



**JATSS, 2024; 6(3), 214-232**

***First Submission: 05.04.2024***

***Revised Submission After Review: 12.06.2024***

***Accepted For Publication: 29.09.2024***

***Available Online Since:30.09.2024***

**Research Article**

**Humanising The 'Naire' in Money: A Scoping Review**

**Lanre Akinpelu Olanrewaju Olutayo <sup>a</sup> & Adedeji Saheed Oyenuga <sup>b</sup>**

**Abstract**

As the world progresses into the critical Year 2030, the magic Year for attaining the Sustainable Development Goals, doubts about the certainty of success are high. Amid COVID-19, the climate crisis, the Russia-Ukraine war, among many other wars, and the high cost of living pushing most of the people into poverty and hardship, it is time to reconsider what is being done to make the world a better place for most of the people. In doing this, this paper attempts to interrogate the influence of money in the consistent world economic crises. It argues that the 'inevitability of money', attendant on changing technology, pervading the World Capitalist System needs to be reoriented to *homos sociologicus*. In a way, it recommends the need to 'humanise' money and technology, such that humans construct it socially instead of vice versa.

*Keywords:* sustainable development goals, COVID 19, money, world capitalist system

*JEL Codes:* E49, O1, P1

---

<sup>a</sup> Prof. Dr., University of Ibadan, Faculty of The Social Sciences, Department of Sociology Ibadan, Oyo/ Nigeria lantopamtu@yahoo.com ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4011-3045>

<sup>b</sup>Dr., Lagos State University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Ojo, Lagos/ Nigeria adedeji.oyenuga@lasu.edu.ng ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5348-7658> (Corresponding Author)





JATSS, 2024; 6(3), 214-232

*İlk Başvuru:05.04.2024*

*Düzeltilmiş Makalenin Alınışı:12.06.2024*

*Yayın İçin Kabul Tarihi:29.09.2024*

*Online Yayın Tarihi:30.09.2024*

**Araştırma Makalesi**

**Paranın 'Hararet'ini İnsanlaştırmak: Nijerya Deneyimi**

**Lanre Akinpelu Olanrewaju Olutayo <sup>a</sup> & Adedeji Saheed Oyenuga <sup>b</sup>**

**Öz**

Dünya, Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Hedeflerine ulaşmanın sihirli yılı olan kritik 2030 Yılı'na doğru ilerlerken, başarının kesinliği konusunda şüpheler artmaktadır. COVID-19, iklim krizi, Rusya-Ukrayna savaşı ve diğer pek çok savaşın yanı sıra insanların çoğunu yoksulluğa ve sıkıntıya sürükleyen yüksek yaşam maliyetinin ortasında, dünyayı çoğu insan için daha iyi daha yaşanabilir bir yer haline getirmek için neler yapıldığını yeniden düşünmenin zamanı gelmiştir. Bu makale sürekli tekrarlayan dünya ekonomik krizlerinde paranın etkisini sorgulamaya çalışmaktadır. Değişen teknolojiye bağlı olarak Dünya Kapitalist Sistemine hakim olan 'paranın kaçınılmazlığı'nın homos sociologicus'a yeniden yönlendirilmesi gerektiğini savunmaktadır. Bir bakıma tam tersi yerine parayı ve teknolojiyi 'insanileştirme' ihtiyacını insanların bunu sosyal olarak inşa etmesini önermektedir.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* sürdürülebilir kalkınma hedefleri, covid 19, para, dünya kapitalist sistemi

*JEL Kodlar:* E49, O1, P1

<sup>a</sup> Prof. Dr., University of Ibadan, Faculty of The Social Sciences, Department of Sociology Ibadan, Oyo/ Nigeria lantopamtu@yahoo.com ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4011-3045>

<sup>b</sup>Dr., Lagos State University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Ojo, Lagos/ Nigeria adedeji.oyenuga@lasu.edu.ng ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5348-7658> (Sorumlu Yazar)



## Introduction

Since the acceptance of Charles Darwin's 'Survival of the fittest' as the explanation for the behaviour of human beings in the Social (and Management) Sciences, individual roles in social arrangement came to the fore. It was, in a way, a convenient avenue to show that human beings do what they do, not because they *want* to but because they *must*, given the circumstances/contexts confronting them. It was the 'perfect' 'icing on the cake' for the Enlightenment Thinkers arguing for the taking away of the supernatural explanation in explaining human behaviour. This informed Adams Smith's 'Law of the Invisible Hands' in the marketplace based on the idea of the 'rational human being' until JM. Keynes' contribution of the need to 'regulate' human 'excesses'. Indeed, the German historical school of economics' critique of the idea of the rational man contributing, in no small measure, to the two World Wars (Olutayo, 2001/2002) demonstrated that 'choice' is never freely given but a deliberate effort to foist 'choices' by those in authority positions, on others, for them to realise their interests. This is what Erinosh, (2023) referred to as 'hypocrisy'. Nonetheless, the notion of the 'rational man' continues to hold sway in the explanation of why human beings behave the way they do. This is engendered through societal processes at the institutional levels. It is the intention of this paper, in interrogating the allure of money, whether in terms of various forms of money or financial assets, to demonstrate how various institutional processes 'condemn' human beings to perpetually crave for more. In this paper, therefore, we have not differentiated between the various forms of money and the financial institutions giving 'money' its more complex understanding (Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2023).

The paper is divided into seven sections, including the introduction. The next section discusses the why of money while the next discusses the inevitability of money. Section four is about the 'good things of life', being the modernists' perspective to development while section five discusses the inevitability of money in the attainment of the good things of life narrowing down the next section, the infeasibility of the Sustainable Development Goals and the question of money as we demonstrate the ways by which the inevitability of money pervades the social institutions thrown up by the capitalist social structure.

