nonetheless, it would be the United States, not the former colonial powers, that would ultimately have the greatest cultural impact in the post-World War II era. The economic preponderance of the United States at the end of World War II (1939-1945) allowed the nation to export a range of products and to gain access to emerging markets as states became independent. Products such as Coca-Cola, Levi’s jeans, and General Motors vehicles came to be regarded as synonymous with the United States.
This American economic expansion would evolve into cultural imperialism as the world embraced U.S. products. In addition, the rise of the American entertainment industry helped expand the cultural influence of the United States. During the Cold War, the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union limited the global reach of American culture. With the end of the Cold War, these constraints were lifted. The result was a dramatic period of American cultural dominance.

**Cultural Imperialism and Post-colonialism**

However, the culture contact brought by colonialism conveyed relative positive changes to the antiquities of the colonies. Apart from generally navigating them to modernity, it ensured the revival of collapsing cultures. Crankshaft puts it that:

In colonies such as India, Burma, or Indonesia, these native elites endeavored to combine positive aspects of Western culture with their own indigenous traditions. This helped revive native culture in many areas, even as Western-style governments and economic systems remained prevalent. For instance, the positive effect British incursion of India relatively introduced some positive impacts on the nation.

Some of them according to Deoda (2016) include:

- Britain helped abolish various outdated and gruesome Indian customs as Sati, Infanticide, Dowry System, promoting Widow Remarriage and prohibiting Child Marriage. Efforts were taken by Britain, though harsh fully, to remove the caste system (Untouchability, particularly) from India allowing the people to be more equal.
- Transportation methods and communication were introduced to India by industrialized countries such as Great Britain. Telephones improved and paved roads, cars, trains, and postal networks. This was a positive effect because it boosted the economy, standard of living and the flow of information and people.
- Britain connected India to the modern world through science, technology, medicine, and modern ideas. More advanced machines for manufacturing goods, vaccines, cars, electricity, guns, steel, and steam engines were all brought to India to help industrialize the new colony. Education became much more popular after colonization because social groups were less dominant. Many subjects such as science, health, agricultural resourcing, hygiene, and medicine were taken up, and later, explored & mastered by Indians.

The effects also reflect in Asia:

The development of export economies, which survived past the end of Imperialism, was a factor in the area's post-World War II growth. After independence, the ideas and concepts of the nation-state, courts of law and a centralized bureaucracy that were learned from the Imperial powers contributed to the rapid economic development.
of Southeast Asian nations such as Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia. (Reference.com)

Generally the effect of imperialism on the entire Global South is devastating. In “Imperialism: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences”. Bob Maier (1968, 33) saw that:

The foreign administration systematically destroyed all the foundations of the ancient culture and nothing positive was established in its place. What were set up were legal and property relations related to a market economy and the administrative institutions to enforce these new laws. What this means was that a way of life that once functioned tolerably well, although it was primarily agrarian, was replaced by parasitic landlords, loan sharks, petty businessmen, speculators, and slums of diseased and starved millions. In other words new classes, tied to the imperialist’s rule and system, were created.

The possible response to justify colonialism is philosophically founded on Hegel’s dialectical determinism. The dialectical movement of the world spirit providentially threw up supposedly the West on civilizing mission to the rest of humanity, especially the third world, for the purpose of opening them up to modernity. Hegel’s determinism is exemplified in the theory of social Darwinism. Thus Crankshaft notes that:

The contemporary popular notion of social Darwinism, which argued that different ethnic groups were at different stages of intellectual and physical development, was often used as a justification for imperialism. Pro-imperial politicians and officials would even use social Darwinism to contend that the imperial states had a duty to civilize the less-developed regions of the world by spreading European culture. Such sentiments were presented in contemporary newspapers and literature that reinforced public support for imperialism. Social Darwinism was also used to justify the elevation of some groups and the suppression of others. For example, many British and French colonial officials believed that people from the India subcontinent or Asia were superior to Africans and, therefore, transported people from these regions to Africa where they often became part of the colonial elite.
The global south general response to the ineluctable reality of change engendered by socio-cultural contact of imperialism gave rise to relative inward economic growth. The embraced capitalist system widened the global south internal and transnational markets to the extent of rearing its head within the inter-capitalist competitive platform. Driven by the competitive nature of the prevailing system, some global south societies like China embarked on a radical economic revolution of which result challenges the US hegemony. Conscious of the possibility of transcending its imperial circumstances as well as the prospect of alliance with established economies at its expense, the US unready to compromise its political cum economic sway, resorted to subtle forms of neo-imperialism—neo-liberalism, military interventions and humanitarianism. These hybrids were to be viable with the instrument of subtle Westernization in the guise of globalization. In his The New Imperialism of Globalized Monopoly-Finance Capital, John Bellamy Foster(2015) posits:

