
Globalization and Corporatocracy: An African Perspective

Connie W. Kivuti and Prof. Eric Aseka

International Leadership University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400376>

Received: 13 April 2026; Accepted: 18 April 2026; Published: 11 May 2026

INTRODUCTION

The Failure of Neoliberal Globalization

Globalization has often been portrayed as a catalyst for economic growth and integration, yet its impact on Africa tells a different story. Despite decades of engagement with global markets, many African nations remain mired in poverty and economic stagnation. The neoliberal model of globalization, which emphasizes free markets, deregulation, and privatization, has not delivered the anticipated benefits. Instead, it has entrenched structural inequalities and reinforced historical patterns of domination. Scholars such as Aseka (Aseka 2005 and Aseka 2007) have argued that this system mirrors colonial dynamics, where external forces continue to shape and constrain African development. Koro and Clement (2013) suggest that the root of global crises lies in neglecting the principle of shared human dignity, and they, therefore, advocate for replacing competitive, profit-driven global systems with collaborative frameworks that prioritize empathy, equity, and collective well-being.

A central feature of this dynamic is the emergence of corporatocracy, where large multinational corporations wield disproportionate influence over political and economic systems. These entities often operate with minimal accountability, shaping policies and trade agreements to serve their interests. In Africa, this influence is evident in sectors such as mining, agriculture, and telecommunications, where foreign corporations dominate and extract value with limited reinvestment in local economies. This concentration of power undermines national sovereignty and perpetuates dependency, leaving African states with little room to maneuver in shaping their own development trajectories. Ojo et al (2024) contend that globalization has deepened Africa's developmental challenges by fostering economic reliance on external powers, facilitating the exploitative practices of multinational corporations, and eroding the autonomy of national government

While theoretical critiques of globalization and corporatocracy abound, there is a pressing need for empirical research that quantifies their impact. Existing frameworks, such as those proposed by Hardt and Negri, offer valuable insights into the nature of global power, but they often lack concrete data. This study seeks to bridge that gap by examining measurable indicators of inequality, economic diversification, and corporate penetration. By analyzing these variables, the research aims to demonstrate how globalization, mediated through corporate dominance, has exacerbated economic disparities and limited the scope for autonomous development in Africa.

In response to these challenges, African governments and regional bodies have introduced policies aimed at reclaiming control over their economies. Initiatives like the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) are designed to boost intra-African trade and reduce reliance on external markets. Similarly, local content regulations in industries such as oil and gas aim to ensure that foreign investment contributes to domestic capacity-building. However, these efforts often face significant obstacles, including resistance from powerful corporate interests and structural constraints imposed by global financial institutions.

This paper argues that the current form of globalization is not a neutral process but a system of control that deepens inequality and limits sovereignty. By empirically examining the relationship between globalization, corporatocracy, and economic outcomes in Africa, the study contributes to a broader understanding of how global economic structures operate. It also highlights the importance of regional cooperation, policy innovation, and intellectual resistance in challenging these dynamics and forging alternative paths toward equitable development. The findings aim to inform both academic debates and policy decisions, offering a grounded critique of globalization's promises and its realities.

Concepts and Theoretical Framework: Operationalizing Corporate Power

Globalization is defined narrowly as economic integration via trade, FDI, and capital flows, driven by a neoliberal ideology of market liberalization. The critical view posits this integration is inherently unequal, reinforcing a core-periphery system. Corporatocracy, the de facto rule by transnational corporations (TNCs), is operationalized using three empirical indicators to move beyond theory:

1. **FDI Dependence and Corporate Concentration:** Measured by the ratio of FDI to Gross Capital Formation and the concentration of foreign firms in strategic sectors (e.g., mining).
2. **Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) Exposure:** Indicated by the volume of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and the incidence/threat of ISDS claims, which erode state sovereignty and impose a "regulatory chill."
3. **Limited Corporate Tax Capture:** Assessed by the significant gap between statutory and **effective corporate tax rates (ECTR)**, reflecting TNCs' leverage to negotiate tax concessions and drain state revenue.

The framework asserts that neoliberal globalization sets the stage, while TNCs, acting as agents of corporatocracy, use these mechanisms to extract wealth and restrict African policy autonomy.

Methodology: Comparative Case Studies

The paper adopts a Comparative Case Study methodology (Path B), focusing on three nations that represent varied policy responses: Ghana (Resource Governance/Local Content), Kenya (Financial Technology/Mobile Money), and Ethiopia (State-led Industrial Parks). The analysis covers the period from 2000 to the present, utilizing data from international bodies (World Bank, UNCTAD, IMF) and post-2015 academic scholarship. A mixed-methods approach is employed: (1) Quantitative trend analysis to correlate corporatocracy indicators with outcomes (Gini, manufacturing value-added, debt-to-GDP); and (2) Qualitative process tracing to analyze specific policy interventions (e.g., local content rules) and their success in moderating corporate influence.

