

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

East Africa: Globalization on Peasants' Shoulder

Busha Taa¹ and Muluken Fikadie²

Abstract

The conventional wisdoms are universally revered portray peasants as hoarders of innocence, tellers of truth and makers of peace. The sense of respect, humility and sociability of the East African peasants come from their classical humanity that was cemented in a distant past – the past that often been interpreted as sacred by the elders. Many elders treat the past as the fountain of the present and the projector of the good future. Most elders solve prevailing problems by congregating under trees of peace, without seeking any advice from modern courts. The decisions of the elders are enforced by trust-based moralized actions rather than by police forces. All social activities –life, work and decision-making processes are social and collective and thus do not subject peasants to the maxim of individualism. As a result, the East African peasant communities utterly reject the leviathanism of globalization –the power that bestows freedom on the powerful actors to exercise might without imposing any moral or legal limitations on their actions. Most East African peasants opposed to globalization led dominant idea that considers peasants as unsophisticated and stoic rustics whose disappearance is imminent. Hence, the East African peasants are neither on the verge of collapse nor eager to collaborate with Hobbesian styled modern leviathan that quietly envisions obliterating their livelihoods.

Keywords: globalization, peasants, tradition, development, environment, cooperation

Introduction

Many discussants of the East African peasant society, such as Rahmato, (2008), Getachew, (2001) Amoako, (2004) and Desta (2010) have neglected the major sources of strain between the ruling elites and the peasant population. These scholars could not unearth authentic and substantive evidences because they underestimated the impacts of contextual viability of political and cultural factors that have viciously plagued honest and genuine interactions between the ruling elites and the peasants. The inability of these scholars to succinctly elucidate this complexity was generated by the notoriously evasive East African rural development policies. The East African rural policy making process thus is devoid of sincerity in terms of projecting goals while it remains sensationally electrifying elite orchestrated stage management. Shadowing the true objective of the critical policies is an ingrained obsession of the political elites, and the meticulous of the researchers may not be able to discover the real motives of the leaders nor the prevailing tensions between peasants and chauffeurs of globalization. Comprehending the key dynamics mediating the tattered tripartite relationships among the ruling elites, the global actors and the peasantry may not be answered only by laborious reading of historical archives. Hence, an attempt to explain the prevailing intricacy in East Africa demands an appreciation of rural/ urban interactions, grasping spoken and tacit ethos and understanding the socio-political order of the region. As born and brought up in Ethiopia,

1 Department of Sociology, University of Gondar, Email: bushataa@gmail.com; mfikadie@gmail.com, P.O.Box: 196, Gondar, Ethiopia

2 Department of Sociology, University of Gondar, Email: mfikadie@gmail.com P.O.Box: 196, Gondar, Ethiopia

we have genuinely tried to address features that continuously cripple cordial interactions between governments and peasant population, as well as the unspeakable dangers that globalization imposes on peasants' livelihoods in the following discussion.

Despite the inability of peasants to completely prevent the entire encroachments from global organizations, they surely can subvert and retard the expansion of these organizations. Nevertheless, both the parochialism of peasants and the spacious appetite of globalization are manifested by their egocentric reciprocity. It is commonsensical that progress and change are inevitable while homogenization of the global society is unattainable (Huntington, 1997). All societies possess dominant and peripheral economic/social sectors and there are pockets of traditionalism in the developed world as there are well developed modern sectors in the traditional East African region. The interactions between these economic sectors are not often cordial in undemocratic milieus. Evaluating the highly cumbersome relationships between managers of globalization, the peasants and the ruling elites in East Africa may shed a clear light on the prevailing developmental nuances.

For this reason, it is necessary to logically analyze the complex and often antagonistic relationships in Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, and Djibouti, havocking the interactions among global actors, East African leaders and the peasant communities. Hence, this paper examines central themes pertinent to these interactions. First, the paper examines whether globalization can lead to the "homogenization" of the world, controlling the global economy including the peasant sectors. Second, the inability of the peasant communities to thwart aspirations of globalization is highlighted. Third, if the local elites are willing and able to chart lucid development agendas that will also be extensively investigated. Prior to embarking on comprehensive analysis, nonetheless, operationally defining globalization and peasant is necessitated in order to facilitate smooth transition to the fundamental discussion of the subject matter.

Defining globalization and peasant

It is apparent that the idea of globalization has received pervasive attention only in the last decade. Many vague and incompatible definitions have been recently offered in various literatures. While there is a slight agreement on its exact description, globalization often refers to a multidimensional process whereby markets, firms, production and financial systems are incorporated in a global dimension (Brawley, 2003). Globalization is an invisible and yet gigantic vehicle that has widened the gap between the rich and the poor, intensifying the dominance of global trade by the rich, worsening the problem of accessing markets for the poor and exacerbating the magnitude of exploitation of farmers, growers and workers (Tabb, 2001). Similarly, globalization is a system in which economic, political, environmental, and cultural events in the developed world quickly become significant for people in the developing world (Tabb, 2006). Henceforth, globalization should be understood as an inescapable integration of markets, corporation and technologies to move around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper in unprecedented fashion (Cameron, 2000). However, the loudly praised irreversibility of its success, the contribution it made to the society and the "wealth it produced" has been extremely over magnified (Saul, 2006). Despite the prior prosperity promises and the benefits of an information accessing society, the afterwards inequality has increased (Ayenagbo et al. (2012). In effect, globalization has become a source of abject misery for rural communities because it is not kind to agriculturalists, traditional groups and pastoralists' way of life (Robbins, 2001). Thus, the glorification of its triumph is contested to the best and cursed to the worst by many East Africa peasant communities.

