



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Emerging Innovative Thoughts on Globalization amidst the Contageon of COVID-19

Jackson, Emerson Abraham

University of Birmingham, UK

9 April 2020

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/101789/>
MPRA Paper No. 101789, posted 19 Jul 2020 01:58 UTC

**EMERGING INNOVATIVE THOUGHTS ON GLOBALIZATION AMIDST THE
CONTAGION OF COVID-19
INDUSTRY, INNOVATION & INFRASTRUCTURE (SDG9) - ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE
UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

Emerson Abraham Jackson

Affiliation: 1. Doctoral Scholar in Sustainable Livelihood Diversification, Centre of West African Studies, University of Birmingham, UK. 2. Senior Research Economist, Model Building Analysis Section, Research Department, Bank of Sierra Leone.

Email: EAJ392@bham.ac.uk / emersonjackson69@gmail.com / ejackson@bsl.gov.sl

Disclaimer: *Views expressed in this chapter are those of the author and do not reflect any of the named institutions for which he is associated.*

SYNONYMS

- Market Development
- Integration
- Transmittable

DEFINITION(S)

The concept of globalization is quite broad and given its many facets, it can be linked to three main areas, namely Economic, Political and Social as outlined in the definitions below:

- According to Shangquan (2000), Economic globalization refers to the increasing interdependence of world economies as a result of the growing scale of cross-border trade of commodities and services, flow of international capital and wide and rapid spread of technologies.
- Political globalization involve transformations in the relations between political processes and territorial states (Ougaard, 2004).
- Social globalization on the other hand, is defined as information flows, personal contacts, and cultural sharing across countries (Cho, 2013; original citation in Dreher, 2006).

The above definitions provide specific scope with regard to the original definition of globalisation as provided by the World Health Organization (Online), which state thus: *increased interconnectedness and interdependence of peoples and countries, and it is generally understood to include two inter-related elements: the opening of international borders to increasingly fast flows of goods, services, finance, people and ideas, and the changes in institutions and policies at national and international levels that facilitate or promote such flows.* There is a real focus on interconnectedness, with the possibility for people in the global community to access opportunities through cross-border movements.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of globalization first emerged in English dictionary around the 1940s, with a broad focus in addressing economic and political issues. In contemporary time, the discourse of globalization is now channelled in the direction of speed, particularly in the area of technological innovation and its consequences on social, political and economic well-being (Estrada and Arturo, 2020; Griffith and Marrion, 2020; Kinnvall, 2004). Claims of the historical commencement of globalization have been dated as early as in 1492 (Christopher Columbus in search of America) and 1498 (Vasco da Gama's run in Africa in a bid to snatch monopoly rent from the Arabs and Venetian spice traders). Empirical study produced by O'Rourke and Williams (2000) spelt the dichotomy of the economic relevance of 19th Century globalization boom in comparison with the acclaimed exploration of Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama. O'Rourke and Williams' (2000) study, which provide the connection of globalization's impact on concerns relating to factor prices, commodity prices and endowments world wide.

As specified above, globalization, though not completely rosy given the experiences from Trans-Atlantic slave trade to industrial revolution period in the USA (in addition, the 19th century effort in Latin America and East Asia), have gone a long way in bringing people together, typically epitomised by an easy mobility of people and resources across continental borders (O'Rourke, 2019). With the expansion of trade liberalisation measures in South-east Asian economies (notably Singapore, Indonesia and Philippines), many of these economies were also able to take advantage of the move towards globalization, given the independence of governments to invest highly in human-resource potential, with the added benefits of cheap factor of production (Bassino and Williams, 2017; O'Rourke and Williams, 2017). Such venture is quite admirable and the benefits have been enjoyed through liberalization policies, which comes in the form of technology transfer and innovative mindsets through creation of better opportunities in relation to jobs and higher growth prospects as linked with the SDG8 agenda (Perraton, 2019; Milberg and Winkler, 2013). The transfer of technology channelled through means like Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) have made it more beneficial for countries with high level of human resource capacity to take advantage of opportunities by utilizing rent-seeking to develop domestic industrial base for the utilisation of expanded growth capacity as witnessed in many of the Asian Tiger economies, notably Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore (Jackson and Jabbie, forthcoming).

The objective of this chapter is dedicated to explore emerging thoughts on how best to cultivate innovative approach to the concept of globalization, given the recent challenge that COVID-19 has brought to the global economy. This is crystallised through the collapse and re-engineering of vital structures (for example, closure of educational establishments, businesses, with central banks adopting swift measures to support institutions, etc.) as the pandemic continue to manifest itself across continental borders. The experience of the 2014-2016 EBOLA epidemic in Sierra Leone and its neighbouring countries for example, have made it possible for global investment models in epidemic preparedness and resource allocation to be utilised through creative innovation in drug research and the utilization of techno-managerial creativity as control measures – equally too, countries around the world, and more specifically, across Africa have engaged in preparedness for the widespread impact of COVID-19, given the experience of globalization associated with China-Africa interaction (Leach, 2020).