However, in the last few decades many of these phenomena have seemingly receded or taken on new forms. Inter-capitalist competition often seems a thing of the past in the new globalized, “transnational” reality. A handful of emerging economies are demonstrating that rapid economic development within the global South, even catching up to some degree with the North, is possible, at least for a time—though seldom taking the form of truly self-reliant or auto-centric development based on internal markets. Military interventions by the United States and its allies, masquerading as a community of nations, are often now (mistakenly) seen as manifestations of globalization, anti-terrorism, and humanitarianism. Revolutions aimed at delinking from the imperialist world system no longer appear feasible, following the demise of the Soviet-type societies and China’s reintegration into the world market. The U.S. colossus is reasserting itself politically, economically, and militarily on the world stage, taking the lead in forging a new neoliberal world order—raising questions about the previously heralded decline of U.S. hegemony. The result of all of this has been to throw doubt on the inherited framework of the classical Marxian theory of imperialism. This has given rise in recent years to a whole set of grand substitutions for the classical theory, such as postmodern Empire, super-imperialism, transnational capitalism, and neoliberalism.

Kwame Nkrumah bemoaned the effect of Western subtle continued imperialism of Africa in his Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism (1965) which has been summarized below:

On the link between Neocolonialism and Imperialism, Nkrumah writes that neocolonialism is the worst and most heightened form of imperialism. For those who practice it, it ensures power without responsibility and unchecked exploitation for those who suffer it. He
explains that neocolonialist exploitation is implemented in the political, religious, ideological, economic, and cultural spheres of society. He further provides details of the infiltration and manipulation of organized labour by agencies of the West in African countries. He discusses how the mass media is used as an instrument of neocolonialism in the following statement: “If Hollywood takes care of fiction, the enormous monopoly press, together with the outflow of slick, clever, expensive magazines attends to what it chooses to call ‘news’” (Nkrumah 1965). Religion too, according to Nkrumah, is distorted and used to support the cause of neocolonialism.

**Globalization as Neo-colonialism**

It remains noteworthy that the apostles of globalization preach the gospel of global economic integration. This is gaining steady strength with the instrumentalities of liberalization of trade policies, elimination of restrictions in the movement of capital and elastic migration laws. However, these tools are subtly manufactured to serve the unstated interests of big world communities on constant struggle for super power dominance at the expense of the global south societies. Thus if anything like ‘the guise of globalization’ is conceivable as a form of neo-colonialism, it would entail in the words of Salisu that in the world of today, control of human and material resources is not done through forceful domination of people through military subjugation, …. But it remains that the new form of control is spearheaded by international finance organizations aimed at consolidating a global economic structure that very often has its head offices in New York, London, Tokyo, Paris, Frankfurt, and other investment hubs across the world. Line Mouaffac (2016), collaborated this positions in his “Globalization is a form of Neo Colonialism” stating that:

Globalization is a form of colonization. The colonial powers of today do not need military might and occupation to control the lives and destiny of billions of people in their former colonies. They just need values. Perhaps in the not too distant future, Microsoft or Apple will have a seat in the United Nations. After all, these two companies alone generate more wealth every year than all of Africa’s 700 million workers.

A major effect of Neo-colonialist globalization on developing economy is dependency. The saturation of lower economies with foreign aid, consequent upon imperial factors strategically lowers the ability of national self-development. It rather creates capitalist consciousness among locals for the ultimate profiteering for their empowering masters. Hence:

Dependency theory contended that the dependent position of LDCs in the periphery was not a simple product of impersonal market forces described in structuralism, but by intentional actions of the
core. The capitalist class, the core bourgeoisie, established multinational corporations to continue to exploit LDCs after the end of formal colonialism. MNCs sent profits back to the core, while their activities in the global south, ran their enterprises, often in isolated enclaves, in such a way that few workers gained much benefit. Some dependency theorists, like Andre Gunder Frank, claimed that this kind of economic activity in LDCs did enrich a local comprador class, but their economic interests were allied to the wealthy West, not to their countrymen within the LDCs. Compradors therefore had an interest in continuing this exploitative system. They also worked with the international bourgeoisie to prevent democratic or representative political regimes from being established in the global south.