Although the term peasant primarily refers to agriculturalists whose livelihoods depend on farming, the term also embraces pastoralists, cattle breeders, rural artisans and other rural residents living on subsistence economy (Akram-Lodhi A.H and Kay C, 2010). These people are traditionalists who prefer to live in small and scattered ways without any aspiration to join complex supranational entities. The East African peasants have no interest to harbour an acquisitive organization that is coveting their lands, depleting food animals and debilitating their social ethos. Most East African peasants know that the overture of globalization may compel them to the edge of extinction, poverty, disease and forced labour (Birara, 2011). If peasants choose to participate in globalization, they will be subjected to producing cash crops – at the expense of food crops – becoming the recipe for starvation. In other words, producing cash crops by farmers cause pitting farmers against one another and forgoing neighbourly loyalties and old friendships. Ironically, the ruling elites who initiated this scuffle by subscribing to globalization are strangely invisible and irresponsive to the immediate needs of rural population (Desta, 2010). Whatever slogan these leaders chant, peasants watch them not only with suspicion and cynicism but they also react forcefully against all elite driven globalization desiderata. In order to survive, however, the East African peasants are forced to combine class-bound politics with concerns about peasant identities, logical analysis with sentimentality, grassroots democracy with conspiratorial secrecy, and selfless sacrifices with glaring opportunism.

Affairs between peasants and the globalizers

At present, peasants and preachers of globalization have engaged in grave row due to their natural inability to simply ignore one another. Their grudge tainted interactions therefore are elevated by the mammoth of tripartite suspicion, intrigue and cynicism. Any attempt to consolidate globalization in a traditionalist peasant world is delicately challenged as any obstacle to the aspiration of global capitalism is also chided by powerful global actors. On the one hand, proponents of globalization argue that the keeper of the past cannot be the builder of the future (Baran, 1957). On the other, opponents such as Obadina (1998) contend that demolishing an old house does not diminish the necessity of preserving the debris to help build a new house – and hence market obsessed radical orientation of globalization is widely disliked from various angles (McNally, 2002). For environmentalists, globalization enhances pollution, toxicity and contamination, undermining environmental safety regulations (Enrlich P., and Enrlich A., 1991). For agriculturalists, globalization is a means of distorting sedentary lives, pushing local communities out of their lands, forcing them to sell their labour for survival. Thus, globalization is a self-serving conglomerate – a classical elephant in the politics of jungle (Taa, 2009). In the East African case, it may grow by forcibly pushing and displacing peasants out of their space. Even so, there is solid evidence that the vision of globalization is ragged with ambiguities, contrary trends, and wishful thinking (Tarrow, 2003). Although it is highly sidelining the interests of East African peasants, globalization itself is suffering from ideological overzealousness, doctrinal incoherence and intellectual fatigue. For example, the high priests of globalization such as the United States of America are targeting not only the Russians and Chinese, but they have consumed with undermining the European Union.

Recently, the rampaging nuisance of globalisation has made the East African states incapable of defining rules and regulations of their economy, production, distribution, and exchanges of goods and services (Black, 2007). Despite these short comings, most East African elites are wedged to pronouncing the importance of globalization for the region, invoking various fallacious arguments. These elites have contended that peasants prefer to wear jeans than traditional clothing, arguing that peasants have become players in cementing globalization. However, peasants wear jean because jeans are durable and can

resist harsh weather far better than the local textile products. Thus, wearing jeans may not signal embracing globalization but rather it can be seen as the result of cost/benefit calculation. Also, the ruling elites have explained that East African economy is prospering due to the emergence of globalization. This argument is also inconsequential because peasants are starving, their crops are forcibly bought by government agencies with very low price in the form of confiscation, and the magnitude of poverty is increasing (Birarra, 2011).

The regional elites have advanced that East Africans have constructed “super” highways; hence globalization is flourishing (Chang, 2008). Nonetheless, a reasonable policy maker should not boast about building super highway when most of its population use donkeys, horses and camels as a major mode of transportation. In fact, development theorists appreciate information high way than physical highway, but information highways are conventionally bared or relegated to the lowest level for political reasons. Hence, development can only be measured by decencies of governments to manage equitable distribution, sharing and caring for their citizens rather than by constructing high ways alone (Edelman, 1999).

Moreover, preachers of globalization glamorize that modern peasants own and utilize modern media such as radios and televisions and thus they argue that peasants have been immersed into the global market. Arguably, even if peasants have radios, the radios might be the one that only work with dry batteries since there are no electric powers in rural areas. Furthermore, when ruling elites become uncomfortable with transnational media, they frequently jam radios, televisions and other transmissions from abroad (Birarra, 2011). Even if permitted, listening to radios and receiving information about the western societies cannot be a symbol of development in the subcontinent where there are inadequate democratic superstructure and widely debilitated infrastructures.

Nonetheless, it must be conceded that globalization is supremely relevant in uprooting terrorism from the region of East Africa. As peace is the best precondition of development, chasing and defeating Al Queda, Al Shaab, the so-called Islamist state and Jihadists in the region through cooperative framework of global anti-terror networks is extremely important. Hence, crushing extremists that have vowed to rewind history back to its primitive self is a proto-type of serving the interest of the peasant population. Globalization also has served Africa in the fight against Ebola and other infectious diseases.