Despite the on-going concerns of COVID-19, there is no doubt in relation to the benefits that globalization has brought to the world economy – to highlight a few, the development of modern economies in the Asian bloc as spearheaded through transfer of technologies that took advantage of cheap factors of production (namely, labour) and among others, welfare gains, which so far have been manifested through improved prospects relating to job creation and equality in gender participation across the globe (Danaeefard and Abbasi, 2011; Cho, 2013; TechWomen, 2019).

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF GLOBALIZATION

Theoretically, the concept of globalization was initially classified under three main themes – namely Economic, Political and Social (Shangquan, 2000; Cho, 2013). As time progresses, there

was a need to address wider categories of its remit, which is hereby grouped under eight headings as emphatically exemplified below (PooJo, Online):

- Theory of Liberalism – this is construed as a market-led process of globalization, which require human beings to seek for greater economic welfare and political liberty. Such innate desire of human beings to explore their freedom have fructify itself as seen through advances in technological progress pertaining to transportation, communication and the firming up of appropriate legal and institutional set up to promote market-led liberalization across continental borders. Contrary to the liberalist view of globalization, there are schools of thought which believe strongly that the first world war was on account of the forces of liberalism as supported by the Heckscher-Ohlin model of trade (Rowe, 2005).
- Political Realism Theory - this is based on the reality of state powers, more so in pursuit of national interest and conflict between states – the greatest of this is to do with the dominance of one state or group over the other - for example the G7, which currently influence the state of international rule, while at the same time containing conflict between other states (PooJo, Online). This has its benefit given the need to address reality concerned with political integration, more so in facilitating benefits pertaining to trade liberalization and movement of people across regions as seen in the European Union and other regional institutions such as the African Union (reference to Wivel; 2004).
- Marxist Theory of Globalization – this conceptual theory is modelled on Marxist mode of production, which seeks to eradicate social exploitation through unjust distribution, and freedom as masterminded in capitalism (PooJo, Online). Marxist rejection of liberalist and political realists explanation of globalization is based on capitalists inherent tendency to exploit surplus accumulation of capital, with the ulterior motive of maximizing profits – such approach is machinated through the establishment of legal institutional framework, which also instigate classism in society. One way forward in addressing Marxist objective is for economies to utilise their own designated means of self-capacity, considered more suited to individual economy’s developmental pace, in achievement of self-sufficiency as promoted in the case with Import Substitution Industrialization (Jackson and Jabbe, forthcoming). An extension of marxist philosophy is rooted in neo-marxism, which actually examine the significance of the underclass to resist the globalization of capitalism through support from new socialist movements, along the line of consumer advocates, environmentalists, peace activists, racism and womens’ movement in a bid to addressing equality.
- Theory of Constructivism – this is associated with the construct of people’s view of the social world, also linked with symbolism, language, images and interpretation (PooJo, Online). This is based on the dynamic conscience of human beings – such is the case with the current pace of production level and governance. The pursuit of human being is modelled on continuous conversation and symbolic exchanges, which makes it possible for constructs about the world to be developed. In this regard, the informed notion pertaining to the epistemological and ontological domain of social geography is making it possible for people to be engaged, both mentally and physically with occurrences in the global community (Held and McGrew, 2007; Jackson, 2016). This really explain the main focus of social constructivist view, by paying

particular attention to international actors (more so the utilisation of advanced technologies and their contribution to the acceleration of economic globalization), quality of anarchy and state actors (Mozaffari, 2002). One of the main issue of this theory is its neglect for issues connected with structural inequalities and power hierarchy in the domain of social relations, which to some extent can be explained for the early neglect of COVID-19 by the capitalists, who are purportedly considered to be the god-father of globalization.

- Postmodern Theory of Globalization – this is epitomised by its rationalist feature, which puts emphasis on the empirical world and subordination of nature to human control (Poojo, Online). There is an overwhelming emphasis on economic growth, technological innovation and bureaucratic organisations – the carved ‘*creative-destruction*’ concept as initiated by Schumpeter is thought to fit well into the characterisation of postmodern theory of globalization, given its emphasis on entrepreneurial ability and innovation (Jackson, 2020a). There is a tendency for this form of knowledge to manifest authoritarianism and cultural imperialism, which therefore diminishes all other forms of knowlede exploration pertaining to the theoretical concept of globalization. The postmodern view of globalization makes it possible for human critical mindset to go beyond all of the aforementioned theories, with the possibility of exposing social or exploitative conditions (notably market forces, mergers, financial crisis, drone strikes, deposed migrants and stagmatized muslims) that are certainly in support of the conventional form of globalization (Chatterjee, 2019).
- Feminist Theory of Globalization – this is based on the emphasis of social construction on masculinity and feminity. In this regard, it is obvious that women are more at risk of being marginalised than their male counterpart, while remaining silent about pertinent issues around global discourses (Jackson and Jackson, 2020; Poojo, Online). This is also a radical form of globalization, which seeks to address women’s concerns pertaining to the internationalisation of social, political and economic affair of things, while it is perceived that women’s influences are considered negligible in the world of opportunities (Chatterjee, 2019). The persistence of women to be vocal about discriminatory issues and other forms of marginalisation is making it possible for their efforts to be subsumed very well into the general discourses of globalization.
- Globalization Theory of Transformationalism – this is construed as the speed of transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions (more so in tandem with multiple competencies – see Saffa and Jabbie, 2020), which normally operate through transcontinental or inter-regional flows and other forms of networked activities (PooJo, Online). In this, there is a connection between the hyperglobalization approach, which typically meant that people everywhere are being subjected to the underlying notion of events in the global marketplace. In this vein, one will expect the presence of Multi-National Enterprises (MNE) and Intergovernmental Organisations (IGOs) to be seen as key players, with their motive of maximizing profits through exploitative means of cheap factors of production, while ignoring their role in embracing corporate social responsibility of the host communities (Jackson and Jackson, 2017). In view of its application to reality, Murat and Isaac (2019) conducted a study to assess the effect of globalization on the performance of Small and Medium Enterprises

