

Introduction to Neoliberal Globalization and Multipolarism

Introduction to Neoliberal Globalization and Multipolarism

By

Paul C. Mocombe
and Ericcson T. Mapfumo

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Introduction to Neoliberal Globalization and Multipolarism

By Paul C. Mocombe and Ericsson T. Mapfumo

This book first published 2026

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2026 by Paul C. Mocombe and Ericsson T. Mapfumo

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 978-1-0364-6645-9

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-6646-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures, Diagrams, and Tables.....	vi
Acknowledgements	ix
Preface.....	x
Introduction	xi
Chapter I.....	1
Theories of Globalization	
Chapter II.....	13
Mocombeian Structurationism	
Chapter III	19
Phenomenological Structuralism: A Theory of Human Action	
Chapter IV	75
From the Consciousness Field to the Constitution of Mind and Society	
Chapter V	95
Neoliberal Globalization	
Chapter VI.....	123
Multipolarism in Neoliberal Globalization	
References Cited.....	128
Index.....	159

LIST OF FIGURES, DIAGRAMS, AND TABLES

Fig. 1. The univon model composed of a superluminal primordial information quantum (spring). The mathematical horn torus surface on which the spring travels is cut away to show the interior. The black closed curve on the surface of the horn torus is the trajectory of the univon's spring (indicated by the black dot).

Figure 2. The parametric equation of the univon model composed of a circulating spring. The calculated maximum speed of the circulating spring is $c\sqrt{5} = 2.236c$ (at the equator of the mathematical torus) while its minimum speed is c (at the centre of the mathematical torus).

Figure 3. For Mocombe, building on BBBHT, the superverse with entangled and superimposed (via black holes) multiverses share the same informational content. So, the hypothesis here is that one superverse, absolute vacuum, created a universe, and its informational content is entangled and superimposed on top of another universe with the informational content of the previous universe emerging in it via black holes. Hence what you have are a layer of multiverses and a superverse, superimposed and entangled, whose informational content is shared or recycled via black holes, which organize and structure the multiverses similarly. As such, quantum fluctuation and big bangs are constantly occurring and producing the same worlds, ad infinitum. So, when physicists look out to the cosmic microwave background (CMB), they are looking at the remnant from an early stage of our universe, which came forth from its older version a layer above it, and so on ad infinitum. Put more concretely, the physicists are in a superverse, of our universe, in our milky-way galaxy, looking out to the black hole of a milky-way galaxy from the superverse/multiverse above us.

Figure 4. This figure represents how the psychions are embodied from the consciousness field (CF) in the microtubules of neurons of brains (figure a, adopted from McFadden, 2020, represents the human brain—left (L) and right (R) hemispheres—and its EM field, which holds together and integrates the qualia of psychions, informational content of the superverse/multiverses, which becomes individuated consciousness recursively

organized and reproduced as practical consciousness), which produces an EM field that holds together and integrates the qualia of the psychions as individuated consciousness. For Mocombe, building on BBBHT, the superverse with entangled and superimposed (via black holes) multiverses share the same informational content. So, the hypothesis here is that one superverse created a universe, and its informational content is entangled and superimposed on top of another universe with the informational content of the previous universe emerging in it via black holes. Hence what you have are a layer of multiverses and a superverse, superimposed and entangled, whose informational contents are shared or recycled via black holes, which organize and structure the multiverses similarly. As such, quantum fluctuation and big bangs are constantly occurring and producing the same worlds, ad infinitum. The informational content, qualia, of these multiverses and worlds are encoded and transmitted as psychions and embodied in the microtubules of neurons of brains, which create an EM field that holds and integrates the psychions as individuated consciousness.

Figure 5. Adopted from Kozłowska and Kozłowski. The formula represents the elementary value of quantum energy for brain and Schumann waves.

Figure 6. Garyian equation (named after my physicist uncle, Gary Belizaire) for individual consciousness. The formula represents the elementary value of quantum energy for brain and Schumann waves plus or minus the resonating frequency channel or station of subjective phenomenal consciousness.