### The 'Why' of Money

Money is what everyone wants! All things of value are hidden in it, since prehistoric times, whether in livestock as well as all items of rarity. Today, money, in paper terms or otherwise, is controlled and guaranteed by the Central Banks of each country. The CBNs set the notes and coins in circulation, and they constantly renew the process through sanitation and substitution of worn out and torn notes. In whatever form money exists or has existed, whether as cowrie shells and other items of nature, coins, leather money, paper, gold standard, credit cards and bit coins, it is not as important as the fact that it is not valuable. Its value is in the amount of good and services it may purchase. It is not surprising, therefore, that the importance of money is dependent on the importance people place on it, whether as a medium of exchange, storage of value or unit of measurement. Consequently, everybody worries about it, thinks about how to get more of it and are also engrossed about how (and when) to spend and/or keep it (Tikkanen, 2020). This is more so that, without it, it is believed, it is almost impossible to survive. Indeed, without it, people may not be able to sleep! It may define the state of health on people and nations. No wonder the Yoruba would say: *Owo ni t'oun ba sin'le, k'eniken ma daba ounkoun* (translated to mean when money is not present, no one should think of doing anything).

Others say: money answers all things. Rakoczy (2023) further shows the importance of money thus:

Money cannot buy happiness, but it can buy security and safety for you and your loved ones. Human beings need money to pay for all the things that make your life possible, such as shelter, food, healthcare bills, and a good education. You do not necessarily need to be Bill Gates or have a lot of money to pay for these things, but you will need some money until the day you die.

Even in death, money is inevitable as the amount of money you have determines where (and how) you would be buried. Despite all these, is money, really, the means of survival?

Contrary to the 'why' of money being the means of value exchange and enhancement of trade and reciprocity, it has become clearer, more than before, that money now serves more as a means of perpetuating social hierarchies in societies and given validation by the state through its various institutions. Indeed, its being a major cause of international warfare is undebatable as nations contend with each other over superiority engendered by money. In the process, nations have generated humongous amount of wastes, including Weapons of Mass Destruction, which have been, in turn, destroyed, without being used, with, sometimes, enormous amount of money (Department of Defence, 2019). As far as money continues to play these roles, conflicts, whether at the micro or macro level, would, be insurmountable. Thus, money is, today, defined by people and what they do with it (University of Minnesota, 2016). As such, as reflected in the conceptualisation of money as 'social construction', it is no longer what money can do but what the society in which it exists says it can do. It is, in a way, the 'creditworthiness' in a relationship guaranteed by the state. While this may signify 'collective intentionality' it also, defines the function the collectivity/community attaches to it. It is the collectivity/community that, in the end, defines 'function' of any action/inaction. The paper attempts to show how money plays the role of perpetuating social hierarchies at the micro level as the capitalist institutions and structures engender the necessity for more, unending! It does this by interrogating the bourgeois concept of development and how this conceptualisation makes money an inevitable necessity of life. But is money really, inevitable?

### **The Inevitability of Money**

The inevitability of money/finance comes to the fore when one considers the end to which money is desired. For most philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, money should not be an end. Indeed, Adam Smith seemed to have agreed with them arguing that even self-interests in the pursuit of wealth helps, in the end, to provide public good and are of great value to the people generally. No wonder that Weber, in his world acclaimed Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (Weber, 1976), posited that the virtues of ambition, industry, frugality and discipline epitomised in the 'protestant ethic' led to the development of capitalism. Yet, the scandals and crisis, especially about the global financial crisis of 2008 and the impact of COVID 19 on the World economy with the recurrence of the 'survival of the richest' does not seem to abate (Oxfam, 2023). Debates continue to abound around the unnatural love of money in which the acquisition of money is sought 'for its own sake'. This is the concern of Karl Marx as it concerns the endless accumulation of money being the sole goal of the capitalist. Others like Walsh and Lynch (2008) have argued that money has become associated with 'selfishness and greed' such that, taking a step further, one is ready to do anything for money (Anderson & Sandberg, 2019). Consequently, money 'makes' one treat others as 'means for one's end' rather than end in themselves. It is not surprising, therefore, that speculations about money and

gambling, crave for usury and interests, deception and fraud, insider trading, buying of votes, lobbying, perversion of justice in and across countries and in Nigeria today Yahoo+++ are rife, all in a bid to get rich and, with time, be famous because of one's known and acclaimed possessions.

"Yahoo Plus", as an evolved form of the infamous "Yahoo" Internet Scam and Advance-Fee Fraud, has taken deception to an escalated level, involving ritualistic practices and black magic—the incorporation of mystical and ritualistic elements to manipulate victims and amplify the effectiveness of scams. It is also believed to enhance their scams' success rates and protect themselves from law enforcement. Oyenuga (2018) asserted that from the point of view of law enforcement in Nigeria, "Yahoo Plus" is not only about the use of mystical tools but also any other money-making activities (usually criminal) engaged in by an identified "Yahoo Boy" to validate his status quo. These other activities may include robbery, money rituals, gambling, and other youth-related vices. All in the bid to make money and gain the expected recognition in society.

Ironically, whether as Commodity-Money-Commodity or Money-Commodity-Money, which Marx described as 'fetishism' of money/commodity (Marx, 1990), that is whether as use and exchange values, its temporariness is lost on those who crave to have it at all costs. The thoughts of 'where are the wealth' and 'possessors of wealth' of yesteryears are never under any form of consideration. Even if thought relevant, they will, not likely, matter as far as the inevitability of money continues to ginger them on. Without money, the perception seems to be, there is no life or living. This is more so that, yes, 'man shall not live by bread alone', they still need 'bread', anyway. Unfortunately, the amount of 'bread' that will sustain any individual is never certain as far as the 'free market' economy is governed by the 'law of the invisible hand'. The price of a commodity in the morning may, by the afternoon, change, such that the consumer is not able to purchase the same commodity for the same price due to inflation either where demand is more than supply or when more money is needed to purchase the same amount of commodity. How do these play out in real life and living?