In an elite driven globalization, success is measured by accumulation of wealth while success in the peasant world is rooted in basic human psyches. Whereas affluence and profession determine status for globalizers’ reputation earned for contribution to community development is a symbol of status for peasant communities. The peasant communities have distinct identities with symbols, myths, and stories in order to create and sustain communitarian values. They easily manage sufficient similarity by sharing information across groups and establishing clear rules for transparency. Therefore, the argument that globalization is exceedingly producing wealth in East Africa is an amateurish song recited by drum loving political elites – suffering from integrity deficits.

Bush, R. (2008) asserted:

Globalisation brings poverty and inequality to Africa as a result of the continent’s uneven incorporation into the world economy. The main hope for the future is not free trade, open markets and technological gains; rather, it is resistance to the impact of globalisation by workers and peasants, and the construction by Africans

themselves of an alternative future (p. 43).

Additionally, the natural and basic interests of the East African peasants are incompatible with the orientation of globalization (Deininger, 2011). The main utensils of globalization are electrification, industrialization and urbanization and it cannot exist/function without these sophistications. Conversely, rural population in East Africa still use wooden fire for cooking, kerosene lamp for lightening and depend on rain, wells and running waters for drinking, sanitation. Most of these peasants live by gathering edible fruit, growing food crops, raising cattle and hunting for food (Getachew, 2001). In a moral universe, East African peasants are people of consciousness, dignity and respect who constantly keep their promises. They do not shovel friends to sideline during crises; but rather they remain ally, supportive and loyal to their associates; they do not strive to gain at the expenses of their friends – a social taboo, completely antithesis to globalization. These peasants are classical essentialists – revere ancestry, honour place of birth and favour extended families. Peasants want to have more children and believe that children are equivalent to wealth, power, respect and means of self defence. Hence, their aspirations, beliefs and goals are very contrary to that of the high priests of globalization.

Above all, globalization aspires to establish modern markets at peasants' backyards – paternalizing them to provide local people with services at their neighbourhoods. However, peasants enjoy long distance market rather than having one at their doors; they believe that modern markets breed antagonism, bitterness and ill feeling among participants and thus peasants do not appreciate backyard markets diseases (Turnbull, 1962). Thus, the East African peasants consider that creating modern markets within their neighbourhood is tantamount to subjecting them to the behest of globalization. On the one hand, peasants detest the spirit of modern market –the spirit that enhances competition, profiting, and wiping people out of business. On the other, peasants prefer their own local markets – markets that thrive on mutual exchange of goods through acquaintance and bartering. No peasant wants to profit at the expense of the other and all peasant marketers collegially engage in trading articles of consumptions. This market is basically autonomous, there is face-to-face engagement between buyers and sellers, and it is socially regulated (Esminger, 1992). Operations of their markets are simple, cooperative and humane (Taa, 2004) as their markets are not only arenas for buying and selling commodities but also are places of forging alliances and friendships.

Advocates of globalization argue that the global market is a free plate where corporations, states and individuals fairly compete to further their own vital interests (Reiger and Leibfried, 2003). The global emissaries preach that hegemonic powers maintain order and stability in the mercantile jungle Hoogvallt (1997). Paehike (2003) argued that digitalization, depersonalization, cellularization and computerization of society help them achieve their highest ends. Proponents assert that globalization is the product of electronic capitalism – dominated by the internationally integrated economic elites. Nevertheless, it seems that these elites have taken oath of allegiance to shatter down the social power of states. Arguably, electronic capitalism (globalization) succeeded industrial capitalism which was, in turn, accountable to democratic control because the industrial capital occupies physical space, and the capitalists were known to local people. In effect, industrial capitalists were nationalists who compassionately care about fellow citizens without eroding the core principle of gaining profit. Conversely, the current electronic capitalists operate through remote control and no one knows their nationalities or their citizenship or their residences, leaving the question of accountability in limbo. This current leviathan has no border to defend, no citizen to feed or no code of morality to observe. It is merely a colossal conglomerate – instrument of oppression – comprised of hierarchy of rich and poor – operating to

the advantage of the rich and committed to the economic war of few against billions (Taa, 2009). Contrary to its conventional claims, globalization has already become a threat to the rural poor rather than serving as an opportunity for eradicating poverty (Obadina, 1998). Hence, globalisation is simply a supranational power with big appetite – enforcing ferocious order of marginalisation on rural communities (Bernstein, 2001).

By design or by default, globalization is currently knocking every door with vicious rapidity that left little time for planning, and even those who invited it to the sub continent have been caught with dilemmas (Greider, 1997). As a result, it may invariably change peasants' ways of life, but it cannot alter their spirit or diminish their resilience. Peasants put extensive resistance against globalization because they have more interests in social health than wealth – constantly praying to God so that it protects them from danger and potential diseases (Turnbull, 1962). The peasant communities thus are incapable of living double life and do not want to see the disintegration of their values; they are people of incorruptible soul as opposed to globalization – an organization of soulless entity. At the same time, peasants are wise people who possess the highest degree of dignity endowed by nature not nurture (Abel, 1992). Their old ways of life spark brightness, purpose and meaning that do not fade away with the advent of globalization (Turnbull, 1962). They have never been static, with possible rare exception; they are not passive spectators of their own plight, but they collectively resist probable obliteration and thrive afterward – owing their survival to their flexibility. Thus, peasants have traits of adaptability within recognizable limitations. Their adaptability however, is challenged by the encroachment of global investors who persuade governments to sell farming lands to foreign companies. These new “investors” are ruthlessly displacing farming communities in the name of rural development.