(SMEs) in Nigeria. The study, which utilises the ex-post facto covered a scoping period of 32 years (1986-2018); the outcome suggest that Nigerian government should encourage import and export of SME products and service across border, with little or no restriction on their products and services as a way of encouraging their expansion and growth in Nigria.

- Globalization Theory of Eclecticism – this theory is broadbased as it does not hold rigidly to a single paradigm. Therefore in this regard, one will consider it to be the model approach to address concerns and developments revolving around the broad concept of globalization, given the presence of accomodative means to draw upon multiple theories or styles as a way of gaining deeper insight into contemporary discourses. The determination of capitalists to amass wealth, which means exposure to fierce competition over competitors is a subject of market forces that requires the adoption of a competetive approach to wide ranging paradigms. In order words, given that the capitalist motive is hinged on expanding markets, while also moving assets across national boundaries through exposure of technological innovation, it is absolutely necessary that consideration is given to a combination of relevant theories (PooJo, Online).

The above explanatory theories provide the underlying basis on which the concept of globalization is modelled, with the ulterior motive of facilitating interaction and integration amongst people, businesses and governments across the world. Despite emphasis being laid on economic outcomes, the entirety of theoretical underpinnings as detailed above and in particular the eclectic approach, makes it possible for areas concerning ecological, political and social discourses to be addressed as part of the wider motive of integrating societies. Which ever way the perceived benefits may be construed from, more so in terms of economic growth, expansion and development of human creativity, the underlying motive is manifested through creative-destruction as manifested through innovation technologies (Jackson, 2020a). There are still critics or antagonists who think the process is detrimental to societal well-being, be it at global or local level. Such antagonistic views could be linked to issues revolving around the natural sustainability of long-term or expansion of economies and the persistent inequalities or environmental concerns arising from capitalists‘ predatory or hegemonic influences associated with the process of globalization (Jackson, 2020a; Jackson and Jackson, 2017; Overland, 2016; Vujakovic, 2010).

RECENT CHALLENGES BLIGHTING PROSPECT FOR GLOBALIZATION

Historically, globalization seem to have gone through series of transformation and not only as witnessed with the emergence of COVID-19. Notably, one could point to the era of the 1930s, which manifested itself with issues concerning deglobalization that calls for increase in tariffs, with widespread imposition of import and export quotas (O’Rourke, 2019). Moving on from the great recession and more lately in 2018, the USA, under the premiership of President Donald Trump also pursued an action contrary to the effort of globalization by calling for some form of tariff restrictions on its trading partners, more so China (O’Rourke, 2018).

Applaud for globalization as the way forward in addressing growth prospect in the world economy has brought with it new concerns on the emergence of COVID-19 (Kidman and Chang, 2020).

This time, the forecast of economic downturn (4% decline as presented by Tim Clayton, 23rd March, 2020) was not even a possible consideration when one contemplates COVID-19 as an exogenous factor (epitomized by the attribute of an error term – Warburton and Jackson, 2020) in a typical econometric model as exemplified in Yilmazkuday's (2020) empirical analysis. On a day-to-day basis, one will be more inclined to focus attention on the possibility of a crash in the housing market and the usual turbulence of Stock Market announcements, associated with supply-side driven shock, normally linked with Crude Oil and other forms of disturbances. Eventually, the least expected, COVID-19 manifested itself calmly in the city of **Wuhan**, and not even the brightest of economists (Eichengreen, 2020) could envisage its impact to be as heavily widespread, particularly to the detriment of the world economy as empirically documented in a Structural Vector Autoregression (SVAR) study carried out with reference to the Baltic area (Yilmazkuday, 2020).

With reference to Gschwandtner's (2009) crafted use of the term '*Shrinkonomics*', the emergence of COVID-19 indeed manifested itself with its impact adversely felt in all sectors of the world economy - epitomized through high risk of population mortality, downsizing of economic activities, and the return of draconian-like measures, involving forced quarantine in a bid to stampede governments' authority to address critical issues at hand. On a parallel note, central banks across the world have had no option, but to exercise their mandates (notably, price and financial stability) to act swiftly on policy measures relating to: "*quantitative easing to address possible financial instability in the system (an approach highly utilised in the 2007-09 global financial crash – see Kapetanios et al, 2012), adjusting Monetary Policy Rate (MPR) and other forms of incentivization*". This could be interpreted as a way of cushioning the distressed state of households, businesses and, economic agents' uncertainties about events in individual domestic economy activities and an eventual spillover in the international community.