Adrij Adrij’s article, “Globalization - Another name for Neo-Colonialization” serves as a summary of the neo-colonialist globalization thus:

Today we do not have forceful domination of human and physical capital by dictators or army regimes. Rather a few MNCs, corporate bodies and investment hubs are fast establishing a new form of control: exerting power influence over local & national governments to enact policies that strengthen business rather than protecting rights of local people. Thus exploitation of the local labor force, Export of country’s important resources & most importantly dependence of developing countries over their wealthy counterparts have increased manifold. World trade or interestingly “free and fair trade” is the instrument used for establishing this form of control. Not surprisingly a few rich countries and corporations are today dominating the global scenario. The sub-Saharan African countries are characterized even today by poor living standard, increasing income inequality, low productivity, lower per-capita income etc. Globalization has indeed failed to eliminate these afflictions and has on the contrary deepened them. World economic powers have been sadly successful it seems in exploiting and tapping the resources of these lesser developed countries. Owing to strong advancement in technology in the western world they have emerged as strong players and winners nonetheless, in most business transactions in the globalized world. Globalization can be visualized to be a world of marginalization and exclusion, rather than an oppoportuny. Today not only are indigenous people & nations affected but vast sectors of the world’s population too are suffering. In a way the big corporations are in fact forming their own colonies
Scholars like Mazrui (2002), Maduagwu (1999) and Afisi (2011) in Salisu have similar views on the synonymity of neo-colonialism and globalization, owing to the toll the phenomena takes on Africa. He stated that:

In the Africa of the early 21st century, some scholars, such as Ali Mazrui, have opined that the new form of neocolonialism is globalization. Much as the way that neocolonialism has been variously described, Mazrui also describes how globalization “allows itself to be a handmaiden to ruthless capitalism, increases the danger of warfare by remote control, deepens the divide between the haves and have-nots, and accelerates damage to our environment” (Mazrui 2002, 59). This negative perspective on globalization, particularly as it relates to extreme capitalism, essentially corroborates the assertion by Michael Maduagwu that “globalization is only the latest stage of European economic and cultural domination of the rest of the world which started with colonialism, went through imperialism and has now arrived at the globalization stage” (Maduagwu 1999, 65).

Looking at globalization in this way, Oseni Afisi, also condemns it to the corridor of neocolonialism and cultural subjugation. Globalization becomes the imposition of a particular culture and value system upon other nations with the direct intent of exploitation. What this indicates is that globalization is indeed the engine room for the propagation of neocolonialism and new imperialism on the African soil. While colonialism has ended, the reality on the ground in Africa in the immediate years after it is that political independence in many African states has not culminated in the much desired economic and cultural freedom (Afisi 2011, 5).

The Stroke of Neo-liberalism

In the Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith conceived of a principle of international free trade as a better alternative to protecting the monopolies of the imperial powers for greater economic global development. That classical liberal economic theory hugely informs trending neoliberal economic theory especially in its Friedman model. Charles Mckelvey(2013) submits that:

Its premises are: (1) the state should not distort the natural and spontaneous economic order; (2) governmental policy should be based on the principle of the unlimited supremacy of the market; (3) states should not interfere with the free play of supply and demand; and (4) governmental interference in the economy ought to be eliminated. Specific neoliberal policies include: the elimination of government protection of national currency and the trading of currency at a free market rate; privatization of government-owned enterprises; reduction of protection for national industry, reducing or
eliminating tariffs and taxes on imported goods; facilitation of the free flow of capital into and out of the country; and the elimination of union restrictions on the free play of supply and demand (Prieto 2009:108-11).