Consequences of Land grabs

In the universe of globalization, there is no natural property but only goods to be sold, bought, possessed or dispossessed (McKeo, 2013). Conversely, most peasants believe that some properties such as land are the natural gift from God that does not only belong to the present; but also, to the past and will belong to the generations yet to come. Therefore, land is sacred and golden tool to connect the past, the present and future generations (Turnbull, 1962). For globalizers, however, land is a commodity; not only that it can be sold but it can also be pierced by foreign investors who pay no attention to the East African local values (Alden-Wily, 2010). Arguably, the East African governments have frequently changed grazing policies and unlawfully displaced/evicted peasants in order to satisfy global appetite (Vidal, 2010). The consistent neglect by governments to consult peasant communities, the arbitrary modification of land tenure, and the failure to address water shortage underlie the colossal debacle of pro-globalization policy makers (World Bank, 2010). Hence, those who speak in glowing terms of popular participation in globalization do not pay attention to the dynamics of the sparsely and remotely settled rural social formations (Gubbles, 1998). The expropriation of peasants' lands not only devoid them of the right to culturally appropriate food but also denied them the right to define their own systems of development (Michael, 2010).

It is possible to extrapolate that globalisation erodes the determinism of the state and peasant communities (Suarez, 2013); it controls what states, peasants, firms and people do; where they do it; it monitors the way, people see themselves (their identity) and dictates their social and economic preferences (Akenidele, Gidado; Olaopo (2002). As a result, East African countries cannot unilaterally set social or development agendas and are consequently forced to tune in sync to the global routes that are unsuitable to them-

selves (African Union, 2009). In some East African countries such as Ethiopia and Kenya, peasants are flagrantly expropriated their lands on the claim that the lands were needed for public purposes (Rahamato, 2008). Contrary to the public purpose claims, the Ethiopian fertile lands are taken away and sold to Britons, Chinese, Indians, Pakistanis and Saudi Arabians at knockdown rate, 150 pound a week for 2500 sq km of virgin and fertile land (Vidal, 2011). The Karuturie global, the company that snatched most of the plots has planned to produce and export palm oil, sugar, rice and other food crops (Araghi, 2010). These “investors” are not only given the land with an extremely low price but also awarded tax holiday. Thereafter, the global companies ordered peasants to leave the leased area immediately to commence ploughing (Alden-Wily, 2010). Hence, the process of “modernizing East Africa” was a euphemistic slogan for dispossessing East African peasants (Bush, 2008). Nonetheless, the Karuturie global was forced to abandon the field due to its inability to keep its promises.

As reported by Human Right Watch (2015), many Ethiopians living in rural areas have been unwillingly removed. Once forcibly emptied, villages were destroyed and their cattle were taken away. Along with pastoralists, villagers were literally goaded to the new hamlet where there was neither a basic resource nor infrastructure (Gubbles, 1992). Of course, the cultural values of these peasants are incompatible with that of the investors and evicting peasants from the region is the natural outgrowth of conflicting values. The peasants thrive on collective benefits, social harmony and unity while investors dwell on cost benefit calculation with a huge disregard for social and emotional worth. And, peasants’ cultural values and social knowledge are local and unique – communally produced, distributed and utilized. These unique ways of knowing are important facets of the world’s cultural diversity that provide a foundation for locally appropriate/sustainable development. The peasant communities possess uncodified knowledge that is open to robbery similar to their ritual symbols that are not protected (Posy and Graham, 1996). In sharp contrast, knowledge owned by globalizers is protected by passwords and encryptions making it safe from thefts (Aggrawal, 1995). Hence, the global orders are not only inequitable but also are implicated in the reproduction of poverty and oppression.

The East African mercantile elites would have us believe that globalization promotes uniformity, standardization and conformity (Greider, 1997). However, the prescription that all societies should eventually pass through the same gate towards the same end is not practically forthcoming (Lauer, 1991). Also, the argument that progressive civility will automatically come with the advent of globalization is proven fatalistic in some part of the world. Even if the assumption is true, any progress that does not observe moral reasoning to serve and protect the weakest portion of the global society is fundamentally perilous. Hence, for peasants, globalization is too radical – making the stability of social phenomenon too fragile by imposing disequilibria. Incongruously, East African leaders embrace the theory of inevitable development, once developed by W. W. Rostow (1960). This theory advocates that all society must pass through five stages in order to progressively develop. These stages were modeled on the analysis of the British industrial revolution – the revolution that is incongruent with the current socio-economic order of East African countries. Above all, development is not a transcendental concept that can claim universal validity as it cannot pass the test of time (Rist, 1997). The socioeconomic accomplishment of one country cannot be replicated to the other. Samuel Huntington (1993) argued that history often does not march forward in a straight line, but when skilled and determined politicians push, it does move forward. If history, however, is pushed by careless leaders, it does move in a convulsive jolt (Peet, 2003). Thus, some of the East African politicians with the advice of greedy global actors have negligently undermined the dreams of development and swift advancement of democracy.