Figure 7. For Mocombe, one superverse created (from the absolute vacuum) a universe, via quantum fluctuation, tunneling, and inflation, and its informational content is entangled and superimposed on top of another universe with the informational content of the previous universe emerging in it via black holes as highlighted in Figure 3. Figure 7 highlights the stages by which these multiverses emerge and unfold from the absolute vacuum. Hence what you have are a layer of multiverses, superimposed and entangled, whose informational contents are shared or recycled via black holes, which organize and structure the multiverses similarly. As such, quantum fluctuation and big bangs are constantly occurring and producing the same worlds, ad infinitum. So, when physicists look out to the cosmic microwave background (CMB), they are looking at the remnant from an early stage of our universe, which came forth from its older version a layer above it, and so on ad infinitum. Put more concretely,

the physicists are in a superverse, of our universe, in our milky-way galaxy, looking out to the black hole of a milky-way galaxy from the superverse/multiverse above us with its own consciousness field.

Figure 2.1. Diagram representing the nature of the relationship between society and the individual or group in phenomenological structuralism. “A” represents the power elites of the social structure; B_1 represents those “others” (hybrids) with their gaze upon the eye of power seeking to be like “A”; B_2 represents those with their gaze averted from the eye of power seeking to exercise an alternative practical consciousness from that of “As” and “B₁s.”

Figure 2.2. Diagram representing the nature of the relationship—C—between society’s semiotic field (bottom of diagram) and the institutional regulators (top of diagram) in phenomenological structuralism.

Table 1. Characteristics of Brain Waves.

Diagram 1. Societal Constitution in Mocombeian Phenomenological Structuralism. The initial human experience of the material resource framework that is the earth determines the mode of production by which they satisfy their biological needs, which comes to be associated with the nature of reality as such through language, medium of communicative discourse (TV, print and social media, folklores, etc.), ideological apparatuses (the family, religion, education, politics, and social relations), and ideologies (democracy, capitalism, socialism, etc.). Culture is the plethora of material and immaterial characteristics placed on the two modes of organizing the material resource framework. The ultimate aim of society is to organize the material resource framework around the nature of reality as such, which for Mocombe is associated with the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism over the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism due to the fact that the latter has shown to be destructive, exploitative, and a threat to all life on earth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work, as with everything I pen, is done in the name of the ancestors, Iwa yo, Erzulie, and my grandparents (Saul and Eugenia Mocombe).

—Paul C. Mocombe

PREFACE

In this work, we argue that in the age of neoliberal (postindustrial) globalization under American hegemony, identity politics, the reification and commodification of (serial) identity practices, cultures, and “all of the accoutrements of the economy of spectacle and the manufacturing of images and fetish desires,” on the one hand, and the continuous atomization of the human subject in (neo) liberalism on the other are mechanisms for creating surplus-value and continuing capitalism’s domination over the world in the era of climate change. These two dialectical practices are offset by an emerging call by Russia and China for a multipolar world order undergirded by traditionalism and nationalism grounded in Karl Polanyi’s double movement thesis. This latter protestation for multipolarism is not a socialist counterhegemonic movement against the climate change problematic, exploitation, and pollution of capitalist relations of production as found in Chinese socialism, in other words; instead, it is a sociopolitical cultural reaction (countermovement) to the uproot of tradition and nationalism promoted by the neoliberal identity (capitalist) processes of the imperial West and America operating out of postindustrial finance economies.

INTRODUCTION

The end of history thesis as adopted in the dialectical works of Hegel proposes a denouement of reason in the world culminating in the endpoint of humanity's sociopolitical and economic evolution and development through the synthesis of contradictions over time (Kojève, 1980; Fukuyama, 1992). At which point, "the end of history," ideological history would end. For many post-Hegel scholars, the French Revolution and the regime of Napoleon represented that endpoint synthesis of equal rights and recognition touted by the values, ideas, and ideals of the Enlightenment. Contemporarily, made famous by postmodern thinkers, Alexandre Kojève (1980), and Francis Fukuyama (1992), the thesis in the postmodern position signifies the end to the modernist emphasis on linear history, grand metanarratives, and universal truth in favor of what is contemporarily known as neoliberal identity politics. In the Kojèveian (1980) sense, the move is away from the French Revolution and Napoleon's regime to emphasize the ideological struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union. Kojève posits that the capitalism of the United States represented right-Hegelianism while the state-socialism of the Soviet Union represented left-Hegelianism. The end of history for Kojève is not the triumph of the latter over the former; instead, it is a triumph of a socialist-capitalist synthesis. For Fukuyama (1992), the triumph of liberal capitalism over state-socialism, right-Hegelianism over left-Hegelianism, as highlighted by the postmodernist identity politics under neoliberal (democratic) capitalism of the United States of America represents the endpoint of history where the regimes of rights and equal recognition have finally been established.