This is now seen as the most topical of threat to globalization, particularly in terms of the negative impact on value-chain network (China is estimated to account higher percentage of global supply and demand - Yilmazkuday, 2020), and also the need for people to be self-quarantined and at the same time, observe social distancing in a bid to prevent wide-scale spread of COVID-19 (French and Monahan, 2020). Worries about the continued spread of the pandemic is still a concern for people – a manifestation of God's test of human resilience to address vulnerability in the area of natural health calamity in the world economy. Stock market volatility around the world signalled turbulence – epistemologically construed as a form of neglect on the part of capitalists given the high risk of escalation when one considers the fact that COVID-19 was recently ranked 10th position in the 2020 Global Risk Report (World Economic Forum, 2020; Ramelli and Wagner, 2020).

Despite the direct impact on health and psychological outcome saturating in the minds of people, there is most importantly, a glare of economic ramifications felt as witnessed in the assessment of stock market negative reaction, where China is mentioned in firm's disclosure pertaining to international activities (Ramelli and Wagner, 2020). It was clearly seen that the reaction of such outcomes manifested poor performance with value-chain activities as participants' expectations started to signal uncertainty. This was mainly as a result of the uncontrolled spread of the outbreak, which in a way, can be construed as a wreck on capitalists' direction of globalization, given their inherent tendency of tilting attention towards the accumulation of profits, to the demise of

building communities through high-end investment in Research and Development (R&D). COVID-19 have witnessed the breakdown of essential structures, through collapse of institutional capabilities to address risks from the early signs of an outbreak, which is now seen to be taking a toll on seamless damages to the world economy. As stressed by Baldwin and di Mauro (2020: 14), the expectation of a recession can only be made to flatten out through preventive policies that incorporate all, but not limited to the highlighted measures - Monetary, Financial Regulation, Social insurance, bumping-up industrial and trade arrangements.

EMERGING INNOVATIVE INTERVENTIONS ON GLOBALIZATION APPROACH TO ADDRESSING HEALTH PANDEMIC

The revelation of COVID-19 pandemic across continental borders is a real challenge in understanding how far human ingenuity will go in withstanding the full extent of natural calamity, more so in attesting to the fact that more is needed in the area of Research and Development (R&D) to sustain the global economy from the continuous threat of health and economic instability. The test of COVID-19 should be considered as a wake-up call for human intervention to probe further into the unknown ontology of their creative mindset, to address what is now considered the biggest challenge of human sustained existence in the world.

The craft-mindedness of fiscal and economic policies seem to have been exhausted and as explained by Eichengreen (2020) - cuts associated with almost Zero MPR and other rates, and also taxes as announced around the world economy are indeed welcoming steps in calming stock market negative signals about the impact of COVID-19. In fact, escalation of the virus in nearly all areas of the world economy have seen businesses hedging high risks by selling bonds amidst massive decline in share prices, while central banks also reciprocated by buying toxic assets in a bid to restore confidence in the world economy (Markus, 2020).

The world economy is at a high risk of being plunged into recession, and even with the effort of central banks to utilise legal mandates (price and financial stability) to calm situations, there is high chances of a recession reaction, which will be most highly felt by smaller economies and the business community in the months and years ahead. It is very necessary that actions are taken now, through emerging innovations in support of globalization effort that economies around the world have enjoyed, through creative and dynamic intervention in innovative technologies since the 1990s (Jackson, 2020a; Jackson, 2020b; Estrada and Arturo, 2020).

As a prescription to the aforementioned points regarding creative innovation, the global economy should act in the area of redefining the parameters of financial innovation strategies that is geared towards mitigating risks associated with health pandemic, namely COVID-19, which is almost at the point of creating lasting damage to the world economy. In view of the World Economic Forum's (WEF – 2020) ranking report on health risk to global economic stability, financial institutions should bolster R&D effort in addressing specific risks to globalization and the overall impact on value-chain processes of mobility associated with businesses and human beings. As witnessed from the Wuhan COVID-19 spillover, financial institutions, particularly in developed economies should commence serious innovation plans with capitalists or businesses by spelling

out possible creative modalities for hedging risks connected with their (international) operations in countries perceived as highly vulnerable to health calamity.

Despite China's progress in terms of moving into the international band of emerging economies, epitomized by its high growth rate immediately after the USA, COVID-19 was still not considered as the most thought about pandemic, until reaction of stock market started manifesting signal of uncertainties through dip-cut in index figures (Ramelli and Wagner, 2020). While capitalists in western developed economies relaxed at the onset, with the perception that COVID-19 is just a problem with China, the influence of globalization (induced through free movement of people across international borders) was still making it possible for every area of the world to be exposed to such vulnerability as now seen with lock-down of businesses and self-quarantining, witnessed almost everywhere in the world economy (Gross, 2020).

