



## The End of Neoliberal Globalization and the Rise of Neomercantilism

**Paul C. Mocombe**  
Keiser University  
West Virginia State University  
The Mocombeian Foundation, Inc.  
E-mail: [pmocombe@mocombeian.com](mailto:pmocombe@mocombeian.com)

This work posits that the neoliberal global order under American hegemony is coming to an end. In its place, and amidst the call to multipolarism by Russia and China, the Americans are seeking to establish a neomercantilist system wherein the world is divided between American colonies on the one hand, and Russian and Chinese colonies on the other. The aim, from the American standpoint, similar to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century mercantilist eras where European countries competed for colonies, is to compete against and defeat the latter two and reestablish American unipolar hegemony as it had it with the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

**Keywords:** Neomercantilism, Phenomenological Structuralism, Structurationism, Neoliberalism, Globalization, Capitalist World-System

### Introduction

This work posits that the neoliberal global order (1991-2020) under American hegemony is coming to an end. In its place, and amidst the call to multipolarism by Russia and China, the Americans are seeking to establish a neomercantilist system wherein the world is divided between American colonies on the one hand, and Russian and Chinese colonies on the other. The aim, from the American standpoint, similar to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century mercantilist eras where European countries competed for colonies, is to compete against and defeat the latter two and reestablish American unipolar hegemony as it had with the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

### Background of the Problem

Neoliberalism represented a resurgence of political economic liberalism in the Western world following the fall of global communism in the 1990s (Archer et al, 2007). Globalization (1970s-2000s) was the imperial attempt of the West, under American hegemony, to establish a unipolar world order whereby they integrate and colonize the (Western and non-Western) world around the juridical framework of political economic liberalism (neoliberalism), which emanates out of the Weberian ontology of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism, at the expense of all other forms of system and social integration. Hence, globalization represented a mercantilist Durkheimian mechanicalization of the world via the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism under American (neoliberal) hegemony around the organization of work (agricultural, periphery nations; industry, semi-periphery nations, and postindustrial, core nations) and identity politics. The power elites, the upper-class of owners and high-level executives, rentier oligarchs, of the latter (American hegemon) served as an imperial agent seeking to interpellate and embourgeois (via the organization of work, ideology, ideological apparatuses, language, and communicative discourse) the masses or multitudes of the world to the juridical framework of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism to constitute a world imperial system wherein countries are divided by the hegemon, i.e.,

The United States of America, into periphery, semi-periphery, and core nations based on prescribed organizations of work (modes of production) by rentier oligarchs, a multicultural, multiethnic, multigender, and multiracial upper-class of owners and high-level executives, operating out of financial based core nations like America and the collective West (including Western Europe, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Korea, and Japan).

In the age of (neoliberal) capitalist globalization and climate change this was done within the dialectical processes of two forms of fascism or system/social integration: 1) right-wing neoliberalism around the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism and organization of work (agribusiness, tourism, and resource extraction of periphery nations; industry of semi-periphery nations; and service financial industries in core nations) prescribed to these countries by America and the West; and 2) (neo) liberal identity politics masquerading as cosmopolitanism or hybridization “enframed” by a cashlessness pegged to the US dollar backed by Saudi Arabian oil with the zionist colony state of Israel grounding the Judeo-Christian metaphysical system of the American empire for social integration via ideology (identity politics and notions of democracy disseminated throughout the world by the American mechanism, USAID, National Endowment for Democracy, NED, World Bank, United Nations, and IMF), ideological apparatuses (church and education), and (medium of) communicative discourses (media, TV, etc.) under the control of the West and America (Mocombe, 2023, 2025).

Both forms of system and social integration represented two sides of the same fascistic coin in the age of (neoliberal) globalization and climate change (1970s-present) even though proponents of the latter (left) position viewed the former antagonistically. The former (1), operating through the nationalism and fascism of right-wing oligarchs, backed by the American hegemon, set the stage for the organization of work prescribed to nation-states by American rentier oligarchs. Once in power and the political and economic order had been prepared for neoliberal capitalism by right-wing oligarchs, they were offset by the identity left (2), also supported (USAID and the NED) by rentier oligarchs of the American hegemon to constitute a political economic order constituted by two political parties representing both positions, each supported by the rentier oligarchs of the American empire through its (financial) control of their mode of production, ideologies, ideological apparatuses, language, and (medium of) communicative discourse.

The BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) nations', which constituted the semi-periphery nations of the American led capitalist (mercantilist) world-system post the fall of the Soviet Union, attempt to institute a multipolar world against American hegemony, under Russian and Chinese tutelage, is not a counterhegemonic move (as in the case of Chinese socialism), in the socialist/economic sense, to challenge the constitution of neoliberal capitalism on a global scale; instead, it is a Polanyian right-wing (reactionary) response, at the global level, to exercise national capitalism, traditionalism, economic autarky, against the identity politics, prescribed organization of work, and free-trade mantra of the left promulgated by American hegemonic forces under neoliberal globalization and identity politics. In the latter sense, it is culturally and politically counterhegemonic but not economically.

On the one hand, in other words, (neo)liberal globalization represents the right-wing (reactionary) attempt to homogenize (converge) the nations of the globe into the overall market-orientation, i.e., private property, individual liberties, and entrepreneurial freedoms, of the capitalist world-system through the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism, the retrenchment of the nation-state system around the organization of work under the control of a national or comprador bourgeoisie, right-wing nationalism, austerity, privatization, and protectionism (Archer et al, 2007; Helleiner, 2021). This (neo) liberalization process under America serving as the metropole of the system is usually juxtaposed, on the other hand, against the free-trade mantra, narcissistic exploration of self, sexuality, and identity of the left, disseminated via ideology, ideological apparatuses, language, and (medium of) communicative discourse under the controls of America and the West, which converges with the (neo) liberalizing process via the identity politics and diversified consumerism of the latter groups as they seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution (around the organization of work prescribed to them by rentier oligarchs operating out of America and the West) with white agents of the former within their market (finance) logic. Both positions, the convergence of the right and the hybridization of the left, are (antagonistically) dialectically related in the age of neoliberal globalization under American hegemony.

Private property, individual liberties, diversified consumerism, and the entrepreneurial freedoms of the so-called marketplace become the mechanisms of system and social integration for both groups even though the logic of the marketplace is exploitative, environmentally hazardous, and impacting the climate of the material resource framework, i.e., the earth, which often requires the protectionist fascists of the right of the dialectic to intervene, in keeping with the “double movement” thesis of Karl Polanyi (2001 [1944]), against the radical (neo) liberalism of the so-called left representing *freedoms to* and identity politics.

That is, according to the Polanyian worldview regarding the constitution of societies based on capitalist relations of production, as new economic processes based on the mode of production in capitalism transmogrify traditional societies (agricultural and industrial) due to the commodification of land, labor, and fiat money, political leaders emerge to protect those societies from the vagaries (exploitation, displacement, and resource exhaustion) of the capitalist processes. Contemporarily, the identity politics and glorification of the self associated with postindustrial economies threaten the traditional social fabric of traditional periphery (agricultural/preindustrial) and semi-periphery (industrial) societies.

Whereas Polanyi highlighted the aforementioned reactionary protectionism associated with the uproot of traditions and religions in preindustrial (agricultural) societies by industrial capitalism, elsewhere I have argued, building on Mocombeian structurationist theory of phenomenological structuralism, that the call by Russia and other BRICS nations for multipolarism undergirded by (economic) nationalism and traditionalism is also a Polanyian (cultural/political) reactionary countermovement in their industrial societies against the social integrative liberal push coming out of the post-industrial West for neoliberal globalization and identity politics, and not an international socialist (economic) movement necessary to offset its (capitalist relations of production) exploitative and climate change problematics (Mocombe, 2025). This global Polanyian response by the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) nations promotes traditionalism, state-nationalism, and economic autarky backed by a multipolar world order with different states dominating different regions of the world against the exploitation and iconoclasm of the neoliberalism and identity politics of the postindustrial West and America serving as the hegemon of the globalist order. In this sense, the Polanyian movement is culturally hegemonic but not economically. On top of the cultural/political movement, I conclude, elsewhere, there is a need to push for an ontological and economic move towards what Mocombe (2020) calls Lakouism or “libertarian communism,” which is socialism with Haitian characteristics that is also embedded in the Chinese socialist state, with an emphasis on equality, economic nationalism, subsistence living, and balance and harmony between the social and environmental world (through regulatory measures) in order to avert the exploitation and climate change problematics of neoliberal globalization, which at present is offset by the core (postindustrial) countries (America and the West, i.e., Western European countries, Australia, South Korea, and Japan) retarding (with the assistance of a transnational comprador bourgeoisie) the economic growth of the periphery and semi-periphery nations of the world-system via neoliberal identity capitalism for their post-industrial financialized markets and consumptive lifestyles.