In the world of common sense, political leaders are expected to be the makers of judicious decisions, takers of reason at times, and seekers and speakers of truth at all times. Machiavelli (1994) contended that state must be led by the government of full truth, and truth is organic to the realization of human values. As custodians of development, however, East African leaders could not pass corruption free effective development legislations. Surely, some of the leaders are extremely partisans and may not even have sufficient time to attend to the concerns of the peasant population (Kenkewenda, 1994). In East Africa, therefore, the public image of state officials as 'selfless servant' for the social good has certainly disappeared due to recurrent corruptions. Hence, East Africa badly needs leaders who consider political power as an opportunity to serve the public rather than aggrandizing economic and political fortunes. In most East African countries, declaring constitutions without the consent of the people has endured because constitutions are guarded by police force. However, declaring development without proper preconditions cannot take root because it requires popular participation (Taa, 2004). In furtherance of the development declaration, these elites extensively announced erroneous rewards to ensue the expansion of globalization. They advanced that globalization brings wealth, harmony, justice and freedom to the region (Tabb, 2001). However, the empty pronouncements remained fixated to their minds without materializing on the ground. Even the East African trade envoys that often negotiate in the world trade organization do not remember about the 80% of their population (farmers, pastoralists and cattle breeders) and tend to disregard them in favour of globalization (Fukuyama, 2004). Hence, rural people, progressive and environmental forces are often excluded from negotiation sites or silenced by the forces of the major actors. In the case of East Africa, thus, "democratization" through globalization has become an elite driven gateless rallying cry.

Peasants' sense of environment

Most peasant communities cleanly and intimately know their agro-ecological area, farming system and socio-economic environment. Their knowledge is superior to what tourist researchers hope to gain after prolonged study. The East African peasants possess extensive and long career of environmental protection with the credentials of safely maintaining/defending well and running waters, vegetations, forests, trees, soils and animals (Cahill and Raymond, 2011). Most peasants often reside where there are enough natural and water sources to sustain their families and cattle. They generally choose hospitable environments that enable them to defend themselves from natural and human calamities (Tepperman, 2011). These people are responsibly adept in preserving the natural environment; they goad their cattle on roads without scattering them off roads in order to save grasses along roadsides. They revere the natural environment with no interest to modify the natural environments. They never squander water as they are very careful even when handling irrigations. As persons born and brought up in peasant communities, we have a first-hand knowledge that peasants do not cut down trees that do not give them immediate benefits, but rather they keep them because trees are mothers of balancing ecosystems. For example, Meaisa tree (the tree that resists sun shine and stays evergreen) cannot be used for anything and even the smell of its leave is very repulsive. However, this tree has multiple branches with huge leaves, and it is a drought resistant tree, serving as sanctuary for cattle during dry seasons. Similarly, Wanza tree produces edible fruit, and its flowers are consumed by bees upon blossoming. The honey made of the flowers of this tree is extremely delicious; the market price of the honey is higher compared to honeys made of other flowers. Thus, peasants protect not only trees but also their seasonal flowers, and the argument that farmers have no environmental vision is totally superfluous.

Moreover, peasants do not haphazardly slash and burn forests as often claimed by tourist researchers. Rather, they protect more because forests are very important to provide protection for many plants such as coffee, limes, orange and other fruits during warm seasons. Their knowledge of the environment grows as a result of their long occupancy of their localities, and this knowledge is cumulative, representing generations of experiences over a long period of time (Shils, 1997). Nonetheless, their knowledge about the environment is not static as often suggested by proponents of globalization but rather innovative and time sensitive. Similarly, the basic tenet of farmers and pastoralists is that only the elder can carry a match box with extra care during dry seasons. Setting fire is seriously avoided because it can destroy their livelihoods. Hence, burning grasses upon which, their cattle depend, destroying forests that give them a shade from the heat of the sun and forcing animals that serve as a source of food out of the area are highly prohibited.

The aura of peasant communities thrives on calmness and sincerity and their natural behaviour is highly suitable to protect the environment. The peasant communities are kept together by the invisible bonds of common thoughts – a common morality is a glue of their bondage to the environment. Their morality springs from relationships to their localities, families, neighbourhoods and ancestors. This morality emanates not from a mere conformity based on fear, but rather from voluntarily granted respect (Birarra, 2011). Their integrity is backed by good reason based on impartial considerations. Hence, peasants are willing to listen to reason even when it means revising their earlier convictions and they do not cultivate self importance (Rottack, 2009). Most peasants do not adore rigid pride that builds wall between people; instead they prefer humbleness that bridges differences by modesty smoothing and soothing communications. They respect and accept each other not based on a status or wealth but belonging to a community of peasants (Govier, 1997). Hence, peasant communities are not built on convenience but on conviction; their bondage is based on communal values than proximity.