### **Explaining the 'Good Things of Life' in the Context of "Money**

Except for dependency theory championed by AG. Frank which conceived the development of underdevelopment arguing that rather than bringing about the 'good life', all attempts at progress have led to more poverty in the so-called developing world. Even in the 'developed world', very high levels of inequality continue to co-exist with fewer people owning most of the resources of their countries, especially with the use of Gross Domestic product (GDP) or Gross National Income (GNI). This came about because dominant explanation for progress, in the 1950s to late 1960s, which the dependency theory criticised, was the traditional/modernisation explanation for wealth. It posited the importance of the human agency in the use of natural resources to supply infrastructure, build roads, dams, provision of electricity and other forms of energy. The focus was 'productive' utilisation or exploitation of previously 'unused' areas of land through improved technology. It was the expectation that the Western European experience, which seemed to begin in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, would replicate itself in other parts of the world. Hence the evolutionary theory and modernisation theory of progress. Progress, in these perspectives, is seen in the application of technology to enhance a fundamental transformation of the existing social structure (Huntington, 1971). It assumed that this would bring about transition from tradition to modernity; hardship to leisure; rurality to urbanity; town to city; agriculture to industry and so on. The more distance, from one point, the

more the explanation of 'progress' at the other end. The more 'scientific' and 'technologically' advanced a society is, it is assumed, the more all the members of the society can enjoy the 'good things of life'.

At the risk of overemphasis, the 'good things of life' are those things that make life more 'pleasurable' rather than being 'arduous'. They are things to be desired as presented in the works of Rostow, Marx and most of the influential Western theories. By implication, these were things those once colonised are expected to pursue if they would be 'developing' with the aim of becoming 'developed' though the 'developed' nations continue to 'develop'! Hence, it is not likely that the present day 'developing' nations would ever 'catch-up' with the so called 'developed' nations. Nonetheless, they should continue to aspire!

Furthermore, and as earlier alluded to, inequalities across and within nations continue to increase rapidly such that more people continue to enter more poverty while only a few profits more, both from the 'new technologies' and what is agreed to be 'scientific'. So, while clear cut evidence shows more science and technology, which more people desire to achieve, fewer people have access to them, whether in terms of expected resulting *evidence* of health, education, communication, and transportation or otherwise. Simply put, the 'good things of life' are possession of material resources evidenced in 'pleasurable' experiences to be desired by all. And, with the seeming acceptance of the works of Dudley Seers (1969; 1972), most nations and international organisations were, in the 1970s, interested in reducing inequality by increasing/improving access to the 'good things of life' through poverty reduction and employment provision, either in terms of the provision of 'basic needs'; need for self-achievement; self-determination; political freedom and security and national and cultural identity (Doyal & Gough, 1991; Streeten et al., 1981; Stewart, 1985; Streeten, 1979, Green, 1978; ILO, 1976). The downturn in world economy, in the 1980s, however, redirected 'progress' to the neoliberal perspective as the World Bank/IMF took over the role of being the 'knowledge centre' of the world (Olutayo, 2009). Whether in the, unaccomplished MDGs up to the recent SDGs, attempts are all geared towards reducing inequality and poverty in its various dimensions. To what extent has inequality reduced since the turn of the millennium and has the level of poverty reduced since then?

### **Inequality in “Money Making” Since the Millennium**

Whenever inequality is considered, attention is, and rightly so, quickly drawn to unequal economic opportunities among peoples. Nonetheless, the associated social inequalities, in terms of power and all other forms of relationships, attendant to unequal economic opportunities deserve some attention (Partington, 2019). This is more so that economic inequality determines, in the long run, the behaviour of both the disadvantaged and the advantaged groups (Nudelman, 2022). Often, the former also want to occupy the latter's status position while the advantaged group want to maintain their status position, or, at least, not become disadvantaged. No poor person wants to be poor forever. All want to be rich, like, if not more than, the rich people. To be rich like, or more than the rich people, is with a view to behave like the rich people. In the process, polarised politics, instability, and violence are inevitable (Baah & Lakner, 2023; UN 2020; Partington, 2019; Solimano, 2001). No wonder all attempts have been geared to reducing the gap between the two groups by enhancing access. But how far has this been since the millennium?

In assessing the effects of four major trends of technological innovations, climate change, urbanisation and international migrations defining world inequality, the Department of

Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations observed, implicating the two divides, as follows:

Technological change can be an engine of economic growth, offering new possibilities in health care, education, communication, and productivity. But it can also exacerbate wage inequality and displace workers. The accelerating impacts of climate change are being felt around the world, but the poorest countries and groups are suffering most, especially those trying to eke out a living in rural areas. Urbanisation offers unmatched opportunities, yet cities find poverty and wealth in proximity, making high and growing levels of inequality more glaring. International migration allows millions of people to seek new opportunities and can help reduce global disparities, but only if it occurs under orderly and safe conditions (UN, 2020, pp.2-3)

Of course, as further noted in the body of the publication, the 'divides' are being exacerbated. Even where it is taken for granted that 'imported' technology becomes assimilated through increased education (given the elasticity of substitution between skilled and unskilled labour) (Behar, 2023), what happens when technology changes again?