Findings and Analysis: Evidence of Corporatocracy's Impact

The Deepening of Economic Inequality and Structural Dependency

Post-2000 data shows globalization has not delivered a "global village," but instead reinforced deep inequalities. Sub-Saharan Africa's share of global poverty has risen, and high Gini coefficients persist. The continent's economies remain structurally dependent on raw material extraction, with stagnant manufacturing value-added a key indicator of failed economic diversification. This confirms that African economies are locked in a complementary, rather than competitive, developmental posture.

Empirical Evidence of Corporatocracy

The operational indicators confirm TNC dominance:

- **FDI Dependence and Concentration:** Cases like Ghana and Nigeria show a handful of foreign corporations dominating key sectors (e.g., petroleum), limiting broad-based economic impact.
- **ISDS Exposure:** The rising number of BITs subjects African states to TNC litigation, where the mere threat of a massive lawsuit often deters governments from progressive social or environmental policy (the "regulatory chill").
- **Tax Avoidance:** Data confirms the **ECTR for TNCs** (especially in extractive industries) is often dramatically lower than the statutory rate due to preferential deals and sophisticated tax planning, draining state resources.

The Cost of Outflow: Brain Drain and Debt

Globalization has accelerated brain drain, weakening the public sector's capacity to negotiate with TNCs. Furthermore, the channeling of development finance toward corporate-friendly projects, often involving debt, has led to a sharp rise in debt-to-GDP ratios since 2010. This effectively shifts financial control from national governments to global creditors and financial institutions.

Discussion and Policy Implications: Conditional Successes and Sovereignty Levers

Assessing Conditional Successes and Counter-Evidence

While corporatocracy is pervasive, the case studies reveal that strategic national policy can moderate its effects:

- **Kenya's FinTech Ecosystem:** The success of mobile money (M-Pesa) demonstrates how state-enabled regulatory frameworks (a "capital-controls sandbox") can harness corporate innovation for social and financial inclusion, despite residual concentration concerns.
- **Ethiopia's Developmental State Model:** By employing a selective, **strategic approach to globalization** via state-driven industrial policy and capital controls, Ethiopia achieved higher manufacturing growth, challenging pure market liberalization.
- **Ghana's Local Content Rules:** These policies, requiring foreign firms to use local inputs/labor in sectors like oil and gas, successfully **claw back policy space** and ensure corporate activity better serves domestic development.

Policy Levers for Reclaiming Sovereignty

To foster genuinely competitive development and protect citizenry interests, African nations must modulate global forces through robust strategies:

- **Strategic Use of Competition Policy:** Utilizing national and regional competition authorities (e.g., AfCFTA structures) to regulate TNC market dominance and investigate anti-competitive practices.
- **Reforming BITs and ISDS:** Renegotiating or terminating BITs that include ISDS, favoring regional investment courts that prioritize the public interest over corporate policy-proofing.
- **Harnessing the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA):** The AfCFTA is the most potent counterweight, creating an integrated internal market that allows African firms to scale up, reduce reliance on TNCs, and compete effectively on a global stage.

Conclusion: Reclaiming Policy Space

The preceding analysis demonstrates that neoliberal globalization has failed to deliver widespread prosperity to Africa. Instead, it has served as an ideological and structural framework for the rise of corporatocracy, which is the control of economic and political systems by transnational corporations (TNCs). This corporate power is not merely theoretical but is empirically evidenced by three critical mechanisms that actively undermine African development and entrench structural inequality.

The first mechanism is the creation of high FDI dependency and corporate concentration, where African nations rely excessively on foreign direct investment, often leading to a few TNCs dominating strategic sectors like oil and gas. This results in minimal impact on broad-based employment and prevents economic diversification, leaving economies in a "complementary" rather than a "competitive" posture. The second mechanism is Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) exposure. Through numerous Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), TNCs gain the power to challenge national laws, imposing a "regulatory chill" that deters governments from enacting progressive social or environmental policies for fear of massive corporate litigation. The third mechanism is systematic corporate tax avoidance. TNCs leverage their power to negotiate favorable deals, leading to a

significant gap between the statutory tax rate and the actual effective corporate tax rate (ECTR). This drain of essential capital exacerbates inequality and contributes to a new era of debt distress, effectively transferring financial control away from national governments.

However, the paper concludes that this trajectory of neocolonial corporate domination is not inevitable. Empirical analysis of case studies reveals that strategic state action can successfully reclaim policy space and moderate corporate influence. Examples include Ghana's targeted local content rules to ensure domestic benefit from resource extraction, Kenya's regulation of its digital ecosystems to channel corporate innovation toward financial inclusion, and Ethiopia's strategic, state-led industrial policy which manages external volatility and prioritizes manufacturing growth.