Neoliberalism, contrary to Fukuyama, is not "the end of history;" it represents a resurgence of political economic liberalism in the Western world following the fall of global communism in the 1990s. Neoliberal Globalization (1970s-2000s) is the imperial attempt of the West, under American hegemony, which conceives of its cultural, political, and economic ideologies in the world as representing the end of history or the nature of reality as such, to 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, contemporary globalization represents 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) serves 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 (neomercantilist) system wherein countries are divided into periphery, semi-periphery, and core nations based on prescribed organizations of work (modes of production) by rentier oligarchs, a global 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 Australia, South Korea, and Japan). In the age of (neoliberal) capitalist globalization and climate change this is 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).

Both forms of system and social integration represent two sides of the same fascistic coin in the age of (neoliberal) globalization and climate change even though proponents of the latter position view the former antagonistically. The former (1), operating through the nationalism and fascism of right-wing oligarchs, backed by the American hegemon, sets the stage for the organization of work prescribed to nation-states by

American rentier oligarchs. Once in power and the political and economic order has been prepared for neoliberal capitalism by right-wing oligarchs, they are 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 control of their mode of production, ideologies, ideological apparatuses, language, and (medium of) communicative discourse.

Contemporarily, post the Russian invasion of the Nazi and fascist state, Ukraine, whose government had been usurped by America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) nations', which constituted the semi-periphery nations of the American led capitalist (mercantilist) world-system, 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 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. This (neo) liberalization (neo) mercantilist 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, which applied to the transition of societies from preindustrial to industrial capitalist societies, regarding the constitution of societies based on capitalist relations of production, as new economic processes (the commodification of land, labor, and money) based on the mode of production in capitalism transmogrify traditional societies, political leaders emerge (in a reactionary and fascist countermove) to protect those societies from the vagaries (exploitation, displacement, and resource exhaustion) of the capitalist processes. Contemporarily, in keeping with Polanyi’s “double movement” logic, 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.

In this work, we, building on Mocombeian structurationist theory of phenomenological structuralism, posit that the call by Russia and other BRICS nations for multipolarism undergirded by (economic) nationalism and traditionalism is a Polanyian (cultural/political) countermovement 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. 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 and politically

hegemonic, but not economically. On top of the cultural/political movement, we conclude, 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 (mercantilist) globalization, which at present is offset by the core 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. 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.

Background of the Problem

Theoretically, “culture of globalization” and the “globalization as culture” metaphors represent two sociological approaches to understanding this contemporary dialectical postmodern struggle between convergence and hybridization within neoliberal globalization (1970s-2000s) amidst its iconoclastic, exploitative, and climate-change problematics. These two sociopolitical understandings regarding the origins and nature of globalization, as Kevin Archer et al (2007) points out, have “set off a vigorous and at times rancorous debate within the social sciences” (2007, p. 2). On one side of the debate you have theorists who emphasize the “culture of globalization,” its convergence, and argue the idea that “the constitutive role of culture is critical for grasping the continued hegemony of capitalism in the form of globalization...Culture, they assert is increasingly being co-opted and deployed as a new accumulation strategy to broaden and deepen the frontiers of capitalism and to displace its inherent crisis tendencies” (Archer, 2007, pp. 2-3). In a word, in the continual hegemonic quest of capitalism to homogenize the conditions of the world to serve capital, globalization, in the eyes of “culture of globalization” theorists, represents a stage of capitalism’s development highlighted by the commodification of culture, i.e., diversified consumerism, as a means for accumulating profits from the purchasing and consuming power of a multiethnic, multiracial, and multigender transnational class of administrative bourgeoisies and professional cosmopolitan elites in core, semi-periphery, and periphery nation-states who subscribe to the social integrative (agential) norms of (neo)liberal bourgeois Protestantism (hard work, economic gain, political and economic liberalism, consumption, etc.). This “culture-of-globalization” understanding of globalization or the postmodern condition in late capitalist development is a well-supported position, which highlights, in the twenty-first century, the continued hegemony of capitalism in the form of globalization (Giddens, 1990; Harvey, 2015; Jameson, 1991).