Inequality has grown in more than two-thirds (71%) of the world population. The income of the richest 1% of the world population increased in 46 out of 57 countries from 1990-2015 while the bottom 20% earned less than 25% of income in 92 countries. Average income of North American residents is sixteen times higher than those in Sub-Sahara Africa since technological innovation is more feasible while technological advances result in large unemployment as machines lead to job disruption and, at times, job destruction, in the former (UN 2020; Olutayo, 2018). Climate change is unequally affecting the rich and the poor, within and across countries (Diogo, et.al., 2023). The richer cope better than the poorer in situations under extreme weather conditions; increasing infectious and respiratory diseases; and environmental degradation. Higher income, wealth, and modern infrastructure, like better health and educational facilities, characterise some urban areas as against slums which exist side-by-side with it, and in rural areas (Stuckler, et.al., 2010). Global inequality encourages international migration from poor to rich countries (even where the migrants, mostly, remain at the bottom of the pyramid in their new abode). It is not surprising, therefore, that many people from Sub-Sahara Africa, where the poorest of the poor live, would do whatever it takes to migrate to the more affluent nations, just to be 'better' than their peers at home.

This is why 'inequality matters' both to the people living in poverty, the society as a whole and the world at large. It affects both the people at the bottom and those at the top, even in matters relating to social justice (UN, 2015). As such, one way or the other, inequality have 'corrosive effects' on economic growth, poverty reduction, social and economic stability, and socially sustainable development (UN,2015, p.21). These, among others, are what the SDGs are set to tackle.

As of mid-2023, the United Nations has observed lingering uncertainties in the world economic situations. Consequently, the capacity and capability of the expected variables that ought to reduce inequality is limited in the areas of governments' ability to invest in education, health, sustainable infrastructures, and energy transition (UN, 2023'a). It is not surprising, therefore, that inequality is widening within and across countries (WEF, 2023). This, of course, is attendant on what the Forum describes as resulting from increasing:

inflation, cost-of-living, crises, trade wars, capital outflows from emerging markets, widespread social unrest, geopolitical confrontation and the spectre of nuclear warfare...(and) new developments in the global risks landscape, including unsustainable levels of debt, a new era of low growth, low global investment and de-globalisation, a decline in human development after decades of progress, rapid and unconstrained development of dual-use (civilian and military) technologies, and the growing pressure of climate change impacts and ambitions in an ever-shrinking window for transition to a 1.5°C world (WEF, 2023, p.6)

Indeed, the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs describes the attainability of the SDG in 'leaving no one behind' as a 'promise in peril' (UN, 2023b). Increasing political tension in the forms of societal polarisation, populism, and growing geopolitical conflicts continue to hinder the achievement of the SDGs, just as, peace continues to deteriorate in the last fifteen years globally (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2023). The WEF (2023) further posits that except there is 'commitment, solidarity, financing, and action', the SDGs will disappear in the 'rear-view mirror' as the early efforts and achievements were 'fragile and too slow'. It warned that:

An assessment of the around 140 targets for which trend data is available shows that about half of these targets are moderately or severely off track; and over 30 per cent have either seen no movement or regressed below the 2015 baseline (UN, 2023'b).

Furthermore, the SDR states that none of the goals is on track to be achieved globally by 2030 (Sachs, et.al., 2023, p.21). But how can there be 'commitment, solidarity, financing and action' where 'de-globalisation' is on the horizon because of which the poorest nations of the world are finding it more difficult than the richer ones to meet the SDGs. This is more so that each nation must take care of itself before bothering about (or be capable of taking care of the need of), the others. Or how can someone help another person when s/he is equally in need of one thing or the other (Selwyn, 2017)? Or is not it clearer that those who have cannot afford to limit their own progress for others to 'catch up'? Simply put in a Yoruba adage, '*irorun igi ni'rorun eiye*' translated to mean that the 'tree would have to be comfortable for the bird to perch comfortably on it'! This comes to the fore where the report states:

The lack of progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals is universal, but it is abundantly clear that developing countries and the world's poorest and most vulnerable people are bearing the brunt of our collective failure. This is a direct result of global injustices that go back hundreds of years but are still playing out today. The compounding effects of climate, COVID-19 and economic injustices are leaving many developing countries with fewer options and even fewer resources to make the Goals a reality (UN, 2023'b).

Without, deeply, considering the implications of the above quote, I believe, the report gave five key areas for urgent action. Or to what extent has the injustices of past over hundred years be wiped off? How feasible is it that those who did what they did earlier would be ready to own for their past and, fundamentally, revise what had been done where they have also created other deeper challenges in their own society?

### **The Infeasibility of Attaining the SDGs and the Money Question**

The logic of the World Capitalism System, which is based on inequality, would continue to make the attainment of the SDGs, almost, impossible. Of course, this is not only because of



the structural arrangements at the top but, also, the bottom-up order which pitches every individual against another in the quest for survival. No wonder the Yoruba's say: *amukun eru e wo, oni oke lenwo, eewo'sale*, translated to mean, the person with crooked legs is being told that her/his load that s/he is carrying is bent answers, you are only looking at the top, not the bottom.

The foundation of present-day world societies is based on 'survival of the richest' where those who have survived dictate the rules of survival for those clamouring for it. This is more so in the World Capitalist System whose rules are as defined by Westernization. Those who have 'developed' are to show the direction for those who have not yet developed, even in issues relating to societal morals and ethics of life and living (World Bank, 2023). It is about attaining an already defined end, which is never insight. It is like a mirage! Even at that, the present 'end' is where everyone is expected to attain though there are limited spaces for all to occupy in the hierarchy! This is contrary to what prevailed in most pre-capitalist socio-economic formations before the capitalist overthrow. Then, each society defined its existence based on the experiential knowledge of its environment. It was around this knowledge that various institutions were built to satisfy their defined needs, determined how and when to change these needs and they developed commensurate societal institutions to ensure the sustenance of the new needs. Without these, no society could have existed for re-orientation. With the Western European experience, which necessitated the search for raw materials to feed itself, other nations were incorporated into the World Capitalist System, either through the threat of the use of force or by actual force. In the process, the pre-existing order in those societies had to be redefined to satisfy the needs of the 'invading' nations. This process has not changed, fundamentally, since the eighteenth century when the West, now including the United States of America (by the twentieth century), decided to foist its conceptualisation of development on other nations of the world. It is what someone calls a 'form of life' which pervades and percolates every fabric of the society (Cole & Ferrarese, 2018). How does this play out at the various societal institutions?