Equally as in the case of addressing innovation in the financial system, the best way forward in calming fears about the continuous risk to health pandemic is for resources to be diverted (by both governments and businesses) into the expansion of R&D laboratories (associated with SDG9). Despite the effort of economies / central banks and philanthropists to intervene in providing economic and financial support announced in the form of drastic cut in rates (MPRs and taxes), the real answer in bringing calmness to the continued risk of world recession is to broaden industrial base, through support for creativity in science and technology, with particular focus on health and well-being (reference to SDG3). In this vein, there is a need to make sure Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) are made integral part of governments' agenda across the world (Jackson and Jackson, 2020a; TechnWomen, 2019; Jamme, 2015), more so in the area of pursued effort in finding lasting solution to air-borne and other form of contagious diseases.

On the above note, funding for high level R&D in universities and specialist laboratories must be made an integral part of government expenditures. This will make it possible for the effort of globalization to be viewed as a worthwhile venture for capitalists, whose intention is to maximize profits through transfer of technologies in regions with cheaper cost of production utilities. The escalation of COVID-19 pandemic also brings one to think strongly in the direction of theoretical critiques levied on the motive for globalization, which as seen here seem to be manifesting itself on the angle of selfishness. This could be construed as a deliberate attempt for capitalists to amassing profits, while ignoring the social and economic ramifications of their delayed actions on related incidence connected with global pandemic. To some extent, outcome from COVID-19 have pointed in the direction of a rethink of globalization, given the delayed reaction of capitalists lagged efforts to intervene earlier, which is now costing the world economy, with signs of a possible global recession.

The effort of capitalists and politics towards championing globalization needs to be reconsidered given the experiences from COVID-19. Globalization is very highly favoured, but not to the extent of skewing effort away from capacitating domestic investments in support of human creativity. Economies around the world and particularly capitalist economies must reconsider their focus towards *inward* approach, in support of an expansion in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) operations, which are really needed to bolster risks of a recession looming. In this vein, support

that result in the expansion of creativity connected with SMEs must be encouraged, possibly through funding for entrepreneurship in universities and the creation of specialist institutions. Despite the tendency of global market intervention to be skewed in the direction of creative-destruction in technology innovation (Jackson, 2020a), economies must endeavour to intervene in promoting SMEs creativity towards high-end productivity in essential commodities, which are geared towards sustaining human well-being during time of distress, as witnessed with COVID-19. Even though the world is diverting attention from the approach of Import Substitution Industrialization (Jackson and Jabbie, forthcoming), experience from COVID-19 have made it more important for economies to consider adopting protectionist policies as a way of building resilience against the possible collapse of local economies – this will make it conceivable to protect jobs and institutions from destruction.

EMBRACEMENT OF THE SDG's WITH THE INCIDENCE OF COVID-19

The real test of embracing all SDGs have manifested itself as the impact of COVID-19 unfold across the world economy. On this note, one will be very much inclined to argue in favour of some of the theoretical critiques levied (PooJo, Online), more so in relation to the direction of globalization. In view of this, the eclectic theory of globalization speaks more in the direction of embracing all 17 SDGs, given its postmodern focus in critiquing anything that is contrary to addressing balances in human intervention towards building a cohesive society. There is a high risk at play here for a delayed action in achieving the SDGs given the present danger of COVID-19's impact on the world economy – such impacts have been manifested through depressed state of economies and the continued uncertainty of recession looming, despite efforts made by central banks to allay fears through an almost zero interest rate announced in many of the developed economies (notably, UK and the USA) and the ramping up of quantitative easing to cushion damages to institutions and stabilizing the financial system.

Even though the effort of Central Banks and governments across the world economy seem to be speaking in one language, which is to address issues revolving around the curtailment of poverty, hunger and protecting health and well-being (SDG1, 2 and 3) through interventions in slashing rates (MRP and Taxes), there is still the need for economies to focus attention inwardly as a way of protecting lives and institutions from collapsing. Experience from COVID-19 seem to manifest itself well in the direction of unearthing the selfish nature of capitalists' focus towards a singular objective, which is to increase profits for shareholders. In reality, such selfish approach is paying dividend in the direction of zero-earned profits and with the chances of recession looming, there is a risk of indebtedness on the part of households and businesses – this in many cases will continue to be a burden on central banks' balance sheet and governments through innovative tax policies as a way of cushioning distress to economic agents across the board. By the looks of it, there is expectation that impact of COVID-19 will continue to manifest itself through sluggish growth in years to come (Baldwin and di Mauro, 2020), even with the effort of addressing concerns around the improvement of R&D, pertaining to health and well being (SDG3).