“Globalization-as-culture” theorists, who emphasize hybridization, outrightly reject this socioeconomic position or interpretation underlying the emergence and processes of globalization. They believe “that globalization is marked by the hollowing out of national cultural spaces either consequent upon the retrenchment of the nation state or because culture continues to be a relatively autonomous sphere” (Archer et al,

2007, p. 2). That is, “[f]or the “globalization-as-culture” group...culture is not that easily enjoined due to its inherent counter-hegemonic properties vis-à-vis neo-liberal globalization. Rather, for this group..., contemporary globalization is not merely economic, but a system of multiple cultural articulations which are shaped by disjunctive space-time coordinates. In other words, globalization is as much if not more the product of inexorable and accelerated migratory cultural flows and electronic mass mediations beyond the space-time envelopes of the nation-state system and the successive socio-spatial fixes of global capitalism” (Archer et al., 2007, p. 4). In fact, culture, in many instances, serves as a counter-hegemonic movement to (neo) liberal capitalism as a governing “rational” system. This line of thinking is best exemplified in the works of Stuart Hall (1992), John Tomlinson (1999), Homi Bhabha (1994), and Edward Said (1993) among many others (Mocombe, 2023). For these theorists, cultural exchanges are never one-dimensional, and hybridization of culture in many instances serves as a counter-hegemonic force to the homogenization (convergence) processes of global capital. That is, as postcolonial hybrids in their encounter with their former colonizers negative dialectically convict the former colonial powers for not identifying with the lexicons of signification of their enlightenment ethos, the hybrid identity is counter hegemonic as they seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with their white counterparts as an ethnic *other* (Bhabha, 1994, Mocombe, 2023).

Theory and Method

Building on Mocombe’s (2019) structuration theory, phenomenological structuralism and consciousness field theory, which views human social action as a duality and dualism tied to two (the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism; and the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism) ontological dominant types of social structures (social class language game) constituted by five systems (the mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse), the (reified) contents or social facts of which human actors internalize and recursively organize and reproduce as their practical consciousness for their ontological security, we view this debate between the advocates of the “globalization-as-culture” and the “culture-of-globalization” hypotheses as a fruitless debate grounded in a false ontological and epistemological understanding regarding the origins and nature of the imperialist and fascist (neo) liberal capitalist system that gives rise to the (neo) mercantilist processes of globalization under American hegemony. Both

groups ontologically and epistemologically assume that the origins of capitalism and its discursive practice are grounded in the dialectic of reason and rationality, thus drawing on the liberal distinction between capitalism as a public and neutral system of rationality, arrived at through ego-centered communicative discourse, which stands apart from the understanding of it as a private sphere or lifeworld cultural form grounded in the ontology of the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism as argued by Max Weber (1905). The latter metaphysical position, if assumed by both schools, is a point of convergence that resolves their oppositions, and gives a better understanding regarding the origins and nature of the processes of globalization and counter movements to what are in fact metaphysical cultural forces, which ought to be changed, for the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism, in order to salvage humanity and all life on earth (Mocombe, 2012). That is to say, both schools of thought are putting forth the same convergence argument within a Polanyian “double movement,” the culture of globalization position from a Marxian systems integration perspective and the globalization as culture position from a Weberian social integration perspective, marked by the call to multipolarism.

For the culture of globalization position cultural, political, and economic practices are converged and homogenized (via the five systems, i.e., language, ideology, etc.) to integrate within the rational rules or systemicity of capitalist (mercantilist) relations of production and consumption at the world-system level so as to generate surplus-value from the financialization and consumption of cultural products as commodities in core nations (America, Western Europe, Australia, Canada, and Japan), industrial production in semi-periphery nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), and agricultural production in periphery nations (the rest of the world). Reactionary protectionist and fascist measures, i.e., religious orthodoxy, nationalism, traditionalism, austerity, high tariffs, etc., from the right, in keeping with the countermovement thesis of Polanyi, are necessary when capitalist crises and iconoclasms jeopardize the social relations of the empire or hegemon of the world-system and elsewhere.