Capitalism needs to oil its machines with raw materials, at the lowest cost and the motive to make a lot of profit, without which it would cease to exist (Munger 2019; Ali, 2016; Jahan & Mahmud, 2015). Equally important is the frequent change in technology/machines which not only destabilises economic growth in the capitalist system but also affects the societal structure, especially the status of the workers who must deskill and reskill to fit into the changing system all over the world. In the process, only a few workers can survive, both within the core capitalist states and the peripheries. Indeed, some owners of means of production also lose their relevance as what constitutes the 'means of production' changes with changing technology. As such, rather than money/finance being the crux of instability in the World Capitalist System, the need to realign with changing technologies fundamentally destabilises the system. So, while the worker is merely looking to increase her/his wages, the owners of means of production are looking for ways to reduce cost to increase profit. The more the profit, the greater the chances of survival in the competitive capitalist system. Across countries, low-and medium income countries undercut one another to make their nations available to exploitation by allowing for tax breaks, lower wages, and exemption from environmental laws thus further impoverishing their employees (Philips 2020; Chen, Pun, Selden, 2019; Mosley, 2017; Norfield, 2012; Slaughter, 2010). Indeed, they may go to wars against each other to attract foreign investments from multinational corporations.

For a fact, as earlier alluded to, the wage worker is also aspiring to become employers of labour to enjoy what the present-day employers are experiencing (Nishibe, 2019). Or, at

least, the worker is in competition with co-workers for better wages to 'better' enjoy the 'good things of life' like, ever-changing, automobiles, mobile phones, fashion, housing, all forms of taste, including what is called 'food' and drink, among others. As such, they are ready to do whatever it takes to acquire more of the 'good things of life' than the others, being, as their main goal, ways of attaining societal status symbols and relevance. In other words, the need to satisfy 'societal requirements' define why people do what they do. It was not surprising, therefore, that many people would easily identify the difference from their lives in the capitalist system, compared to earlier forms, based on increasing wages, as determined by access to 'new' good things of life' (Boudreaux, 2023). This process is repeated at the family and community levels. How?

Families in most pre-capitalist socio-economic formations were the foundation for the society. It was around the family that other institutions were organised. Being the core of economic production and centre of political institution, it also determined the members' religious orientation, source of knowledge of and about themselves as well as how to improve themselves within the society. This is because the family, to whom a member of society belonged, determined the individual's status position with regards to the economy and politics. The economic foundation is determined by the number of people in a family who contribute to produce/satisfy their needs from the farm (Rigg, 2006). As such, families were more extended in nature, with a man marrying more than one wife with the intention to produce many children to farm the land as well as protect for old age insurance. The more the number of available hands to farm the land, the more the level of household production and, by implication, societal relevance. It was also the family that would determine members' 'education' which was based on the economics of survival in the immediate environment. Marriage, therefore, was based on what Horwitz (2007) referred to as 'productive compatibility' and 'the politics of family status'.

The introduction of technology and attendant wage labour disoriented the family as the 'place of work' and determination of economic survival was taken away from the family. Interestingly, wages earned are now used to purchase what the family used to produce as well as other needs defined by the new workplaces, even in informal markets. Capitalism introduced 'market production' against 'household production'. Consequently, the role of the family increasingly reduced as members move to the 'marketplace' to negotiate their survival. Hence, religion, education, and politics of members of the society are no longer determined by the family. At the marketplace of capitalism, competition reigns supreme, both among workers and the owners of means of production (employers of labour). 'Survival of the fittest' began, self-interest heightened, instability of interpersonal bonds increases, affordability of satisfying needs is taken away to the marketplace and, very significantly, the market determines the need as well as encouraging high consumption! This is the strongest hold of capitalism as it ensures both hierarchy, individualism which is compounded by family instability and employment insecurity, (Boldizzoni, 2021; Butler, 2018). Children are reoriented away from the family to be taught in formal educational institutions about things outside their immediate family and community values, for which they must pay. Wives are, no longer, to reproduce children but also to, individually, contributed to the family purse by working outside the home. Marriage is now based on 'individual taste' called love with its attendant personal emotional bias Love is now a 'marketplace' determined value as the couple is, totally, caught away from the social family network, as 'freedom to choose' is fundamental in capitalist settings (Jahan & Mahmud, 2015). In short, need, in all its ramifications, is market defined. How does the market define need?

Markets define needs for the 'customer', whether in terms of searching for a marriage partner, decision to have or not have children, buying a product or in creating wealth. It defines need as the opportunity to deliver the 'benefits' a 'customer' hopes to derive from a product (Mitchell, 2023). It does this by interrogating the functional and emotional needs (which may be unstated need, delight need and/or secret needs) the 'customer' identifies with. In doing this, the 'weakness' or the 'soft spot' of the 'customer' is isolated for satisfaction of her/his needs by the market(er) either through marketing strategies like outdoor advertisement or door-to-door selling, or what some call 'packaging', among others. To be successful, the 'marketer' must make the 'customer' to desire the need, even where it never existed before. This is done by playing, for instance, on materialistic values and allures. They may have to make the 'customer' 'see' what others are doing and the need for them to join the others in doing the same thing. In short, they must play on the emotional intelligence of their 'customers', especially where they must compete with producers in the same product categories. Most marketers would not tell their customers the 'disadvantages' in/of the product because they must sell. Or they may not, at that point in time, understand the disadvantages because it may result from serendipity. Most importantly, the job of the 'marketer' is to sell her/his 'product' to continue to exist and/or be relevant.

