

Colonial Legacy and the Development Dilemma in Post-Colonial Developing Countries

Kouadra Hocine ¹

¹ Larbi Ben M'hidi University - Oum El Bouaghi, kouadra.hocine@univ-oeb.dz

Received: 06/10/2025

Accepted: 18/03/2026

Published: 15/04/2026

Abstract:

This study highlights the development dilemma of developing countries in a historical context linked to the colonial and neocolonial legacy. It traces the origins of European expansion and examines the theoretical approaches that attempt to explain it. It also reviews the establishment of colonies and the consolidation of colonial control, in order to understand the complexity and interconnectedness of the post-independence era.

The aim of this study is to validate the extent to which the major historical colonial powers and neocolonialism laid the foundation for some of the development problems currently facing at least a large number of developing countries. The research reveals that the persistence of the development dilemma in independent countries is related to the penetration of colonial legacies linked to neoliberal and neocolonial networks and global institutions dominated by the Global North and their connections with local ruling elites supported by Western countries.

Keywords: developing countries, colonial legacy, development, imperialism, Postcolonial theory.

Corresponding author: Kouadra Hocine, kouadra.hocine@univ-oeb.dz

INTRODUCTION

Most developing countries have been in transition from a traditional society, with a colonial heritage, to an independent, advanced society in which all available resources can be harnessed to achieve national development goals and objectives. However, several decades (more than half a century) after gaining political independence, this desired goal has not been achieved. The process of achieving national development goals has been extremely slow, and a high degree of underdevelopment, poverty, disease, deprivation, and economic decline persists over the years in most developing countries.

Many reasons have been put forward for this situation, such as poor economic planning, global recession, high oil prices, and the lack of a clear ideological orientation. In seeking solutions to these problems, economists have played a leading role in various economic models and development theories presented as solutions to overcome the development crisis in developing countries.

However, the problem remains unsolved, as these explanations do not provide a sufficient and in-depth analysis of the underdevelopment of developing countries, as the underlying problem may be related to institutional structures inherited from the colonial era. Thus, the causal significance of the colonial legacy varies, as it influences subsequent freedom of manoeuvring to varying degrees and in different directions.

In its most severe and dangerous forms, the colonial legacy may take the form of path determination, meaning that colonial choices shape, or at least condition, post-colonial choices. This has made independence and the departure from colonialism difficult and costly, and may remain so for decades to come in a number of developing countries still suffering from the legacy of the colonial period.

In addition, to the question of the strength of the past's influence on the future for developing countries, we need to consider the nature of this influence by examining the various effects of colonial rule on developing countries' development efforts, based on which we can determine their

position on either a higher or lower trajectory of economic change. In this context, it will be argued that the development paths of developing countries were determined by the time of independence and were not necessarily viewed as having begun in the colonial period, but rather as a continuation of modifications from the paths of change that arose before the European division of spheres of influence. This study seeks to explore development challenges within the historical context of colonialism, beginning by tracing the origins of European expansion into spheres of influence and examining the theoretical approaches that attempt to explain it, within the context of the establishment of colonies and the consolidation of colonial control, in order to conceptualize the complexity of the post-independence era. The aim of this study is to investigate the extent to which major historical forces, such as European colonial imperialism and neocolonialism, laid the foundation for at least some of the problems currently facing a large number of developing countries.

Thus, the development crisis of developing countries will be highlighted within a historical context linked to the legacy of colonialism and neocolonialism. Accordingly, the following question will be posed: To what extent did colonial legacies contribute to the persistence of the development dilemma in independent developing countries?

To achieve the objectives and requirements of the study, a historical-analytical approach was adopted, tracing the various stages of the development of the colonial and neocolonial phenomena and their penetration into independent developing countries. Furthermore, the descriptive-analytical approach was employed, drawing on information drawn from primary and secondary sources, to analyze the reality of development in developing countries in light of the pervasiveness of colonial structures and legacies and their impact on the persistence of the development dilemma.