The globalization as cultural group suggests that in the process of acculturating social actors to the organization of work (means and modes of production) within the capitalist world-system, homogenization or convergence does not take place. Instead, in the process of integration within the world-system, cultural groups, given the autonomous nature of the cultural sphere, intersubjectively defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse to hybridize the lexicons of significations coming out of the globalization process thereby maintaining their cultural

forms not in a commodified form but as a class-for-itself seeking to partake in the global community, via the retrenchment of the nation-state, as hybrid social actors governed by the (neo) liberal rational logic of the marketplace without discrimination. Hence, there is no need for a Polanyian countermovement as culture, in this sense, is an autonomous sphere, and comes to serve as the counter-hegemonic force against the fascistic and exploitative processes of (neo) liberal capitalism as the other simply fight to integrate within the system via their call for “equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution” (Fraser, 1994).

The two positions are not mutually exclusive, however, and when synthesized via Mocombe’s (2019) theory of phenomenological structuralism—which combines system and social integration via the duality of structurationism and negates culture as an autonomous sphere—and Karl Polanyi’s concept of double movement, highlight the same fascistic position. For Mocombe, neoliberal globalization, under American hegemony, contemporarily, represents the homogenization, i.e., convergence, of social discourse and action via hybridization amidst its exploitation and climate change effects. This fascistic movement was and is countered, over time, by a reactionary and fascistic (Polanyian counter) protectionism in light of the crises, exploitation, displacement, migration, resource exhaustion, climate change, and identity politics, brought on by the free-trade and integrationist (identity politics or hybridization) movements of (neo) liberalism emerging out of the postindustrial West and America.

Hence for Mocombe, unlike Habermas, there is no distinction between the system and the lifeworld.

The former, system (capitalism), emerges from the latter, lifeworld (social ethical actions of Protestant groups), and in-turn colonizes it through five systems, i.e., the mode of production, language, ideology (democracy, individualism, identity politics), ideological apparatuses (church, education, urban centers, police force, international institutions, etc.), and (medium of) communicative discourse (media, TV, etc.), constituting a social structure or social class language game used to interpellate, embourgeois, and socialize social actors the World over. Following the Protestant Reformation and the rise of Protestants to positions of power within the Westphalian nation-state system all social actors were interpellated and socialized via Protestant churches to be obedient workers so as to obtain economic gain via the labor market organized around agriculture, industry, and postindustrial service occupations. Be that as it may, the church (other ideological apparatuses such as schools, police force, the law, urban centers, etc., were added later) and the labor market (via education) became the initial defining

institutions or ideological apparatuses for socializing social actors as both Protestant agents and agents of and for capital. That is, individuals, Protestant agents, with a work ethic that would allow them to pursue economic gain via their labor in a market as either agents for capital, laborer, or agents of capital, administrative bourgeoisie. The relationship, therefore, between the Protestant ethic and the capitalization of labor or the constitution of the labor market are not mutually exclusive. Instead, they were and are necessary components for constituting a capitalist society under the metaphysical discourse of Protestantism, and its discursive practice, capitalism. The Protestant Ethic and God, in a word, legitimated the organization of social actors as laborers, and the labor market was constituted to ensure that workers were rewarded, accordingly, to ensure that the discursive practices of the labor market were in line with the metaphysical discourse of the Protestant ethic.

What the two sociological approaches to understanding globalization have done is to separate the dialectic (between the system and lifeworld) and theorize their respective positions from opposite sides of the dialectic, the culture of globalization scholars from the side of labor organization (forces of production) and practices; and the globalization as culture people from the side of social integration (social relations of production). The “culture of globalization” scholars identify the economic practices by which Protestant agents organized and organize social practices (around work) the world over to interpellate and socialize individuals to become Protestant “agents of and for capital” for the purpose of generating surplus value or economic gain for capital. In a word, the organization of work (around agribusiness, tourism, resource extraction, industry, service, sports, and entertainment) and its relation to the desires of capital is the dominating factor in understanding the processes of globalization for the culture of globalization group. Given the mutual constitution of the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism this latter position is not inaccurate as the labor market also serves to integrate the social actor as not only an agent of capital but also a Protestant agent, i.e., a worker who gains, status, upward economic mobility, etc. by being obedient and working hard.