At the marketplace, politics is also out of the family institution's control. Those who now own and control the means of survival of others define who rules, one way or the other. This is contrary to the popularly held believe that sovereignty belongs to the people in modern democracy. As far as the 'representatives', at whatever level, are expected to make decisions on behalf of the people, it is not likely that the people have the final power. This is more that elections, which are supposed to constrain politicians, are imperfect (Rose-Ackerman, 2012). This is because political power is between rivals and contests require that opponents must be defeated at the polls. As a result of ensuing conflicts rivals in the contests would, naturally, rely on all forms of identity politics to influence different groups and individuals to gain or maintain power. Though it is hard to clearly define boundaries in political financing, it is definite that candidates that are well-funded are likely to defeat their opponents. Most candidates are either funded by wealthy individuals, and by the wealthy candidates themselves, political committees, and many private organisations with self-interests in what happens after the elections. When this happens, political donors will expect decisions to be in their favour thus having a very high likely tendency of derailing effective policy implementation (Ogunbiyi, 2022; Mutch, 2020; Briffault, 2020; Friedman 2019; Ogbette, et.al., 2019; Nwoko, 2019; Babatunde, et.al., 2019; Page & Gilens, 2017; Lewis, 2016; McMenamin 2016; Omisore, 2013; Silver, 2013; Beatty, 2013; Speck & Olabe, 2013; Christiano, 2012; Leach, et.al., 2008; Weeks, 2008). Indeed, in matters of politics, money helps to acquire dominance and control over competitors as well as being able to do whatever one likes and whatever that may be, and the poor do not have the ability to withstand them (Kirshner, 2003). It is no longer open secret, as the opensecret.org continues to reveal, on its website (Massoglia, 2023), concerning the upcoming 2024 elections in the Unites States of America, the humongous amount of money foundational to politics in capitalist societies. As such, the 'idea' of the 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people' is only at the level of 'idea'. It is not a reality! Politicians give money to voters, people, in whatever guise. The people take it as a matter of 'survival of the fittest'. The politicians give it as a matter of 'survival of the richest'.

## Conclusion

'... Money answers all things' (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Eccl.10:19). This is what the capitalist world of today portend. Both the rich and the poor desire money as their existential reality, in all spheres of endeavour. As such, they would do all they have to do to get it. Unfortunately, this reality necessitates inequality, which all development institutions hope to tackle. Yet, the more they try, the more it rears its ugly head! This is because attention is not placed on the social construction attached to money, and expected development, differentially. Development is seen as a one-size-fits-all without taking cognisance of societal peculiarities. This was why, in a way, Seers had to present another meaning of development, about eight years later, having realised the importance of each society's values as well as the ways by which the so-called developed societies hypocritically determine the expected development path the 'developing nations' must take (Lipscomb, 1993). In societies with most of informal economies, though they are being made to become formal, they should be allowed to define their own situation. *Homos sociologicus* must replace *homos oeconomicus*. Each society needs to define its values relating to its survival, the pace at which it wants to change/develop, how it hopes to do that and to what end.

## References

- Ali, M. (2016). Dark matter, black holes and old-fashioned exploitation: transnational corporations and the US economy. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 40(4), 997-1018.
- Anderson, A., & Sandberg, J. (2019). Moralising Economic Desert. In C. Cowton, J. Dempsey, & T. Sorell (Eds.), *Business Ethics After the Global Financial Crisis: Lessons from the Crash* (1th ed., pp. 165-184). Routledge.
- Baah, S. K. T., & Lakner, C. (2023, July 31). *Fragility and poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: two sides of the same coin*. ISPI. <https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/fragility-and-poverty-in-sub-saharan-africa-two-sides-of-the-same-coin-137354>
- Babatunde, H. O., Iwu, H. N., & Osuji, A. O. (2019). Money, politics, and vote buying in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: implications for national Security. *Socialscientia Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(2), 40-55.
- Beatty, K. (2013, January 22). *The role of money in politics*. Prezi. <https://prezi.com/h9dcod2g6xlb/the-role-of-money-in-politics/>
- Behar, M. A. (2023, August 11). *The elasticity of substitution between skilled and unskilled labor in developing countries: a directed technical change perspective*. International Monetary Fund Working Paper, <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/08/11/The-Elasticity-of-Substitution-Between-Skilled-and-Unskilled-Labor-in-Developing-Countries-537480>
- Boldizzoni, F. (2021, February 26). *How Capitalism Survives: Social Theory and Structural Change*. Economicsociology.Org <https://economicsociology.org/2021/02/26/how-capitalism-survives-social-theory-and-structural-change/>
- Boudreaux, D. J. (2023, August 16). *The Great Enrichment Was Enriching From the Start*. AIER. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-great-enrichment-was-enriching-from-the-start/>
- Briffault, R. (2020, October 13). Election 2020 sees record \$11 billion in campaign spending, mostly from a handful of super-rich donors. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/election-2020-sees-record-11-billion-in-campaign-spending-mostly-from-a-handful-of-super-rich-donors-145381>
- Butler, S. (2018). The Impact of Advanced Capitalism on Well-being: an Evidence-Informed Model. *Human Arenas*, 2(2), 200–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-018-0034-6>
- Chan, J., Pun, N., & Selden, M. (2013). The politics of global production: Apple, Foxconn and China's new working class. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 28(2), 100–115.
- Christiano, T. (2012). Money in Politics. In D. Estlund (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political* (pp. 241–261) *Philosophy*. Oxford Handbooks. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195376692.013.0013>
- Cole, A., & Ferrarese, E. (2018). How capitalism forms our lives. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 22(2), 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14797585.2018.1461597>
- Department of Defence (2019, September 30). *Annual Status Report on the Deterioration of the United States Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions for Fiscal Year 2019*. U.S. Department of Defence. [www.irp.fas.org/cbw/status-2019.pdf](http://www.irp.fas.org/cbw/status-2019.pdf)