To better understand the subject, the study was divided according to the following plan:

- 1- The origins of European colonial expansion and theoretical explanations of imperialism and colonialism.
- 2- Colonial powers and the formation of colonized developing countries.
- 3- Developing countries and the challenges of post-colonial development.

2-The Origins of European Colonial Expansion and Theoretical Explanations of Imperialism and Colonialism

European domination of the indigenous peoples of the Americas, Africa, and Asia was a largely negative experience, the effects of which are still felt today on these continents. Although there is no specific date indicating the beginning of the European conquest, it is generally agreed that the turning point was 1492, when Christopher Columbus discovered the Americas, or more precisely, the year he discovered San Salvador, the Bahamas, and Cuba. Columbus was sent by the Spanish Crown, which was concerned about the growing influence of Portugal, a pioneer of overseas expansion.

As early as 1415, Portugal occupied Ceuta, a thriving Islamic city and trading center in North Africa. Shortly thereafter, the Portuguese Crown claimed its first Atlantic colonies, Madeira and the Azores. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the imperial rivalry between Spain and Portugal had intensified significantly. In 1521, Cortés conquered the Aztec Empire, paving the way for Spain to take control of the territory now known as Mexico¹.

Over the next four hundred years, European powers sought to dominate much of the world. According to a major study, European countries controlled one-third of the world's land area by 1800, two-thirds by 1878, and over 84% by 1914². This era of European dominance lasted for several centuries.

In this context, it is useful to clarify key terms such as imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism. "Colonialism" refers to the direct rule of peoples by a foreign power, while "imperialism" describes a broader system

of domination by one country over other regions or the entire world³. Neocolonialism is a more complex term that denotes a specific type of relationship characterized by "unfair ties" between former colonies and the global economic system. These ties, which persisted long after independence, stem from the colonial experience⁴. In other words, neocolonialism represents the continuation of European influence over former colonies through ongoing cultural, political, and economic control.

Based on the above definitions, three phases of European expansion can be distinguished. The first, characterized by imperialism, extended from 1415 to 1776. The second phase involved the formal establishment of colonies, which continued symbolically until 1945, when the end of World War II marked the beginning of the official period of decolonization. The final phase refers to the post-independence period for most developing countries, which were separated by competing neocolonial tendencies emerging in major Western powers.

The intellectual foundations of European colonial expansion are rooted in the ideas of the mercantile school, considering that the Age of Exploration contributed significantly to the development of mercantilism. However, the contradiction inherent in mercantilism—the rejection of free trade yet the acceptance of policies that would see the expansion of protectionist trade exports—was resolved and overcome through colonial conquest. Accordingly, mercantilists provided justification for imperial expansion and the establishment of colonies, which were seen as indispensable. They provided an opportunity to eliminate commercial competition and ensure exclusive access to untapped markets and sources of cheap materials (and in some cases, direct sources of the precious materials themselves). This prompted each nation to seek to monopolize as many of these overseas trade opportunities as possible.⁵

From the beginning of overseas exploration, the idea of trade was highly attractive to European rulers, who harbored ambitions of world conquest. The concept of peaceful international cooperation was alien to

European nations, who had been chronically fighting each other for centuries over money, prestige, and territory. In this context, the early adventures of Columbus, Pizarro, and Cortés were financed by the Spanish crown in the hope of becoming a powerful kingdom by finding large quantities of gold and silver. The conquistadors under Pizarro fulfilled these hopes, but in the process, they destroyed the Inca.⁶

Mercantilist ideas remained accepted and dominant in explaining international economic relations until the publication of Adam Smith's famous book "The Wealth of Nations" in 1776. The book strongly supported the idea of free markets, but it also offered a convincing critique of mercantilism. Smith viewed mercantilism as a highly unstable approach to international economic relations. As these liberal ideas took hold, thousands of European explorers set sail for the New World, guided by the mercantilist conviction that it was beneficial to a nation's wealth to engage in selfish, self-centered behavior, even if it meant committing predatory acts against people living in distant lands.