For the globalization as culture scholars the emphasis is on understanding how agents of national cultures avoid being both an agent of capital and a Protestant agent to successfully carve out a national space for their cultural practices, which are autonomous, within the globalizing process so as to achieve equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with the agents of the globalizing power, America since World War II, which is seeking to integrate the multitude and their nation-states into the capitalist

processes of globalization. This position is not an alternative to the culture of globalization group but is saying and doing the same thing. 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, embourgeoisé, 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 (what Leslie Sklair calls a “transnational capitalist class”) 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 embourgeoisé (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. Their overt discourse is not, however, the economic (neo) liberalism of the globalizing power seeking to fascistically 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 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.

It is this incessant (neoliberal and embourgeoisé) claim for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution of the successful socialized

hybrid liberal bourgeois Protestant “other” agent of capital the “globalization as culture” left-wing scholars identify as being counter-hegemonic. This counter-hegemony highlighted by the “globalization as culture” camp is grounded in the fact that the hybrid liberal bourgeois Protestant is allowed, and seeks to, compete in the global capitalist marketplace as a hybrid elite or Protestant agent and agent of and for capital (comprador bourgeoisie) against the gaze of their former colonial masters. This agential moment of hybrid others to participate in the global organization of labor is not counter-hegemonic—as the purposive-rationale of these hybrid agents is economic gain for themselves as an ethnic, sexual, gendered, etc., other at the expense of their poor—but, contemporarily, represents one of two means by which Protestant agents, rentier oligarchs, operating out of the US, predominantly, attempt to universalize, interpellate, and embourgeois their purposive-rationale among the others of the world so as to generate economic gain/surplus value (for its postindustrial service industries) or what amounts to the same thing reproduce the Protestant capitalist social system, globally, amidst its debilitating effects, i.e., climate change, pollution, overproduction, resource exhaustion, and exploitation. The global other, via the language of identity politics and the diversified consumerism of its elites, comprador bourgeoisie, seeks to integrate (via two political parties, one representing the neoliberal processes; and the other identity politics) within the systemicity of (neoliberal) globalization as an embourgeois other (comprador bourgeoisie) not to offer an alternative to it in the face of climate change, pollution, etc., associated with capital organization, accumulation, and exploitation; instead, their aims are for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution within the system.

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, fascistically, 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 (neoliberalism and identity politics) through ideological apparatuses such as USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED)¹.

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 (cultural/political) counterhegemonic and countermovement, "double movement," 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. 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 via religious orthodoxy. 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 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. 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, it would appear, to convert their neoliberal global project (neoliberal globalization) into a protectionist (neocolonial mercantilist) great power struggle or fight over resources, trade routes, and spheres of influence (colonies). Thereby continuing capitalisms destruction and exploitation of the world by reverting to sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (neo) mercantilism and power politics over culture, civilization, and economics, i.e., a global clash of civilizations in the Huntington (1996) sense, which will lead, since they control the bulk of the post World War II international institutions, to the eventual triumph of America and the West again.

To begin our analysis, chapter one deconstructs contemporary postmodern/post-structural understandings regarding the nature and origins of neoliberal (identity) globalization under American hegemony. In the place of postmodern and post-structural thoughts on identity constitution, in chapter two, we argue that neoliberal globalization, promoted by the rentier oligarchs of America, paradoxically, pushes for convergence and homogenization of the post-colonial other around two purposive-rationalities, i.e., neoliberal economic organizations and identity politics. Chapters three and four offer the consciousness field and structurationist theory and methodology Mocombe (2019) calls phenomenological structuralism and consciousness field theory as heuristic and methodological tools to understanding the constitution of the aforementioned processes within the capitalist world-system under American hegemony. Against postmodern/post-structural emphasis on the hybrid, fragmentary, or the decentered subject as a counter-hegemonic force against neoliberalism, this work, in chapter five, suggests that the purposive-rationality of nation-states in the age of neoliberal globalization under American hegemony must be understood predominantly as their continuous struggle to integrate the Protestant Ethic and capitalist class divisions, social relations of production, and ideological apparatuses of the global capitalist world-system under American hegemony. Even the multipolarism sought for by Russia, China, and other nation-states, we conclude promotes this

convergence thesis, but as a parallel to the American dominated system minus the identity politics surrounding sexual orientations. Hence, given the destructive and exploitative nature of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism social class language game, chapter six concludes the work by offering an alternative ontological form of system and social integration, libertarian communism, which is grounded in the Vodou Ethic and spirit of communism of the African people of Haiti and China, to the negative dialectical response for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution and multipolarity to the exploitation and oppression of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism under the auspices of what is becoming a global multicolor, multiracial, multigender, etc., rentier oligarchical class.