- Diogo, B., Spray, J., & Unsal, D. F. (2023, August 11). *Coping with Climate Shocks: Food Security in a Spatial Framework*. International Monetary Fund Working Paper, <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/08/11/Coping-with-Climate-Shocks-Food-Security-in-a-Spatial-Framework-537807>
- English Standard Version Bible*. (2001). ESV Online. <https://esv.literalword.com/>
- Erinosho, O. (2023, August 20). Reflections on A World of Hypocrisy, Hypocrites and Intrigues. *The Nation Newspaper*. [https://thenationonlineng.net/calling-sociologists-to-action/#google\\_vignette](https://thenationonlineng.net/calling-sociologists-to-action/#google_vignette)
- Friedman, S. (2019, August 05). Why new South African law won't end the toxic mix of money and politics. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/why-new-south-african-law-wont-end-the-toxic-mix-of-money-and-politics-121461>
- Horwitz, S. (2007, July 01). Capitalism and the Family. *Foundation of Economic Education*, <https://fee.org/articles/capitalism-and-the-family/>
- Huntington, S. P. (1971). The Change to Change: Modernisation, Development, and Politics. *Comparative Politics*, 3(3), 283–322. <https://doi.org/10.2307/421470>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. (2023, June). *Global Peace Index 2023: Measuring Peace in a Complex World*. Sydney. <http://visionofhumanity.org/resources>
- Jahan, S., & Mahmud, A. S. (2015). What is Capitalism?. *Finance & Development Magazine*, 52(2), Retrieved August 14, 2023, from <https://international.vlex.com/vid/what-is-capitalism-572677878>
- Kirshner, J. (2003). Money Is Politics. *Review of International Political Economy*, 10(4), 645–660. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177480>
- Leach, C. W., Brown, L. M., & Worden, R. E. (2008). Ethnicity and Identity Politics. In L. Kurtz (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict* (2nd ed., pp. 758-768). Academic Press.
- Lewis, C. (2016, September 12). When political self-interest decides donation rules, what chance reform in the public interest? *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/when-political-self-interest-decides-donations-rules-what-chance-reform-in-the-public-interest-65098>
- Lipscomb, M. M. (1993). *Changing meanings of development: Dudley Seers-An Intellectual Biography*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Southampton.
- Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Vol.1. Penguin Publishing Group
- Massoglia, A. (2023, December 21). *Money-in-Politics Stories Driving the News in 2023*. *Open Secrets: Following the Money in Politics* OpenSecrets <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/category/2024-presidential/?emci=31c3917e-2841-ee11-a3f1-00224832eb73&emdi=4ffa20d3-ee41-ee11-a3f1-00224832eb73&ceid=15823707>

- McMenamin, I. (2016, May 30). No bribes please, we're corrupt Australians!. *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/no-bribes-please-were-corrupt-australians-59657>
- Mitchell, J. C. (n.d.). *What is a Customer Need?* Pragmatic Institute. Retrieved August 14, 2023, from <https://www.pragmaticinstitute.com/resources/articles/product/what-is-a-customer-need/>
- Mosley, L. (2017). Workers' rights in global value chains: possibilities for protection and peril. *New Political Economy*, 22(2), 153-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2016.1151057>
- Munger, M. (2019, April 24). *Capitalism in Three Principles*. AIER. <https://www.aier.org/article/capitalism-in-three-principles/>
- Mutch, R. E. (2020). The Role of Money in Politics. In P. Baker & D. T. Critchlow (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Political History* (pp. 246–264). Oxford Handbooks. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199341788.013.10>
- Nishibe, M. (2019). Marx's Financial Capitalism. *The Japanese Political Economy*, 45(1-2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2329194X.2019.1623446>
- Norfield, T. (n.d.). T-Shirt Economics: Labour in the Imperialist World Economy. *Global Labour Column*. Retrieved August 14, 2023, from <http://column.global-labour-university.org/2012/08/t-shirt-economics-labour-in-imperialist.html>
- Nudelsman, S. (2022, July 28). Global inequality in the current era. *Econ Papers*, 32(61). <https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/col000418/020646.htm>
- Nwoko, K. (2019). Money Politics and Crisis of Leadership in Nigeria: A Critical Evaluation of Experiences in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. *International Journal of Innovative Legal & Political Studies*, 7(4), 10-21.
- Ogbette, A. S., Idam, M. O., Kareem, A. O., Eke, I. E. (2019). Money Politics in Nigeria: Causes, Effects and Management. *Journal of Public Administration*, 1(2), 13-17.
- Ogunbiyi, T. (2022, June 7). Money politics and the Nigerian economy. *Businessday*. [https://businessday.ng/opinion/article/money-politics-and-the-nigerian-economy/#google\\_vignette](https://businessday.ng/opinion/article/money-politics-and-the-nigerian-economy/#google_vignette)
- Olutayo, A. O. (2009). Infrastructure and development: catalysis or cataclysm in Africa? The case of Fadama Farming in Nigeria. *Ibadan Journal of the Social Sciences*, 7(1), 69-83.
- Olutayo, A. O. (2018, May 31). *Sabiticcate is equal to what? Inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Ibadan, May 31st*. Ibadan University Press. <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/12858937>
- Olutayo, L. (2001/2002). The contributions of Ralf Dahrendorf to sociological discourse. *Ibadan Journal of Humanistic Studies*, (11&12), 27-43.
- Omisore, B. O. (2013). Money, Politics and Corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(1), 17-40.
- Oxfam (2023, January 16). *Survival of the Richest*. [Oxfam Briefing Paper]. Oxfam International. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/survival-richest>