But, as empires expanded beyond their territorial limits, the growing popularity of liberal arguments would alter the character of their hegemony. In this regard, three distinct perspectives offered competing explanations for why colonialism became such a powerful force in the global economy. The first was the Marxist-inspired theory formulated in the writings of Lenin. The second was that of G. Hobson, who represented the positions of British liberals struggling to explain the persistence of colonialism. The third, that of K. Fieldhouse, proposed an alternative explanation that diverged from both Lenin and Hobson.

As one of the principal architects of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, Lenin devised a Marxist conception of colonial imperialism. In doing so, he achieved two goals with one theory. The first objective is linked to fulfilling the Marxist demand and providing an economic explanation for the explosion of expansionist policies since the late nineteenth century on the part of all major advanced capitalist countries. The second objective is to use this theoretical logic to explain the absence

of the "expected socialist revolution" in the industrialized West, as Marx predicted⁷. The Leninist perspective sees imperialism as the state of development of capitalism in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital became entrenched, in which the export of capital gained prominence, and in which the division of the world between international funds began, dividing all regions of the globe into spheres of influence between the major capitalist powers⁸.

In this context, both theories of uneven development in the global economy—dependency and world system theory—were built around this understanding of imperialism. Colonial expansion unleashed the disruptive forces that permanently characterized the core industrialized countries within the global capitalist system.

Immanuel Wallerstein, the founder of world-systems theory, noted that the three structural positions in the global economy—core, periphery, and semiperiphery—had stabilized by around 1640...This meant that the geographic expansion of the European global economy had led to the elimination of other global systems and the absorption of the remaining microsystems⁹. From a Marxist perspective, the colonial period was crucial for consolidating the existing, inherently unequal structures of the global economy.

On the other hand, John Hobson argues that imperialism results from a combination of forces, focusing in particular on the growing power of international finance, which plays a crucial role in various processes associated with the economies of the late nineteenth century. In his explanation of developments in this period, he rejects the suggestion that European powers were driven by the logic of capitalism and simply engaged in an exploitative search for new markets. Instead, colonies were sought because they offered logical opportunities to invest surplus savings. John Hobson thus considered competition among European powers to be a natural struggle for hegemony. However, the colonial phase of this competition was unique insofar as it was enabled by the transnational

financier. The driving force of imperialism is not primarily financial: finance is rather the driver of the imperial engine.¹⁰

Meanwhile, David Fieldhouse has attempted to defend a different viewpoint, challenging the assumptions made by both Lenin and Hobson. David Fieldhouse argues that colonial expansion in the late nineteenth century was a political phenomenon. He asserts that the costs of maintaining overseas colonies were enormous, and that the existence of colonies therefore entailed special responsibilities. Accordingly, decisions to intensify territorial control over overseas colonial territories stemmed from "multiple problems that arose at the frontiers of European activity on other continents." The emergence of comprehensive colonialism was a necessary response to these frontier problems during a period in which relations between colonizers and colonized had become fundamentally unstable.¹¹

While, none of the theories mentioned above provides a complete explanation of neocolonial expansion, each represents an important effort to understand this crucial period in world history. The Marxist perspective, in particular, has proven highly versatile and has significantly enriched many intellectual debates in the postcolonial era. In contrast, Fieldhouse's political theory is viewed with skepticism today, largely due to its claim that colonialism has simply ended and its implicit dismissal of neocolonialism. This brings us to the ongoing debate regarding the third stage of neocolonial expansion. There is a substantial body of literature—although not exclusively Marxist—that addresses postcolonial theory. This theory involves a critical rejection of dominant ways of thinking that define the Third World in terms of religiosity, backwardness, poverty, nationalism, and anti-Western sentiment¹². The concept of the "postcolonial condition" describes a state in which the colonial legacy remains ever-present—practically, historically, and theoretically—even in efforts to think beyond it.