Unwise development policies

Development is conventionally about the alleviation of poverty, the realization of human potential and the betterment of social lives (Berberoglu, 1994). For these reasons, development process must be autonomous, appropriate, gender-conscious and sustainable (Sen, 1999). However, East African leaders distort the true meaning of development, allying themselves with supranational organizations that propagate self-serving illusions under the banner of development (Guulet, 1988). It is possible to extrapolate that East Africa is in a crisis not only because it is badly governed, but also because it is coarsely advised and terribly coached. The right to define the path to development should have been left to the people of East Africa, without paternalistic interferences from falcons of development (Kenkewenda, 1994). And, pooling East Africa out of socio-economic predicament should be the primary responsibility of East Africans. Foreign inspired development projects in East Africa have always led the race to the bottom – the race in which winners envy losers (Shppman, 2002). Many foreign institutions have trafficked East African development for many years with fundamental canons advocated by “falcons’ of development. The exogenous development agencies teach that market is the best guardian while individuals are the engines of development. In reality, however, falcon led development practices could not solve any problem nor satisfy any person in the region. Unfortunately, these “falcons” are licensed to interfere in the Affairs of East Africa in the guise of “interdependence” that has already victimized the subcontinent. Consequently, there is an enormous lack of food security in households and communities. The capacity of the state to mobilize sufficient food through production, acquisition and distribution, on a sustainable basis has vastly diminished –subjecting the population to foods aid coming from donors (Amoako, 2004).

McClelland (1963) contended that development is a product of high degree of individual motivation and the need for achievement. He elaborated that the nature and direction of development are shaped by the values, motives and psychological forces rather than political and social structures. Conversely, Black (2007) argued that the primary objective of development is to facilitate achievement-based freedom - freedom that encompasses economic facilities, political mobility and social security. Such opportunities have to be linked to entitlement, and people have to be given rights to initiate, participate and lead development projects. The population of East Africa must reproduce and safeguard its own human capital (Guulet, 1988). Thus, instead of expecting foreign led abstract development strategies to produce fruit, peasants have to re-engineer concrete local development model into endogenous ones. They have to strengthen their internal cooperation, create local savings, develop education structure, and promote health care systems that suit their interests. These can only be enhanced by diversifying subsistence/export crops and guaranteeing universal access to land and housing (Shpmann, 2002). Such rational approach to development must put an end to the cruelties of oppressive regimes, intellectual darkness, and blind obedience to unexamined dogmas parachuted upon them by falcons of development (McClelland, 1963). Thus, peasant communities must identify principal community needs and the way to discover the means of satisfying those needs if they are aspiring to maintain happy, just and free society (Toussaint, 2003).

At present, globalization has gradually affected the social structure, culture, belief and family structure of the East African peasantry (Koissaba, 2013). The proponents of globalization are attempting to introduce unholy competitions to the peasant settings (Peet, 2003). In fact, competition can be a potent force for development when individuals share a desire for certain rewards and strive to outdo one another to maximize the share of those rewards (Bennet, 1988). Nonetheless, unchecked competitions have many consequences causing social exclusion, income inequality, more unemployment, colossal instability, destruction of the important feature of community by aggrandizing the sense of personal insecurity (Keiger, 2011). Thus, the social values of peasant communities thrive on cooperation and connection. Dia (1991) argued that the economic psychology of a developing society is characterized by powerful bonds among individuals, groups and communities. These interrelationships and the involvement of supernatural forces "to bless" the relationships vary from one group to another. In some ethnic groups, the belief in the equilibrium between supernatural forces and human agency is highly dominant. And, the higher value is placed on interpersonal relationships and the timely execution of social and religious activities than amassing wealth and promoting individual interests. The rituals surrounding economic transactions are often more important than the economic transactions themselves (Deininger, 2010). These societies are generally hierarchical between differing age groups although they are egalitarian within same age groups. At any rate, the solidarity of a group takes precedence over individual success and any imbalance among family members is tolerated because of its spill-over effects (Kiely, 2001). The fact that peasants live within the context of a single coherent cultural package does not mean that they are necessarily simple or free from series cultural shocks brought to the region by globalization. As a survival toolkit, however, they have an experience of universality and can get through their daily lives without encountering people with entirely different world view who can sow seeds of negativism.

Generally, peasants crave for justice because justice is the catalyst for social and economic development (Li, 2009). They tacitly urge the ruling elites to consider political power as opportunity to serve their people than aggrandizing wealth and remaining unaccountable. Peasants wish a viable vision for the sub continent – the vision that encourages people to

take their own destiny to their hands, the revelation that assists people to have a strong sense of resolve to change the persistent material deprivation and degradation (Stehr, 2002). All peasants, agriculturalists, pastoralists and semi-agriculturalists insist that indigenous people, materials and wisdom have to be given a suitable position in the development processes. The voices of local people have to be heard; ideas that flow from the top have to be debated at the local level, and ideas that do not coincide with local realities have to be readjusted or discarded. Instead, the East African modern development policies are formulated at the top or bought in open market to be forced upon ordinary people. Thus, modern development policies have become objects of commercial prescription with no regard to transparency and accountability.

Conclusion

This paper endeavoured to argue that globalization has imposed rural underdevelopment, displacement, lack of effective national leadership, wildish land grab by new capitalists –imposing calamitous lives on peasant communities in the region. In the opening decade of the 21st century, globalization, urbanization, and advanced communication technology tend to detach peasants from a sense of belonging in a local setting and thus are vehemently cursed by these communities. Not only that but also the ground of globalization is not yet solid. Since nothing is standing still, peasants' view should not be omitted from comprehensive intellectual and social considerations.