The revelation of COVID-19 really speaks to the fact that more is needed in the direction of bolstering investments to capacitate the human creative minds (Jackson, Jackson and Jackson, 2020). Initiative towards creative investment is an integral part of the successful achievement of the 2030 SDG goals, which means that human ingenuity will need to be explored through different ways, but with high focus in the direction of science and technology. Health pandemic, particularly air-borne diseases are proving to be the most considered challenge to human existence and the stability of the world economy. Hence, R&D should be made the focal point of governments' agenda in a bid to ensuring their effort towards the 2030 SDG goal is achieved. Such approach must be practically focused in creating job opportunities, with its ultimate impact manifested in high potential for economic growth and development (SDG8), while at the same time building capacity for the expansion of technology-based infrastructures (SDG9), geared towards utilising human ingenuity in a productive and equitable way. Such approach should incorporate gender equality as an integral part of the agenda to capacitate human ingenuity (reference to SDG5 and 10 – reference to Cho, 2013). To strengthen such effort, international institutions such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the United Nations (UN), World Health Organisation (WHO), the World Bank (WB) and many more should endeavour to synchronise their effort (ensuring legal agreements are well in place to protect smaller economies) to make sure all the SDGs (particularly SDG 16 and 17) are achieved, despite continued risks to the stability of the global economy.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDED POINTS FOR CHAMPIONING NEW THOUGHTS ON CREATIVE INNOVATION

The agenda of political and liberalist approach on globalization, geared towards mobilizing industrial capacity from high to low-costly regions as a way of increasing profits must be revisited. The real test of such imbalanced approach has manifested itself through the incidence of COVID-19, and for which the impact will be a talked about agenda for years to come. As explained by Hutton (8th March, 2020) in 'The Guardian' newspaper article, Coronavirus will not bring an end to globalization, but will change it hugely for the better. The approach to its governance is very critical on how best the world is to be seen as a unified force - the mandate of international institutions like the World Health Organisation (WHO) should make it possible for governments across the globe to pull resources, supposedly geared towards fighting the spread of COVID-19 and many more related illnesses – such may also be the case with parallel move on concerns pertaining to climate change, the ocean, finance and cybersecurity, which are critical for the achievement of SDG in the year 2030 (Hutton, 2020).

Governments' intervention that seeks to address market imperfection (Jackson and Jabbie, 2019) is quite essential here, particularly in ensuring real investment in human capital is geared towards exploring innovative ways of improving and stabilising the world economy. Effort in building a cohesive world economy is highly under the control of governments and international organizations like the UN and World Bank to make sure fair game is at play, where institutions are seen to be working on the interest of building a cohesive society as opposed to amassing profits, which as seen in the case with the initial neglect for COVID-19, ended up as zero outcome for investors as manifested in stock market news around the world (Ramelli and Wagner, 2020).

As already highlighted, businesses and governments should endeavour to focus their attention towards high-end investments in R&D that support creativity in science and technology – such approach will advertently support the SDG3 agenda on ‘*Good Health and Well-Being*’. The experience of COVID-19 have seen how relevant it is for economies to promote healthy living, particularly the eradication of air-borne diseases that can be easily spread by way of the liberalist approach of globalization. The lesson from COVID-19 indicate that ‘*Health Economic Science*’, is as equally important as the management of traditional economic policies pursued in institutions like central bank.

Central banks across the globe were very quick to respond through inducement of packages to calm global panic about the perceived downward trend in economic activities, but the reality still speaks to the need for increased R&D investment, particularly in the curing of Health related illnesses to calm investors worry about risks to the sustainability of their investments and also, the sustenance of households’ livelihoods in general. Equally, there is also a responsibility on the part of governments worldwide to act swiftly by instituting policies to bolster investment in human creativity – this will allay uncertainties about the possible spread of COVID-19 and other related air-borne diseases.

In conclusion, the world economy and more so, governments all around must continue their deliberations to providing much needed support in the area of R&D to enhance creativity in health research, while at the same time affirming their commitment towards achieving the SDGs by the target year of 2030 – now considered the greatest challenge for the world economy, given the tight fiscal environment economies are now placed in amidst the emergence of COVID-19. The emphasis here should be towards the enhancement of ethical investments, particularly that which is focused in promoting healthy living and sustained well-being for citizens in the global community – this should take precedence over all other forms of injudicious creativity connected with the development of destructive technologies (notably, nuclear armaments), which have proved more catastrophic to health (6th August, 1945 atomic bomb attach in Hiroshima as a cited example of memory complex incidence - Olesen, 2019), with the possibility of alluring the persistent uncertainties on stock market reactions across the globe. In view of Schumpeter’s approach to entrepreneurship, resources should be skewed in the direction of investing on human creativity (Jackson, 2020a), with the ultimate goal of ensuring that the calamity of COVID-19 and other related diseases will ultimately be seen as less threatening to human existence on this earthly ecosphere.