Postcolonial theory focuses on how Western practices of colonial domination affect processes of identity formation and political organization

among indigenous communities. It questions the extent to which postcolonial identity diminishes the capacity for individual and collective agency for independence. It also examines the responses of postcolonial societies to offers of new engagement with the West in the form of cultural, social, or commercial relations. The analytical starting points of many postcolonial discourses come from diverse sources and focus on individual and societal experiences shaped by colonial institutions in the Americas, Asia, Africa, and the Pacific. A crucial point raised by postcolonial thinkers concerns the global spread of economic liberalism. According to this view, liberalism's "cosmopolitan spirit" contains a justification for imperial ambitions¹³.

3- Colonial Powers and the Formation of Colonized Developing States

By the end of the nineteenth century, colonial powers had established spheres of influence in virtually every region of the world and were able to exercise political hegemony through direct control made possible by their possession of superior military weapons. While Native Americans used clubs and axes of stone and wood to fight invaders, Europeans possessed steel swords, spears, daggers, and body armor, and were in the process of mastering firearms. While Native American armies moved on foot, Europeans used horses to terrifying effect¹⁴.

Jared Diamond argues that the great disparity in technology and development between colonizing and colonized nations stems from the influence of geographical determinism. The rapid development of Eurasia was initially driven by a favorable climate and fertile terrain, which over thousands of years created specific animals that could be domesticated and used as tools, food, and clothing. The more favorable geographical setting and climate allowed for the cultivation of cereal crops such as wheat, barley, and rye. These factors enabled the establishment of permanent, specialized communities, and over time, the division of labor contributed to making Eurasian settlements more efficient, secure, and conducive to the development and application of new inventions.

Furthermore, Jared Diamond attributes this superior military technology to the more favorable development path enjoyed by Eurasian societies, as conditioned by geography. The argument suggests that the faster progress toward specialized settlements in Eurasia was initially driven by a more favorable climate and fertile terrain. Otherwise, people living in a harsh, scarce tropical climate were forced to expend most of their resources trying to survive. The harsh climate and terrain forced many indigenous communities to live as nomads, with very limited options for developing new technologies. Thus, historically traced geographical factors can explain the differences in all aspects of technology between colonists and indigenous peoples, and these differences are partly responsible for the success of European expansion¹⁵.

In criticizing the geographic determinism hypothesis, Acemoglu and Robinson claim that it is incapable of capturing the nuances of nations' historical trajectories. Some countries have consistently failed despite being located in regions with abundant natural resources. Others have excelled where their geography predicted they should have failed. Instead, the researchers have developed the institutional factors thesis as a factor influencing the historical trajectories of nations¹⁶. The key to the successful development of societies is the quality of state institutions. In their detailed historical analysis, the researchers demonstrate the importance of inclusive democratic institutions for economic development and the dire consequences of extractive institutions.

According to this thesis, the colonial era was a crucial period for most colonized societies. The state became the most important structure transferred by colonial powers to the colonized territories. However, state institutions varied according to the colonial power's preferences, and extractive institutions were imposed on societies without their consent¹⁷. Unfortunately, the peoples of newly independent states found themselves faced with governments that reinforced extractive institutions rather than creating new, more democratic ones. They simply replicated and intensified the abuses perpetrated by the colonizers, often severely restricting the distribution of political power.

Independence movements sought to change the political makeup of post-colonial societies. but they were rarely successful because the states inherited from the colonial era were an obstacle. Institutionally, post-colonial states resembled centralized entities organized to ensure the implementation of colonial policies. Politically, they were simply repressive organizations prepared to use violence if necessary to maintain control over their people. Many of these states were also artificially defined borders, drawn at negotiating tables under the guidance of the colonial powers. These colonial state-building projects thus reflected Europe's conviction that the state must be replicated worldwide as the desired form of political authority.