What neo-liberalism means in the context of Global south neo-imperialism is strategic use of market forces, by global conglomerates, to subtly excerpt gains from proletariats and peasants to enhance their competitive hegemony. For John Smith in his *Imperialism in the Twenty-First Century: Globalization, Super-Exploitation, and Capitalism’s Final Crisis*; … the core capitalist countries need no longer rely on military force and colonialism (although these still occur) but increasingly are able to extract profits from workers in the Global South through market mechanisms and, by aggressively favouring places with lower wages, the phenomenon of labour arbitrage. Saeed Rahnama(2017) sees that the monopolist associations of Lenin’s imperialist theory, which created world market and divided the world into their spheres of influence no longer exists in today’s capitalism. Rather, “Continuous technological, organizational and marketing innovations maintain the dominant position of monopolies in the global market.” Generally though:

Through continued concentration and capital mobility at the global level, oligopolies now control networks of clusters of smaller companies scattered around the globe, adding to their monopolistic status. To attract these corporations to invest, both “home” and “host” governments offer all sorts of concessions to them, including lower taxes and “labor-union-free” environments. Confronting the powerful corporations of today is far more difficult and complicated than taking on their dinosaur predecessors, the cartels.

**Quest for Domination**

What is philosophically evident in Global South neo-imperialism is what Augustine termed in *City of God* lust for domination characteristic of his conceived earthly city. It approximates a terrain for the symbolic clash of the Titans and the adage that when two elephants fight, the grasses suffer. For instance, Lind (2014) discerned that, "The major cause of World War I was Imperial Germany’s determination to become a “world power” or superpower by crippling Russia and France in what it hoped would be a brief and decisive war, like the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71."

In the words of Augustine:

The earthly lifts up its head in its own glory, the Heavenly City says to its god: ‘My glory; you lift up my head’. In the former, the lust for domination lords it overits prunes as over the nations it subjugates; in the other both those put in authority and those subject to them serve one another in love, the rulers by their counsel, the subjects by obedience.

It further states:
The earthly city will not be everlasting; for when it is condemned to the final punishment it will no longer be a city. It has its good in this world, and rejoices to participate in it with such gladness as can be derived from things of this kind. And since it is not the kind of good that cause no frustrations to those enamoured of it, the earthly city is generally divided among itself by litigation, by wars, by battles, by the pursuit of victories that bring death with them or at best doomed to death. For if any section of that city has risen up in war against another part, it seeks to be victorious over other nations, though it is itself the slave of base passions; and if, when victorious, it is exulted in arrogance, that victory brings death in its train. Whereas if it considers the human condition and the changes and chances common to mankind, and is more tormented by possible misfortunes than puffed up by its present success, then its victory is only doomed to death. For it will not be able to lord it permanently over those whom it has been able to subdue permanently. (599)

What imperial giants desire in their antics and activities is ultimately peace or in the words of Augustine, ‘earthly peace’ (ibid) which if not pursued without the higher good, amounts to no other than fresh misery and increase of wretchedness. The lust for domination which ineluctably drives imperialism again finds philosophic significance in Hobbesian state of nature thesis in which war of all against all is informed by man’s uncontrolled natural passion. Despite the expected civility supposedly entrenched by social contract, man’s uncontrolled tendencies hold sway over the rule of reason. However, all subtleties for domination are geared towards peace which of which perfection Augustine maintains is only possible not in this earthly existence but in God’s heavenly City.

Conclusion

This paper had presented global south as the society previously identified as ‘third world’ in the global developmental ranking. Neo-imperialism in the global south deployed the tool of colonialism engendering, for instance, Britain, France and Portugal’s scramble for Africa. The effect of colonial culture contact leaves Africa with lingering cultural identity crisis. The effect on the rest of colonized global south societies include the enthronement of capitalist economy and democratic system of government. The imperialist sway continues in the post-colonial time with the neo-liberalizing market forces informing the characterization of globalization as a subtle kind of colonialism. On the factor that basically informs imperial actions and activities, the paper identified lust for domination as conceived by St. Augustine in his city of God and man’s uncontrolled egocentric passion of Hobbesian state of nature. However, the positive aspects of neo-imperialism in the global south include inward economic growth and improved civilization.
References
Adrij Adrij http://www.academia.edu/11281765/Globalization_-_Another_name_for_Neo-Colonialization
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scramble_for_Africa
http://www.iep.utm.edu/neocolon/#H4 Retrieved 7/9/17
https://www.reference.com/geography/were-effects-imperialism-southeast-asia-1bd669f484290925#. Retrieved 20/5/17
Maier, Bob. 1968. “Black & Red” Number 1, September, p.33