CROSS-REFERENCES

- Reducing Hunger and starvation (SDG1)
- Good Health and Well-being (SDG3)
- Quality Education (SDG4)
- Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG8)
- Reducing inequalities (SDG10)
- Partnership for the SDG Goals (SDG17)

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, R., and di Mauro, B.W. (2020). Introduction. In, *Mitigating the COVID-19 Economic Crisis: Act Fast and Do Whatever It Takes*. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) Press.
- Bassino, J.P., and Williams, J.G. (2017). “From Commodity Booms to Economic Miracles: Why Southeast Asian Industry Lagged Behind”. In, Kevin Hjortshoj O’Rourke and Jeffrey Gale Williams (eds.), *The Spread of Modern Industry to the Periphery since 1871*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chatterjee, I. (2019). Radical Globalization. *Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode* at 50. <https://10.1002/9781119558071.ch43>.
- Cho, Seo-Young. (2013). Integrating Equality: Globalization, Women’s Rights, and Human Trafficking. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 57(2013): pp. 683-697. <https://doi.org/doi: 10.1111/isqu.12056>.
- Clayton, T. (2020). Coronavirus Impact Study: CEBR Forecasts Worst Peace-Time Global Recession Since The 1930s. Centre for Economic Research (CEBR). Available at: <https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/news/28995/2020-03-23-coronavirus-impact-study-cebr-forecasts-worst-peace-time-global-recession-since-the-1930s.html>. (Accessed: 23rd March, 2020).
- Danaeefard, H., and Abbasi, T., (2011). Globalization and Global Innovation. In, Piotr Pachura (ed.), *The Systemic Dimension of Globalization*, Intech Open. <https://doi.org/10.5772/17282>.
- Dreher, Axel. (2006). Does Globalization Affect Growth? Empirical Evidence from a New Index. *Applied Economics*, Vol. 3(10): pp. 1091–1110..
- Estrada, R., and Arturo, M. (2020). Is Globalization Responsible of the Wuhan-COVID-19 Worldwide Crisis: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3551944>.
- French, M., and Monahan, T. (2020). Dis-ease Surveillance: How Might Surveillance Studies Address COVID-19). *Surveillance and Society*, Vol. 18(1): pp. 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v18i1.13985>.
- Held, D., and McGrew, A.G. (2007). Globalization theory: Approaches and controversies. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41(3): pp. 796-797. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423908080967>.
- Griffith, L.M., and Marion, J.S. (2020). Globalization. In, Brown, N., McIlwraith, T., and de Gonzalez, T., (2nd. Eds.), “*Perspectives: An Open Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*”. The American Anthropological Association: USA.

- Gross, M. (2020). Virus outbreak crosses boundaries. *Current Biology*, Vol. 30(5): pp. R191-R194. <https://doi.org/10.106/j.cub.2020.02.049>.
- Gschwandtner, G. (2009). SHRINKONOMICS – How should we adjust to the incredibly shrinking economy? Available at: <https://blog.sellingpower.com/gg/2009/07/shrinkonomics-how-should-we-adjust-to-the-incredibly-shrinking-economy.html>. (Accessed: 16th March, 2020).
- Hutton, W. (2020). Coronavirus won't end globalisation, but change it hugely for the better. Available at: <https://www.google.co.uk/amp/s/amp.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/08/the-coronavirus-outbreak-shows-us-that-no-one-can-take-on-this-enemy-alone>. (Accessed: 10th March, 2020).
- Jackson, E.A. (2020a). Fostering sustainable innovation through creative destruction theory, In: Leal Filho W., Azul A., Brandli L., Özuyar P., Ozuyar, P.G. (ed.) *Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham.
- Jackson, E.A. (2020b). Economics of technology innovation for sustainable growth – with reference to Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), In: Leal Filho W., Azul A., Brandli L., Özuyar P., Ozuyar, P.G. (ed.) *Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71059-4_128-1.
- Jackson, E.A. (2016). Ontological and Epistemological Discourse(s) on Sustainable Development: Perspective on Sierra Leone in the Aftermath of a Decade of Civil Unrest. *Management of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 8(1): pp. 35-43.
- Jackson, E.A. and Jabbie, M (forthcoming). Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI): An approach to global economic sustainability. *Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure: Encyclopedia of Sustainable Development Goal*, Springer Nature Publisher.
- Jackson, E.A., and Jabbie, M. (2019). Understanding Market Failure in the Developing Country .Context (Online First). In, Walter L. Filho (eds), *Decent Work and Economic Growth: Encyclopedia of Sustainable Development Goals*, Springer Nature Publisher. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71058-7_44-1.
- Jackson, E.A. and Jackson. J. (2020). Global Perspectives on Gender Sensitivity and Economic Benefits. In Walters L, Filho et al (eds.). *Gender Equality: Encyclopedia of Sustainable Development Goal*, Springer Nature Publisher.
- Jackson E.A., Jackson E.E.S., Jackson H.F. (2020) Nurturing Career Development for Human Resource Sustainable Development. In: Leal Filho W., Azul A., Brandli L., Özuyar P., Wall T. (eds) *Decent Work and Economic Growth. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71058-7_2-1.