During the colonial era, which roughly coincided with the 300 years following the Treaty of Westphalia, political systems outside the European state system were considered according to three categories. The first category included European trading partners and competitors, such as China and the Ottoman Empire. The second category included non-sovereign political systems... but not as entirely dependent¹⁸. This included parts of Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Latin America. By the end of the nineteenth century, China and the Ottoman Empire also fell into this category. The third category consisted of colonized states that were entirely under the sovereign rule of European powers. The colonies then formed secondary extensions of the colonial powers, under the tacit rule that no other European state could legitimately interfere in their affairs. Naturally, the colonial territories were the site of numerous armed conflicts between European powers¹⁹.

From an economic perspective, the European powers exercised dominance by organizing the colonial territories in a way that best served their needs and economic interests. Through decrees and coercion, the colonizers altered the prevailing patterns of economic production in the occupied territories by creating socio-economic structures that benefited them at the expense of the colonized peoples. In contrast, most of the economic activities that arose in the colonized territories were limited to the

production of primary goods, particularly in the agriculture and mining sectors. The goal was to ensure supplies of agricultural goods and cheap raw materials. For industrial consumption in Europe. While the European powers continued to develop their economies to become major centers of manufacturing industries, the colonies remained subservient to supplying Europe with essential goods.

On the cultural level, European hegemony demonstrated its power through organized religion and the spread of its languages and new educational systems in its colonies. With the exception of a few regions, such as the Middle East (where Islam and Arabic remained dominant) and China, most other areas under colonial control adopted the religion and language of the colonizer. Colonial powers worked to spread and practice Christianity, which became one of the most powerful tools of cultural disruption imposed on colonized societies. Christianity, whether Protestant or Catholic, provided Europeans with an aura of superiority and a sense of a civilizing mission. By refusing to learn local languages and disseminate their cultures and educational curricula, colonizers sowed seeds of psychological and cultural inferiority in the minds of the native populations. Despite these organized efforts to project the seemingly invincible power of the colonial powers, European colonialism began to collapse during the twentieth century. However, most post-independence efforts to achieve social, economic, and political stability failed. And wealth for a large number of post-colonial countries.

4-Developing Countries and the Challenges of Post-Colonial Development

Most colonized countries gained their independence by generating strong nationalist sentiments. Before independence, most territories under colonial control were not governed in a way that would instill a sense of national pride among the often diverse groups of peoples who found themselves within the borders of the newly established independent states. Local leaders who fought for independence were still able to mobilize the support of the indigenous population by championing nationalist ideology.

The call for national unity drew the oppressed together and directly confronted them against their common enemy—the colonial powers. The rise of nationalism and subsequent self-government in post-colonial territories was made possible by the following key factors:²⁰

- The weakness of European colonial powers as a result of World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945) accelerated the rise of nationalism in the colonized territories. The two world wars, coupled with the Great Depression of the 1930s, significantly reduced the ability of European colonial powers to effectively administer their colonies. The emergence of new global superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) was equally significant, particularly at the end of World War II, as they did not support the continuation of European colonialism.
- The role played by former soldiers from the colonies who served with their colonial masters in both world wars. Before the wars, the colonists projected an aura of invincibility. However, the devastation and massacres caused by the wars eroded the impregnable image of educated Europeans. As a result, the colonial soldiers realized that the colonizers had fears and weaknesses and could be defeated. Upon their return to their countries after the wars, these former soldiers became some of the strongest nationalists.
- The rise of an educated local political elite imbued with Western ideals of liberal democracy. Most leaders of nationalist movements in the colonized territories had participated in European educational systems and learned about democracy, self-determination, and independence. Later, local political elites were able to appeal to such emancipatory ideas, along with the indigenous people's deep sense of dignity and aversion to colonial oppression, thus fueling nationalist fervor.