- Oyenuga, A. (2018). Law Enforcement Agencies and the Control of Cybercrime Involvement in Metropolitan Lagos. *LASU Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 65-72.
- Page, B. I., & Gilens, M. (2017). *Democracy in America? What Has Gone Wrong and What We Can Do About It*. University of Chicago Press.
- Partington, R. (2019, September 9). Inequality: is it rising, and can we reverse it? *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2019/sep/09/inequality-is-it-rising-and-can-we-reverse-it>
- Philipps D. & Ismay J. (2023, July 6). US Is Destroying the Last of Its Once-Vast Chemical Weapons Arsenal *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/06/us/chemical-weapons-stockpile.html> accessed 070723
- Philips, J. (2020, October 31). The Effects of Capitalism on Impoverished Nations. *Borgen Magazine* <https://www.borgenmagazine.com/the-effects-of-capitalism/>
- Rakoczy, C. (Updated 2024, Jun 27). Why Money Is Important. *Lend Edu* <https://lendedu.com/blog/why-money-is-important/>
- Rigg, J. (2006). Land, farming, livelihoods, and poverty: Rethinking the links in the Rural South. *World Development*, 34(1), 180-20.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (2012). Controlling political power. In *Corruption and Government Causes, Consequences, and Reform* (pp. 143 – 174). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139175098.010>
- Sachs, J. D., Lafortune, G., Fuller, G., Drumm, E. (2023). *Implementing the SDG Stimulus. Sustainable Development Report 2023*. Dublin University Press. <https://doi.org/10.25546/102924>
- Seers, D. (1969). *The Meaning of Development*. IDS Communication 44. Brighton Institute of Development Studies.
- Seers, D. (1972). What are we trying to Measure? *The Journal of Development Studies*, 8(3), 21-36.
- Selwyn, B. (2017, January 26). How globalisation brought the brutality of markets to Western shores. *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/how-globalisation-brought-the-brutality-of-markets-to-western-shores-63228>
- Silver, Nate. (2013, February 11). New Rove Group Could Backfire on G.O.P. *The New York Times*. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/11/new-rove-group-could-backfire-on-g-o-p>
- Slaughter, M. J. (2010). How U.S. Multinational Companies Strengthen the U.S. economy Data Update. [https://www.uscib.org/docs/foundation\\_multinationals\\_update.pdf](https://www.uscib.org/docs/foundation_multinationals_update.pdf)
- Solimano, A. (2001). *The evolution of World Economic Inequality: Assessing the Impact of Globalization*. United Nations CEPAL ECLAC Serie.



- Speck, B. W., & Olabe, P. B. (2013, November 14-15). *Money in Politics: Sound Political Competition and Trust in Government Community* [Conference presentation]. Background Paper Prepared for OECD Policy Forum on Restoring Trust in Government: Addressing Risks of Influence in Public Decision Making. Public Sector Integrity Network, OECD, Paris, France. Retrived August 23,2023 from <https://www.oecd.org>
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2023, March 10). Philosophy of Money and Finance. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/money-finance/>
- Stuckler, D., Basu, S., & McKee, M. (2010, March 02). Drivers of Inequality in Millennium Development Goal Progress: A Statistical Analysis. *Plos Medicine*, 7(3), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000241>
- Tikkanen, A. (n.d.). A Brief (and Fascinating) History of Money. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrived June 06,2023 from <https://www.britannica.com/story/a-brief-and-fascinating-history-of-money>
- United Nations. (2015). *Inequality Matters: Report of the World Social Situation*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- United Nations. (2020). *World Social Report: Inequality in a Rapidly Changing World*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- United Nations. (2023'a). *World economic situation and prospects as of mid-2023*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Retrived August 14,2023 from [https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/WESP\\_2023\\_MYU\\_KeyMessages.pdf](https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/WESP_2023_MYU_KeyMessages.pdf)
- United Nations. (2023'b). *Promise in peril*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Retrived August 14,2023 from <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/Promise-in-peril/>
- University of Minnesota (2016). *What is Money? Principles of Economics*. Retrived June 06, 2023 from <https://open.lib.umn.edu/principleseconomics/chapter/24-1-what-is-money/>
- Walsh, A., & Lynch, T. (2008). *The Morality of Money: An Exploration in Analytic Philosophy*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Weber, M. (1976). *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*. George Allen and Unwin
- Weeks, D. (2008, January 01). Does Money Buy Elections? The Impact of Spending on U.S. Congressional Campaigns. Institute for Free Speech [https://www.ifs.org/research/httpwww-campaignfreedom-orgdoclib20091103\\_doesmoneybuyelections2008-pdf/](https://www.ifs.org/research/httpwww-campaignfreedom-orgdoclib20091103_doesmoneybuyelections2008-pdf/)
- World Bank Group. (2023, May 31). *World Bank Group Statement on Uganda 2023 Anti-Homosexuality Act*. [Statement]. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/statement/2023/05/31/world-bank-group-on-uganda>
- World Economic Forum (2023, January 11). *The Global Risks Report 2023*. World Economic Forum <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report->

2023/#:~:text=The%20Global%20Risks%20Report%202023,human%20development%20and%20future%20resilience.

## **Information About the Article/Makale Hakkında Bilgiler**

### **The Ethical Rules for Research and Publication / Arařtırma ve Yayın Etięi**

The authors declared that the ethical rules for research and publication followed while preparing the article.

Yazarlar makale hazırlanırken arařtırma ve yayın etięine uyulduęunu beyan etmiřtir.

### **Conflict of Interests/ ıkar atıřması**

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Yazarlar ıkar atıřması bildirmemiřtir.

### **Grant Support/ Finansal Destek**

The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

Yazarlar bu alıřma iin finansal destek almadıęını beyan etmiřtir.

### **Author Contributions/ Yazar Katkıları**

The draft process of the manuscript/ Taslaęın Hazırlanma Sreci L.A.O.O./A.S.O., Writing The Manuscript/ Makalenin Yazılması L.A.O.O./A.S.O., Submit, Revision and Resubmit Process/ Bařvuru, Dzeltme ve Yeniden Bařvuru Sreci L.A.O.O./A.S.O.