- Jackson, E.A., and Jackson, H.F. (2017). The role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Improving Firms' business in the direction of sustainable development, accountability and transparency. *African Journal of Economic and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 6(2/3): pp. 105-118. <https://doi.org/10.1504/AJESD.2017.089942>.
- Jamme, M.E. (2015). What STEM can do for Africa? <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/01/what-stem-can-do-for-africa/>. (Accessed: 11th March, 2020).
- Kapetanios, G., Mumtaz, H., Stevens, I., and Theodoridis, K. (2012). Assessing the economy-wide effects of quantitative easing. *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 122(564): pp. F316-F347.
- Kidman, G., and Chang, C.H. (2020). What does "Crisis" education look like? *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, Vol. 29(2): pp. 107-111. <https://doi.org/10.10382046.2020.1730095>.
- Kinnvall, C. (2004). Globalization, identity, and the search for chosen traumas. In, Kenneth R. Hoover (eds.), *The Future of Identity: Centennial Reflections on the Legacy of Erik Erikson* (pp. 111-136). Lexington Books.
- Leach, M. (2020). Echoes of Ebola: Social and political warnings for the COVID-19 response in African settings. Available at: <https://somatosphere.net/forumpost/echoes-of-ebola/>. (Accessed: 21st March, 2020).
- Markus, E. (2020). EUR/USD, GBP Hedging Perspectives. ECR Research. Available at: https://www.ecresearch.com/system/files/reports/200317-EURUSD%20%20GBP%20Hedging-en_0.pdf. (Accessed: 18th March, 2020).
- Milberg, W., and Winkler, D. (2013). *Outsourcing Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mozaffari, M. (2002). A world-constructivist approach. In, *Globalization and civilization*. Psychology Press (E-book).
- Murat, A., and Isaac, O.M. (2019). Effects of Globalization on the Performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Nigeria, *American Journal of Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol. 4(4): pp. 125-131. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajere.20190404.12>.
- Olesen, T. (2019). The Hiroshima Memory Complex. *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 71(1): pp. 81-95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12717>.
- O'Rourke, K.H. (2019). Economic history and contemporary changes to globalization. *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 79(2): pp. 356-382. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050719000044>.
- O'Rourke, K.H. (2018). "Two Great Trade Collapses: The Interwar Period and Great Recession Compared". *IMF Economic Review*, Vol. 66(3): pp. 418-439.

- O'Rourke, K.H., and Williams, J.G. (2017). *The Spread of modern industry to the periphery since 1871*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Rourke, K.H. and Williams, J.G. (2000). *When Did Globalization Begin?* NBER Working Papers No. 7632, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Ougaard, M. (2004). Introduction. In: *Political Globalization*. International Political Economy Series. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403943996_1.
- Overland, I. (2016). The missing link in globalization. *Energy Research and Social Science*, Vol. 14: pp. 122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.01.009>.
- Perraton, J. (2019). Globalization after the financial crisis: Structural change and emerging market multinationals. In, Breinbauer, A., Brennan, L., Jager, J., Nachbagauer, A., Nolke, A. (eds.) *Emerging Market Multinationals and Europe*. Springer, Cham.
- PooJo. (Online). Eight Theories of Globalization Explained. Available at: <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/articles/8-theories-of-globalization-explained/642>. (Accessed: 17th March, 2020).
- Ramelli, S., and Wagner, A. (2020). What the stock market tells us about the consequences of COVID-19? In, Baldwin, R., and di Mauro, B.W. (eds.), *Mitigating the COVID-19 Economic Crisis: Act Fast and Do Whatever It Takes*. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) Press.
- Rowe, D.M. (2005). The Tragedy of Liberalism: How Globalization Caused the First World War. *Security Studies*, Vol. 14(3): pp. 407-447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636410500323153>.
- Saffa M., Jabbie M. (2020) Developing Transformational Competencies for Sustainable Development. In: Leal Filho W., Azul A., Brandli L., Özuyar P., Wall T. (eds) *Quality Education. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-319-69902-8_116-1.
- Shangquan, G. (2000). *Economic Globalization: Trends, Risks and Risk Prevention*. CDP Background Paper No. 1 ST/ESA/2000/CDP/1. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/cdp/cdp_background_papers/bp2000_1.pdf. (Accessed: 18th March, 2020).
- TechWomen. (19th March, 2019). SIERRA LEONE DAY 2: SHOWING STUDENTS A FUTURE IN STEM. <https://www.techwomen.org/uncategorized/sierra-leone-day-2-showing-students-a-future-in-stem>. (Accessed: 10th March, 2020).
- Vujakovic, P. (2010). How to Measure Globalization? A New Globalization Index (NGI). *Atlantic Economic Journal*, Vol. 38(2): pp. 237. <https://10.1007/s11293-010-9217-3>.

- Warburton, C.E.S., and Jackson, E.A. (2020). Monetary Policy Responses to Exogenous Perturbations: The case of a small open economy (2007-2019). *PSL Quarterly Review*, Vol. 73(293): pp. 181-201. https://doi.org/10.13133/2037-3642_73.293_5.
- Wivel, A. (2004). The Power Politics of Peace Exploring the Link between Globalization and European Integration from a Realist Perspective. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 39(1): pp. 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836704041104>. World Economic Forum. (2020). The Global Risk Report 2020. Available at: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risk_Report_2020.pdf. (Accessed: 24th March, 2020).
- World Health Organization. (Online). Globalization. Available at: <https://www.who.int/topics/globalization/en/>. (Accessed: 17th March, 2020).
- Yilmazkuday, H. (2020). Coronavirus Disease and the Global Economy. SSRN 3554381. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3554381>.