On the eve of independence, political leaders promised their citizens dignity and prosperity. However, for most independent countries, the post-colonial era was marked by a series of seemingly insurmountable challenges, exacerbated by the Cold War. Newly independent developing countries found themselves caught in the ideological divide between East

and West. During this period, political loyalty to one of the superpowers meant financial and political support for these countries. For example, the struggle for international supremacy between the United States and the Soviet Union reached the point of supporting some of the most repressive political regimes in the Third World—such as Mobutu's regime in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo), Mengistu's regime in Ethiopia, or Bokassa's regime in the Central African Republic. Even decades after the end of the Cold War, the political mistakes made during this period continue to hinder development efforts in many developing countries.

Despite, the legacy of the colonial past that continues to haunt the developing world today, former colonies have become independent, sovereign states. New states have also been created from armed conflicts that have raged between and within a number of post-colonial states. While for some states and ethnic groups, formal recognition of statehood remains an aspiration, the international system of states operates on the principle of sovereignty, but it is useful to remember the limits of such an arrangement. For as one scholar puts it "Two useful imaginings are claimed to underlie this system: the sovereign equality of states and the concept of anarchy as presupposing the nature of relations among them. These notions facilitate the management of conflict, cooperation between units, and the creation and functioning of international organizations. They obscure the notion that actual relations among constituent units are hierarchical or hierarchically arranged groups of units"²¹.

Nonetheless, the formal end of colonialism, the international system of sovereign states remains highly asymmetrical. Divisions along economic lines are perhaps the most pronounced. It is impossible to separate issues of poverty in the developing world from the colonial past. Nor can past injustices be redressed by membership in international organizations. Achille Mbembe views the destabilizing processes of integrating former colonies into the global economy as new patterns of economic exploitation leading to new techniques of domination of Africa²². This scholar cautions against attempting to define the needs of contemporary Africans, as this

exposes our limited and guilt-ridden conception of Africa. He is concerned about the risks to the cohesion of African societies. There are threats of internal disintegration resulting from external constraints and pressures related to debt repayment, structural problems, and internal wars. Persistent discord and violence, fueled by deepening inequalities and corruption, have created intense movements that may be the final defeat of the African state as we have known it in recent years²³. Although developing countries struggle to overcome the challenges of the post-colonial era and develop their resources to ensure a better life for their citizens, they will need foreign investment. Neo-colonial exploitation and control of developing countries will continue unless the international community integrates the principles of fairness and justice into the global economic system as a whole, and into international transactions and partnerships for global development worldwide.

5-Conclusion

In conclusion, It can be argued that there is an effort to challenge the prevailing intellectual fallacy that colonialism is ancient history in independent developing countries, and that independent countries and societies have been given the opportunity to find their own path and chart their own destiny in the post-colonial period without the interference of former colonial powers. Instead, some of the contemporary problems of post-colonial developing countries, including economic dependency, persistent conflicts, governance challenges, and entrenched inequalities, can be traced back to colonial practices and legacies perpetuated through neoliberal and neocolonial networks and global institutions dominated by the Global North, and through local communities represented by local ruling elites supported by former Western colonial powers.

Study Findings : The study reached the following conclusions :

- The persistence of the development dilemma in post-colonial developing countries is linked to complex contradictions, including the ongoing struggle between history and reality, particularly the negative impact of the

colonial legacy and its pervasiveness in these societies during the period of independence.

- On the political side, former colonies, artificially divided, have become the foundation for most future developing countries. The distorted political systems inherited from the colonial era and ethnic relations sowed the seeds of disaster in the political development of independent developing countries.

- On the economic front, the distorted colonial economic structure made it difficult for developing economies, even after independence, to free themselves from their heavy dependence on external economies (especially Western economies), resulting in a lack of independence in their economic development.