## Theory and Method

Hence, contemporarily, the oligarchs of the American hegemon, in light of the call to multipolarism, and failures to defeat Russia in the Russia/Ukraine crisis fueled by America and Western Europe, within the neoliberal globalization order, embrace the call to nationalism and traditionalism (given their inability to defeat Russia and China militarily) and are seeking to convert their neoliberal global project into a protectionist (neocolonial mercantilist) great power struggle or fight between Russia, China, Western Europe, and America over resources, trade routes, and spheres of influence (colonies) thereby continuing capitalism’s destruction and exploitation of the world by reverting back to sixteenth and seventeenth centuries neomercantilism, which they (America) assume they will win and reestablish the unipolar world given their control of the (Bretton-Woods) institutions of the world-system that dates back to the end of World War II. As such, this work posits that the neoliberal global order under American hegemony is coming to an end in the short term to be reestablished in the long-term with the defeat of China, Russia, and Iran.

In its place, in the short term, and amidst the call to multipolarism by Russia and China, in other words, the Americans are seeking to establish a neomercantilist system wherein the world is divided between American colonies (the Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan, Philippines, Zionist colony Israel, and South Korea) on the one hand, and Russian and Chinese colonies on the other; all three competing or scrambling for the African continent once again.

The aim, in other words, from the American standpoint, is to compete against and defeat the latter two and reestablish American unipolar hegemony as they had it following the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 via a neomercantilist model, which parallels that of the European one of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

That is, in neomercantilist neoliberal globalization under American hegemony the attempt of capital, the multicultural, multiracial, multisexual, and multigender upper-class of owners and high-level executives, rentier oligarchs, operating predominantly out of the US is to have national cultures carve out national spaces, nation-states, within a global marketplace (organized by work prescribed to these national spaces, under the control of a comprador bourgeoisie, interpellated, embourgeoised, and controlled by American and Western rentier oligarchs) enframed by a cashlessness pegged to the US dollar wherein every group can have a comparative advantage disseminating their natural, cultural, and identity resources so as to accumulate economic gain for themselves and national and global capital under the ideological umbrella of identity politics and diversified consumerism taught to the masses via language, ideological apparatuses, and (medium of) communicative discourse under the control of the West and America. So, through the commodification and financialization of natural and cultural resources and identities (their comparative advantage) for sale and consumption, diversified consumerism, on the labor market, global elites hybridize and universalize national discourse and discursive practices to serve capital accumulation in postindustrial (core) societies as a comprador bourgeoisie (Frantz Fanon's term).

Hybridized national cultures in this process are not counter-hegemonic. They are interpellated and embourgeoised (converged) to meet the desires of global capital operating in postindustrial economies with emphasis on servicing the financial wealth of a transnational multicultural (phenotypically, sexually, etc.) capitalist class (comprador bourgeoisie) in control of natural and cultural resources of their nation-states in a world-system under American hegemony. Their overt discourse is not, however, the economic (neo) liberalism of the globalizing power seeking to fascismistically homogenize their practical consciousness to benefit global capital around the organization of work. On the contrary, identity politics or cosmopolitanism, i.e., respect for (democratic) human rights of “the other” to participate as agents seeking equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution in the (financialized) fascism of the neoliberal processes of the hegemonic power, is the *modus operandi* of the multicultural “other” elites (a professional managerial class for capital) in control (with the West and America) of the language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourses of their nation-states.