It must be stated that a healthily functioning person in the globalized world should think rationally and understand rural areas. She or he should also be able to appreciate and draw on social heritages by drinking from the well of ecological and spiritual feeling that is being tapped by rural people. Any attempt to annihilate peasants' tradition, custom and rituals would encounter fierce resistance to the extent of causing colossal damages to the reputation of the ruling elites. The rural tradition remains a daily guide to social practices, conferring internal peace upon the peasant communities. No one doubts that globalization brings ideas, styles, and behaviours but it should not try to recreate the traditions of peasants – the tradition that cannot instantly melt into thin air over night. In the eyes of the oppressed, exploited and displaced peasantry, globalization is nothing but a soulless despot, a graveyard of freedom and a colossal interrupter of communal culture and social stability. Therefore, it should be noted that “economic success” without success in terms of human wellbeing and environmental quality is worthless, unsustainable and should instantly be void. The main hope for East Africa is not free trade or open markets but rather resistance to the impact of globalisation and devising their own alternative future. Finally, we believe that development can unite, rather than divide and it can dignify, rather than diminish East African cultures/values, and that it can strengthen the universal rights and freedoms that make humans the most precious species.

Reference

- Abel, D. C. (1992). *Theories of human nature: classical and contemporary readings*. Toronto: McGraw Hills Inc
- Agrawal, A. (1995). Indigenous and scientific knowledge: some critical comments. *Indigenous knowledge and development monitor*. 3 (3): 3-5.
- Akenidele S. T, Gidado T.O, Olaopo O.R. (2002). *Globalisation, its implications and consequences for Africa*. Nigeria: Obafemi Awolowo University;
- Akram-Lodhi A.H, Kay C. (2010). *The agrarian question: peasant and social change*. In: Akram-Lodhi A. H. and Kay C. eds. *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. London: Routledge;

p. 3-35.

- Alden-Wily, L.; (2010). Whose land are you giving away, Mr. President? Paper presented at: The Annual World Bank Conference on Land Policy and Administration, April 26-27; Washington DC.
- Amoako K. Y. (2004). Land tenure systems and their impacts on food security and sustainable development in Africa. Addis Ababa: African Economic Commission.
- Akram-Lodhi A. H, Kay C, eds. (2010). Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question. (P. 288-313) (London: Routledge,
- Araghi, P. (2010). The invisible hands and the visible foot: peasants, dispossession and globalization. In: Akram-Lodhi A. H, Kay C, eds. Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question (p. 111-148). London: Routledge; 2010.
- Ayenagbo, K. (2012). The impact of globalization on African countries economic development. *African journal of business management* 6(44):11057-11076
- African Union. (2009). Declaration on land issues and challenges in Africa. The General Assembly of the African Union's Thirteenth Ordinary Session. Addis Ababa; The secretariat, July 1-3; Decl.1 (XIII)
- Baran, P. (1957). The Political economy of growth, Monthly Review Press, New York: P. 308-354.
- Bernstein, H. (2001). The peasantry in global capitalism: who, where and why? Socialist register (pp. 26-51).
- Birara, A. (2011). The great land give away. Washington: World Book.
- Black, M (2007). The no-nonsense guide to international development. Toronto: New Internationalist Publications Ltd;
- Brawley, M. R. (2003). The politics of globalization. Toronto: Broadview Press
- Berberoglu, B. (1994). The political economy of development: development theory and the prospect for change in the third world. Albany: State University of New York Press
- Bennet, J. W. (1988). The political ecology and economic development of migratory pastoralist societies in East Africa. In: Donald A. Thomas B, Hojn G, eds. Power and poverty: development and development projects in the third world (P. 31-61), Boulder. Westview Press;
- Bush, R. (2008). Africa and globalization. *African Studies Bulletin* 70, 43-52
- Cahill L, Raymond K. (2011). Environmental health and safety audits. 9th ed. New York: Government Institutes.
- Cameron, D. (2000). Globalization triumphant or globalization in retreat: implications for Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Chang, H.J. (2008). The bad Samaritans: the myth of free trade and the secret history of capitalism. New York: Bloomberg Press.
- Desta, A. (2010). Industrialization by invitation: will it work in Ethiopia? [Cited 2017 April 20]. Available from: <http://farmlandgrab.org/100083>.
- Deininger, K. (2011). Challenges posed by the new wave of farmland investment. *The journal of peasant studies*, Routledge, 38 (2): 217-247.
- Deininger K, Byerlee D, Lindsay J, Norton A, Selod H, Stickler M. (2011). Rising global interest in farmland: can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits? Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Dia, M. (1991). Development and cultural values in sub-Saharan Africa. Finance and development. December; P. 10-13.
- Enrlich P, Enrlich A. (1991). The population explosion. New York: Touchstone.
- Edelman, M. (1999). Peasants against globalization: rural social movements in Costa Rica. Palo Atlo CA: Stanford University Press.
- Esminger J. (1992). Making a market: the institutional transformation of African society.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State building: governance and world order in the 21st century*. New York: Cornell University press.
- Getachew, K. N. (2001). *Among the pastoral Afar in Ethiopia: tradition, continuity and socioeconomic change*. Netherlands: International Books.
- Greider, William. (1997). *One world, ready or not: the maniac logic of global capitalism*. New York: Touchstone.
- Govier, T. (1997). *Social trust and human communities*. Montréal: McGill – Queens University Press.
- Gubbles, P. (1998). *Peasant farmer agricultural self-development: The world neighbours experience in West Africa*. Ileia: Centre for Sustainable Agriculture.
- Guulet, D. (1988). *Development strategy in Sri Lanka and people's alternative*. In: Attwood, D, Thomas B, Hojn G. *Power and poverty: development and development projects in the third world* (P. 61-85), Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hoogvelt, A. (1997). *Globalization and the postcolonial world*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1997). *The clash of civilisation*. New York: Touchstone Books.
- Huntington, S. (1993). *The third wave: democratizing in the late twentieth century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma press.
- Human Rights Watch. *The Ethiopian army commits torture and rape: abusive villagization*. [cited 2015 March 23. [cited 2015 May 27] Available from: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2012/08/28/ethiopia-army-commits-torture-rape>
- Kenkwenda, M. (1994). *Marabouts and merchants of development in Africa*. Codeseria Bulletin; 3: 9-15.
- Keiger, D. (2011). *The curse of the golden egg: Why are resource-rich African countries plagued by slow growth, economic disparity, corrupt and repressive governments, and civil strife?* Johns Hopkins University Magazine.
- Kiely, R. (2010). *The globalization of manufacturing production: Warrenite fantasies and uneven and unequal realities*. In: A. Akram-Lodhi H, Kay C, eds. *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. (P.169-190). London: Routledge.
- Koissaba, B.R. O. (2013). *Effects of globalization in the Maasai Family*.
- Kottak, P. Conard. (2009). *Cultural Anthropology*. Thirteenth ed Toronto; McGraw Hill.
- Lauer, R. H. (1991). *Perspectives on social change*. Toronto: Ally and Bacon.
- Li, T.M. (2009). *Exit from agriculture: a step forward or a step backward for the rural poor?* *Journal of Peasant Studies*; 36(3): 629–636.
- Machiavelli, N. (1994). *The prince*. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Inc.
- McClelland, D. (1963). *The achievement motive in economic growth*. In: Bert F. Hosieltz, Wilberet E.M, ed. *industrialization and society*. Paris: UNESCO.
- McNally, D. (2002). *Another world is possible: globalization and anti-capitalism*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Mckeo, N. (2013). *Globalization One Does Not Sell the Land Upon Which the People Walk: Land Grabbing, Transnational Rural Social Movements, and Global Governance – 10:1,105–122*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2013.760911>.
- Michael, P. (2010). *Food sovereignty, social reproduction and the agrarian question*. In: A. Akram-Lodhi H, Kay C, eds. *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. (p. 288-313). London: Routledge.
- Obadina, T. (1998). *Globalisation, human rights and development*. *Africa Today*. October; p. 32-33
- Paehlke, R. (2003). *Democracy's dilemma*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Peet, R. (2003). *Unholy trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO*. New York: Zed Book.