- The so-called discrepancy between internal development and external models primarily refers to developing countries' importation of external development models during their development process. Practice has shown that external development models do not adapt well to the local contexts of developing countries. This inability to adapt highlights the unique national circumstances of developing countries, and it is precisely this alienation from the rest of the world that prevents developing countries from unconsciously copying development models from the outside world.

- The demands of the new ruling classes in developing countries, exacerbated by structural constraints inherited from colonialism, can't escape the competitive pressures of the broader system, especially when the crisis worsens. This calls for viewing today's mass struggles and new social movements as important factors in bringing about the necessary change and finding a way out of the impasse that some developing countries continue to face.

Recommendations :

- Developing countries must understand the existence of colonial legacies and their negative impact on the development process in order to find ways to resist them and continuously decolonize their minds, given that

intellectual freedom is a prerequisite for decolonization.

- The decolonization project of independent developing countries can be shaped by an understanding of the "self," even when it is imagined that the "self" will be reshaped and reshaped through decolonization, and the cultures of these societies will inevitably be liberated from the control of cultural colonialism and engaged in counterproduction or self-creation.
- African countries must make significant efforts to transform their economic structures, liberate themselves from external dependency, and improve governance. Only in this way can economic development in African countries really get on the right track.

6. Bibliography List :

¹ Jonathan Hart, *Comparing Empires : European Colonialism from Portuguese Expansion to the Spanish-American War*. New York, NY : Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 13–19.

² David K. Fieldhouse, *Economics and Empire 1830–1914*. Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press, 1973, p.490.

³ Henry Bernstein, “Colonialism, Capitalism, Development”, in : Tim Allen and Alan Thomas (eds), *Poverty and Development into the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford, UK : Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 250.

⁴Ibid, p. 290.

⁵ Benjamin J. Cohen, *The Question of Imperialism*. New York, NY : Basic Books, 1973, p. 21.

⁶ Niall Fergusson, *The Ascent of Money : A Financial History of the World*. New York, NY : The Penguin Press, 2008, p. 20.

⁷ Albert O. Hirschman, *Essays in Trespassing – Economics to Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 171.

- ⁸ Vladimir Lenin, “Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism”, in : Axel Hulsemeyer, *International Political Economy : A Reader*. Oxford, UK : Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 98–99.
- ⁹ Immanuel M. Wallerstein, “The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System : Concepts for Comparative Analysis”, in : Axel Hulsemeyer, *International Political Economy : A Reader*. Oxford, UK : Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 116, 119–120.
- ¹⁰ John A. Hobson, "Imperialism : A Study". 1902, available at : <http://www.panarchy.org/hobson/imperialism.1902.html> (accessed 30/09/2025).
- ¹¹ David K. Fieldhouse, *Economics and Empire 1830–1914*. New York : Cornell University Press, 1973, p.476.
- ¹² Gyan Prakash, “Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World : Perspectives from Indian Historiography”. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 32, no2, 1990, p. 384
- ¹³ Duncan Ivison, *Postcolonial Liberalism*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 43.
- ¹⁴ Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel – The Fates of Human Societies*. New York, NY : W.W. Norton & Company, 1997, p. 358.
- ¹⁵ Ibid, p.p. 354–359.
- ¹⁶ Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Why Nations Fail : The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York, NY : Crown Business, 2012, p.p. 48–56.
- ¹⁷ Ibid, pp. 408–409.
- ¹⁸ Daniel Philpott, *Revolutions in Sovereignty : How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations*. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 2001, p.33.
- ¹⁹ Ibid, p. 34.

²⁰ John Isbister, *Promises Not Kept : The Betrayed of Social Change in the Third World*. Bloomfield, CT : Kumarian Press, 2001, p.p. 101-144.

²¹ Robert W. Cox and Michael G. Schechter, *The Political Economy of a Plural World : Critical Reflections on Power, Morals and Civilization*. London, UK : Routledge, 2002, p. 32.

²² Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley, CA : University of California Press, 2001, p.67.

²³ *Ibid*, p. 68.