These dual processes of neoliberalism and identity politics lead, however, to crises (of opportunity, recognition, distribution, pollution, exploitation, and climate change) in the hegemon (America), and elsewhere, of the world-system, which fosters reactionary right-wing traditionalism (to protect the population against identity politics) and nationalism, to protect the population of nation-state actors from the exploitation and economic crises of the left neoliberal integrationist movement clamoring for identity politics, economic growth, and equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution, however. That is, as the global (cultural) left, fascismistically, embrace the neoliberal project, i.e., privatization, deregulation, etc., of the right for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution, identity struggles emerge, and the exploitation, displacement, resource wars, famine related to climate change, and overall environmental degradation forces the other to seek refuge in America, the imperial hegemon of globalization, and the West (and elsewhere) where right-wing protectionist nationalism emerges (on racial, ethnic, and national lines as opposed to economic ones) to combat the influx of refugees from periphery and semi-periphery countries throughout the globe escaping the capitalist discursive practices, initially, released by the right for capital accumulation, and subsequently promoted by the left, via identity politics, for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution.

In the periphery and semi-periphery countries, where agriculture and industrial production dominates, respectively, Polanyian protectionist nationalism, religious orthodoxy, and traditionalism also emerge against the neoliberalism and identity politics of the hegemon, America, and its vassal states (Western Europe, South Korea, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada), which promote the latter two through ideological apparatuses such as USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED)<sup>1</sup>.

## Discussion and Conclusions

The call to multipolarism by Russia, China, and the rest of the world (outside of the countries, with the exception of Haiti, in the Western hemisphere where the dialectic between the neoliberal right and the identity politics of the left is deeply ingrained given America's domination of the region via its Monroe Doctrine) is grounded in this Polanyian reactionary (cultural/political) counterhegemonic and countermovement to American neoliberalism and identity politics and is not a socialist movement or libertarian communist move (as embedded in the Chinese socialist state) towards equality, subsistence living, and homeostasis between the social and natural world to avert the destruction, exploitation, and climate change problematics of global capitalist relations of production as a world-system under American hegemony. The former two threatens the nationalism and traditionalism of their agricultural and industrial societies, and in the place of identity politics and neoliberal policies, multipolarism calls for nationalism, mix economies with state control of natural resources, social welfare programs, and anti-identity politics especially those focused on sexual orientations. Hence a retrenchment of the nation-state system around nationalism and traditional values under the economic processes of Russia, China, and some emerging countries in Africa, possibly South Africa if it can ever remove itself from the strangleholds of America and the West or the Sahel states (Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger), is the call to order of multipolarism in neoliberal globalization under American hegemony. In that sense, multipolarism is culturally/politically (in a reactive-protectionist-sense) counterhegemonic, but it avoids the socioeconomic and political (ontological) push towards Mocombeian libertarian communism, which calls for subsistence living and balance and harmony between the social and environmental worlds, necessary to avoid the exploitative and climate change problematics of neoliberal and identity global capitalism under American hegemony.

Contemporarily, however, the oligarchs of the American hegemon, in light of the call to multipolarism, and failures to defeat Russia in the Russia/Ukraine crisis fueled by America and Western Europe, within the neoliberal globalization order, appear to embrace the call to nationalism and traditionalism (given their inability to defeat Russia and China militarily) and are seeking to convert their neoliberal global project into a protectionist (neocolonial mercantilist) great power struggle or fight between Russia, China, Western Europe, and America over resources, trade routes, and spheres of influence (colonies) thereby continuing capitalisms destruction and exploitation of the world by reverting back to sixteenth and seventeenth centuries mercantilism in the hopes of winning out against the Russians and Chinese in order to reestablish the unipolar (neomercantilist) world order under American (the sole metropole) hegemony. This process seeks to end neoliberal globalization with neomercantilism, in the short term, in the attempt to reestablish the former (unipolar neoliberal globalization under American hegemony) with the extension and defeat of Russia and China in the long term.

## REFERENCES CITED

Archer, Kevin et al (2007). "Locating Globalizations and Cultures." *Globalizations*, 4,1: 1-14.

Helleiner, E. (2021). *Neomercantilists: A Global Intellectual History*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Hudson, Kenneth and Andrea Coukos (2005). The Dark Side of the Protestant Ethic: A Comparative Analysis of Welfare Reform. *Sociological Theory* 23 (1): 1-24.