- Posey, D, Graham D. Beyond intellectual property: Toward traditional resource rights for indigenous people and local communities. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; 1996.
- Rahmato, D. (2008). Ethiopia: Agriculture policy review. In: Taye A, ed. Digest of Ethiopia's national policies, strategies and programs. Addis Ababa: Forum of social studies of the European Union; p. 129-153.
- Reiger E, Leibfried S. (2003). Limits to globalization. Cambridge; polity press.
- Rist, G. (1997). The history of development: From Western origins to global faith. London: Zed.
- Rist, G. (1990). Development as the new religion of the west. *Quid Pro Quo*. 1(2): 5-8.
- Robbins, R. H. (2001). Cultural anthropology: a problem-based approach. Toronto: Thompson
- Ross, R. J, Trachete, K.C. (1990). Global capitalism: The new leviathan. Albany: State University of New York.
- Saul, J. R. (2006). The collapse of globalism and the reinvention of the world. Toronto: Penguin Group.
- Sen, Amartya. (1999). Development as freedom. New York: Anchor Books.
- Shils, Edward. (1997). The virtue of civility: selected essays on liberalism, tradition and civil society. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund Inc.
- Shipman, A. (2002). The globalization myth. Cambridge: Icon Books.
- Stehr, Nico. (2002). Knowledge and economic conduct: the social foundation of modern economy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Suarez, S. M. (2013). The human rights framework in contemporary agrarian struggles, *The journal of peasant studies*; 40 (1): 239–290.
- Taa, B. (2004). East African pastoralist culture and the problems of development. *Canadian journal of development studies*; 25 (2): 310-324.
- _____ (2009). Integrating Ethiopian immigrants to Canada. Koln: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Tabb, W. K. (2001). The amoral elephant: globalization and the struggle for social justice in the Twenty-First Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2003). Inequality and social policy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tabb, William K. (2006). Globalization, Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2006 http://encarta.msn.com/text_1741588397_1/Globalization.html
- Tepperman, L. (2011). Starting points: A sociological journey. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Turnbull, C. M. (1962). The lonely Africa. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Toussaint, E, Arnaud Z. (2003). External debt: abolish the debt in order to free development. In: Fisher W, Thomas P. Another world is possible. (P. 30-38). Nova Scotia: Fernwood publishing Ltd.
- Vidal, J. (2010). How food and water are driving a 21st century African land grabs? *The Guardian*. March 7. [Cited 2016 May, 10] Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/mar/07/food-water-africa-land-grab>
- (2011). Ethiopia at the centre of global farmland rush. *The Guardian* CO, UK. March 21. [Cited 2015 may 15] Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/21/ethiopia-centre-global-farm-land-rush>
- World Bank. (2010). Rising global interest in farmland: can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits? Washington, DC: Committee Report.
- W. W. Rostow. (1960). A Stage of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto. New York: Cambridge University Press.