Notes

¹ 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.

CHAPTER I

THEORIES OF GLOBALIZATION

Traditionally, right-wing fascism is usually associated with radical authoritarianism, ultranationalism, forcible suppression of opposition, and strong regimentation of society and of the economy. In the age of (neoliberal) globalization, i.e., the Fukuyamaian “end of history thesis,” the latter processes and tactics are utilized by the American empire (and their vassal states) to retrench and force nation-states to adopt the juridical rules and policies of neoliberal capitalism for (neomercantilist) capitalist development and accumulation, which they associate with the nature of reality as such or “the end of history.” Paradoxically, the left utilizes these same fascistic processes and tactics, via identity politics, contemporarily, in order to promote equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with the globalizing power elites of the right despite the exploitative and climate change problematic caused overwhelmingly by the latter processes under capitalism and American (imperial) hegemony. Hence, instead of promoting an alternative (ontological) form of system and social integration to the neoliberal fascism of the right, the cultural elites of the left, antagonistically, seek to integrate within it using the same methods of the fascist right to promote identity politics, diversified consumerism, and equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution as the counter-hegemonic alternative to neomercantilist neoliberalism under American hegemony in the age of globalization and climate change. Be that as it may, globalization, as promulgated by the United States of America, is defined by both neoliberal economics, which pushes for economic convergence, and cultural identity politics, which highlights the hybridization, integration, and celebration, of cultural, racial, gender, and sexual forms for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution and diversified consumerism within the former.

However, for the most part, sociological theories regarding the contemporary (1970s to the present) phenomenon of globalization focus either on convergence (the culture of globalization position) or hybridization (the globalization as culture position) but not both (Ritzer, 2007). The

former, convergence, highlights the ever-increasing homogenization of cultures and societies around the globe via socioeconomic rational forces. From this perspective globalization is tantamount to Westernization or Americanization of other cultures and societies via neoliberal economic, market, subjugation. The latter, hybridization, emphasizes heterogeneity, the mixture of cultural forms out of the integration of society via globalizing processes stemming from improvements in information technology, communications, mass media, etc. In this latter form, cultures and societies are not homogenized; instead, they are hybridized, cultural forms that are syncretized with liberal democratic Western capitalist rational organization. In this work, we want to propose that in globalization under American hegemony both positions are purporting the same process, convergence, and that the only alternative to this thesis of convergence is not multipolarism pushed for by the semiperiphery (industrial) nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa). Instead, the alternative is grounded in the antidialectical (ontological) movement Mocombe (2016) calls national Lakouism or libertarian communism (which is simply socialism with Haitian characteristics, like Chinese socialism is socialism with Chinese characteristics) to offset the destruction, exploitation, and climate change problematics associated with the capitalist world-system that the imperial hegemon, America, attempts to deal with by curtailing the development of the nations of the world via neoliberalism and identity politics under the umbrella of neomercantilist globalization.

Background of the Problem

The “culture of globalization” and the “globalization as culture” metaphors represent two sociological approaches to understanding the contemporary postmodern phenomenon we call neoliberal globalization (1970s-2000s). These two sociopolitical understandings regarding the origins and nature of globalization, as Kevin Archer et al (2007) points out, have “set off a vigorous and at times rancorous debate within the social sciences” (pg. 2). On one side of the debate you have theorists who emphasize the “culture of globalization” and argue the idea that “the constitutive role of culture is critical for grasping the continued hegemony of capitalism in the form of globalization...Culture, they assert is increasingly being co-opted and deployed as a new accumulation strategy to broaden and deepen the frontiers of capitalism and to displace its inherent crisis tendencies” (Archer, 2007, pg. 2-3). In a word, in the continual hegemonic quest of capitalism to homogenize the conditions of the world to serve capital, globalization, in the eyes of “culture of globalization” theorists, represents

a stage of capitalism's development highlighted by the commodification of culture as a means for accumulating profits from the purchasing and consuming power of a transnational class of administrative bourgeoisies and professional cosmopolitan elites in core, semi-periphery, and periphery nation-states who subscribe to the social integrative norms of liberal bourgeois Protestantism (individual hard work, economic gain, political and economic liberalism, consumption, etc.).