Mocombe, P. C. (2021a). Consciousness field theory. *Archives in Neurology & Neuroscience*, 9 (4), 1-6.

Mocombe, P. C. (2021b). The consciousness field. *Advances in Bioengineering & Biomedical Science Research*, 5 (1), 11-16.

Mocombe, P. C. (2019). *The Theory of phenomenological structuralism*. CambridgeScholars Publishing.

Mocombe, Paul C. (2008). *The Soulless Souls of Black Folk: A Sociological Reconsideration of Black Consciousness as Du Boisian Double Consciousness*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Movement Advancement Project, Family Equality Council and Center for American Progress. (2012). *All Children Matter: How Legal and Social Inequalities Hurt LGBT Families*.  
<https://www.lgbtmap.org/lgbt-families>.

Polanyi, Karl (2001 [1944]). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Spivak, Chakravorty Gayatri (1994 [1988]). "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisma (Eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory A Reader* (pp. 66-111). New York: Columbia University Press. USAID, "LGBTQI+ Inclusive Development Policy," August 2023.

Winant, Howard (2001). *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II*. New York: Basic Books.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> According to USAID's 2023 Annual Report (p.X), it is estimated that under the Joe Biden presidency, USAID spent: \$7.9 million to teach Sri Lanka journalists to teach them how to avoid binary gendered language; \$3.9 million for LGBT causes in Macedonia; \$2 million for sex changes and "LGBT activism" in Guatemala; \$1.5 million to promote LGBT advocacy in Jamaica; \$1.5 million to a Serbian NGO, 'Grupa Izadji' ('Group Come Out'), to promote LGBTQ workplace inclusion and economic opportunities. Add to that: \$30 million to fund research on HIV transmission among transgender individuals and sex workers in South Africa; \$6.3 million to a group called "OUT LGBT Well-Being" in Pretoria, South Africa, to advance LGBT in "priority countries around the world"; \$5.5 million "to improve the ... livelihoods of LGBTQI+ in Uganda; \$3.9 million to LGBT causes in the Western Balkans; \$3.3 million toward normalizing "being LGBTQ in the Caribbean"; \$2 million to promote "LGBT equality through entrepreneurship ... in developing Latin American countries"; \$1.1 million to an Armenian LGBT group; \$1 million went toward supporting French-speaking LGBTQ+ groups in West and Central Africa; \$80,000 on an LGBTQ community center in Slovakia; \$47,000 for a "transgender opera" and other transgender representation in the arts in Colombia; \$40,000 to host seminars at the Edinburgh International Book Festival on "gender identity and racial equality"; \$32,000 for a "transgender comic book" in Peru; \$20,600 for a drag show in Ecuador; \$16,500 for fostering a "united and equal queer-feminist discourse in Albanian society"; and \$8,000 to promote DEI among LGBTQ+ groups in Cyprus. Under Biden, USAID was headed up by a lesbian woman married to a woman, Samantha Power. Biden also appointed a Senior LGBTQI+ Coordinator, Jay Gilliam to lead "efforts to advance protections, human rights, and inclusion for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) communities." In an interview with "Medium," Gilliam emphasized: "President Biden issued a Presidential Memorandum to mandate that USAID and all agencies involved in foreign assistance promote and protect the human rights of LGBTQI+ people. Administrator Power ... has continually reiterated the importance of USAID's work to advance LGBTQI+ inclusive development, most recently in a speech.... USAID will continue to support efforts to protect the LGBTQI+ community from violence, discrimination, stigma, and criminalization. We will also support LGBTQI+ livelihoods, health, quality education, access to justice, and so much more." Samantha Power, USAID Administrator, insisted that a condition for Ukraine's integration into Europe was that they increase their support for LGBTQI+ communities. "The criteria that Ukraine is going to need to meet, the roadmap and so forth, is going to entail much stronger protections than have existed in the past," she said. For her, advocacy of "LGBTQI+ rights" was a centerpiece in US foreign policy that left no room for neutrality among the nations of the world. "Imagine the counterfactual," she said. A US foreign policy that did not promote LGBTQI+ rights would "legitimate some of the [anti-LGBTQI+] rhetoric and actions and legal measures," she said.