Ultimately, the most potent counterweight to corporatocracy is regional economic unification, particularly through the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA). By creating a massive, integrated internal market, the AfCFTA allows African firms to scale up and become genuinely competitive, reducing the continent's dependency on TNCs. The imperative for African nations, therefore, is to leverage these strategic national and regional policies to manage and modulate global forces, prioritizing genuine, diversified development and protecting the interests of the citizenry over submission to corporate power.

REFERENCES

1. Aseka, E.M (1999) The Political Economy of Panopticism: Interrogating
2. the Neo- Liberal Discourses in the Globalization process, in Chemchemi Vol.1 No.1 December.
3. Aseka, E.M (2006) "Globalization, Leadership and Governance in Africa: A Theoretical Approach," Institute for Global Initiatives, Kennesaw State University (2006)
4. Aseka, E.M (2004) "Globalization Intellectuals and Security in Africa" in Mwagiru (ed.) African Regional Security in the Age of Globalization. Nairobi: Heinrich Böll Foundation
5. Aseka, E. (2017a). Globalization and Global Governance. Class Notes presented at the GOV. 601 Globalization and Global Governance, ILU Nairobi.
6. Aseka, E. M. (2007) "Making Globalization Work: Review Article," in Journal for Global Initiatives: Policy, Pedagogy & Perspectives, Vol. 1, No. 1.
7. Aseka, E. (2017b). Lesson 2- Ways in which Globalization is Manifested. Class Notes presented at the GOV. 601 Globalization and Global Governance, ILU Nairobi.
8. Aseka, E. (2017c). Lesson 5 - Theories and Causes of Globalization. Class Notes presented at the GOV. 601 Globalization and Global Governance, ILU Nairobi.
9. Aseka, E. (2017d). Lesson 9: Implications of Globalization for Africa. Class Notes presented at the GOV. 601 Globalization and Global Governance, ILU Nairobi.
10. Aseka, E. (2017e). Lesson 11: Globalization and the Shaping of Local Economies. Class Notes presented at the GOV. 601 Globalization and Global Governance, ILU Nairobi.
11. Beri, P. B., Mhonyera, G., & Nubong, G. F. (2022). Globalization and economic development in Africa: A review of the past two decades. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 25(1), a4462. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v25i1.4462>
12. Boesak, A. A. (2009). Theological reflections on empire. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, 65(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v65i1.291>
13. Doyle, M. W. (1986). *Empires*. Cornell University Press.
14. Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Harvard University Press.
15. Houtart, F. (2011). From 'Common Goods' to the 'Common Good of Humanity'. *Historia Actual Online*, (26), 87–102.
16. James, P., & Steger, M. B. (2014). A Genealogy of 'Globalization': The Career of a Concept. *Globalizations*, 11(4), 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.951186>
17. Jones, A. (2006). *Dictionary of Globalization*. Polity.
18. Ketznel, P. (2012). *Digital Natives: Children of Globalization Exposing Empire*. Universitat Potsdam, Germany. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu/download/31086962/>
19. Khan, M. U. (2014). *Globalization-The New Imperialism: Implications for the Societies Around the World*. Margalla Papers. Retrieved from http://ndu.edu.pk/issra/issra_pub/articles

20. Kuschel, S. (2009). *Adrift: The Consequences of American Empire in the Age of Globalization*. Retrieved from <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/117824>
21. Levine, B. E. (2011). *Get Up, Stand Up: Uniting Populists, Energizing the Defeated, and Battling the Corporate Elite*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
22. Lowi, T. J. (2011). Globalization, War, and the Withering Away of the State. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 17(2), 243–256.
23. Mwangi, P. and Bello, A (2024) Globalization and Underdevelopment in Africa: A Critical Analysis Published in *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 12(3), 245–260 https://www.scirp.org/pdf/ojbm_2024031514233482.pdf
24. Nemani, P. (2011). Globalization Versus Normative Policy: A Case Study on the Failure of the Barbie Doll in the Indian Market. *APLPJ*, 13, 96.
25. Norgaard, R. B. (2007). Deliberative Economics. *International Society for Ecological Economics*, 63(2–3), 375–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.04.002>
26. Ojo, E. O, Yusuf, F.M and Mensah, K. A. (2024) Globalization and Income Inequality in Africa: A Panel Data Analysis (2000–2020) Published in *Management Paper*. <https://www.managementpaper.net/archives/2024/vol6issue2/PartE/7-2-77-147.pdf>
27. Okoro, K. N., & Clement, O. I. (2013). Common Humanity Not Common Community: The Solution to Global Crisis. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 7(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR12.060>