In other words, the material and symbolic cultural elements of the cultures of the world are commodified by the upper class of owners and high-level executives of core countries to make a profit or produce surplus-value by fulfilling the consumption tastes of the financiers, administrative bourgeoisies, professional classes, and cosmopolitan elites of nation-states throughout the world who control their masses as a surplus labor force for global capital. Globalization, therefore, is simultaneously the outsourcing of agricultural and industrial work to other nations, and the integration of the cultural realm into the commodity chains of the capitalist elites, the upper class of owners and high-level executives, who interpellate and homogenize, through the (social) media and other "ideological state apparatuses," the behavior and tastes of global social actors as consumers and workers in order to generate profit in postindustrial (core service) economies.

This "culture-of-globalization" understanding of globalization or the postmodern condition in late (postindustrial) capitalist development is a well-supported position, which highlights, in the twenty-first century, the continued hegemony of capitalism in the form of globalization (Hardt and Negri, 2000; Kellner, 1988; Giddens, 1991; Harvey, 1989, 1990; Jameson, 1984, 1991). This line of thinking, in which theorists point to the underlining drive of globalization as the continuing historical push to socially, economically, and politically (under) develop the rest of the world along the lines, or as a simulacrum, of Western American and European Societies to facilitate capital accumulation, began with European colonialism, continued through the "development project" of the Cold-war era, and now is embedded in the globalization process. This historical process is highlighted in modernization, development, dependent development, world-systems theories, and contemporarily it is a trend outlined in the theoretical works of postmodern theorists such as David Harvey (1989, 1990) and Fredric Jameson (1984, 1991) who view globalization as postmodern or the cultural logic of capitalist development in core or developed countries.

"Globalization-as-culture" theorists out rightly reject this socioeconomic position or interpretation underlying the emergence and processes of globalization. They believe "that globalization is marked by the hollowing

out of national cultural spaces either consequent upon the retrenchment of the nation state or because culture continues to be a relatively autonomous sphere” (Archer et al, 2007, pg. 2). That is, “[f]or the “globalization-as-culture” group...culture is not that easily enjoined due to its inherent counter-hegemonic properties vis-à-vis neo-liberal globalization. Rather, for this group..., contemporary globalization is not merely economic, but a system of multiple cultural articulations which are shaped by disjunctive space-time coordinates. In other words, globalization is as much if not more the product of inexorable and accelerated migratory cultural flows and electronic mass mediations beyond the space-time envelopes of the nation-state system and the successive socio-spatial fixes of global capitalism” (Archer et al., 2007, pg. 4). In fact, culture, in many instances, serves as a counter-hegemonic movement to (neo) liberal capitalism as a governing “rational” system. This line of thinking is best exemplified in the works of Stuart Hall (1992), John Tomlinson (1999), Homi Bhabha (1994), and Edward Said (1993) among many others. For these theorists cultural exchanges are never one-dimensional, and hybridization of culture in many instances serves as a counter-hegemonic force to the homogenization processes of global capital. That is, as postcolonial hybrids in their encounter with their former colonizers dialectically convict the former colonial powers of not identifying with the lexicons of signification of their enlightenment ethos, the hybrid identity is counter hegemonic as they seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with their white counterparts as an ethnic *other* (Bhabha, 1994).

Theory

Theoretically, this debate between the advocates of the “globalization-as-culture” and the “culture-of-globalization” hypotheses is a fruitless debate grounded in a false ontological and epistemological understanding of the origins and nature of the post-1980s (neo) liberal capitalist system that gave rise to the processes of globalization under American hegemony. Both groups ontologically and epistemologically assume that the origins of capitalism and its discursive practice are grounded in the dialectic of reason and rationality, thus drawing on the liberal distinction between capitalism as a public and neutral system of rationality that stands apart from the understanding of it as a private sphere or lifeworld cultural form grounded in the ontology of the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism as argued by Max Weber. The latter ontological (duality) position, if assumed by both schools, is a point of convergence that resolves their opposition, and gives a better understanding of the origins and nature of the processes of