

Reconceptualizing Neoliberalism within the Context of “No Alternative to Neoliberalism”: The Need for Diagnostic Social Science

Abubakar Sadeeque Abba, PhD, Abdulrahman Abu Hamisu, MSc,
Idris Abdriss Abdullahi, MSc.

Department of Political Science & International Relations,

University of Abuja, Gwagwalada, Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

Department of Political Science, Nigerian Police Academy Wudil, Kano State, Nigeria.

Department of Planning, Research & Review, Independent Corrupt Practices & Other Related Offences Commission, National Headquarters, Plot 802, Constitution Avenue, Central Business District, Garki, Abuja, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: Idris Abdriss Abdullahi

Abstract: Neoliberalism is a constructivist and immoderate project with hegemony underpinning its purpose. Inherent in hegemony is the tyrannical theory that no social force, regardless of its usefulness to the world, must share the same self-preservation value with empire-building hegemon concealing as an entrepreneur. The purpose of the paper is to unveil the subjectivism, exceptionalism, prescriptivism, and illiberalism underlining neoliberalism. Methodologically, and for purposes of conceptualization, analysis, suggestion, and direction for future research, dialectical inquiry method was adopted. This methodology lends credence to diversity as a universal fact. It claims that fact and value are mutually exclusive and that universal fact must not be sacrificed for ideological value. We contended that, the cliché, there is no alternative to neoliberalism is a political and psychological conditioning to prevent spirited others from tackling the problem of beginning. Meanwhile, as a second-order-reality one phenomenon like neoliberalism cannot be alternative to itself. Thus, it cannot be immune from the flaws and inconsistencies that organically underline it because of ignorance of ontological origin of diversity and cognitive relativism. The aftermath is the foisting of despotic social science which inspires geopolitics of banditry. Finally, we submitted that diagnostic social science is what the world needs now.

Keywords: Neoliberalism, Subjectivism, Prescriptivism, Exceptionalism, Dialectical Inquiry, Social Science.

Date of Submission: 01-03-2019

Date of acceptance: 18-03-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

We begin with a deduction that neoliberalism is not a constructivist reality existing by chance but an empire project for hegemonic expansion and stability. This inference conflict with neoliberal social science claims that “neoliberalism has no alternative” (Friedman; 1962). Our inference suggests that neoliberalism is both objectivity and subjectivity; however, neoliberalists rather instilled objectivism and subjectivism into neoliberalism. This choice conceitedly asserts that neoliberalism is a universal truth for all societies to adopt, conform, and faithfully imbibe without questioning because neoliberalism is an alternative unto itself. This self-obsessed claim makes neoliberalism a “first order reality” of Watzlawick (1984), but in all probability, is it? Probing into the motivation for the claim illustrates a persuasion to foist and foster totalitarian social science because neoliberalists conceived that neoliberalism conferred on them the merit of a trailblazer. An exploratory review proves that this assertion is a *fait accompli* founded probably on illusion of exceptionalism. Evidently, neoliberalism exemplifies Watzlawick’s “second order reality” (1984); hence, we set forth that it is an empire-driven hegemonic assertion founded on prejudice and nervous avoidance of potential peril from itself and other competing values. If this is sure, we presumably suggest that neoliberalism must be at risk of inadequacy, and of course, vulnerable to its own internal contradiction, review and change *ad nauseam*. If these three deductions are taken together, we may begin to think through neoliberalism as a conception of ambivalent social science.

Paradoxical as these deductions really are, they inspire not unusual veneration and aversion for neoliberalism within the context of its pervasively hegemonic ambition. We construe that the prevalence of neoliberalism in the “age of fallibility” (Soros; 2006) is not because it is a broadminded doctrine, but seemingly

a Machiavellian *force majeure* to achieve hegemony in its illiberalism. Chomsky (2003) agreed that neoliberalism is reconstructed via an occidental social science that illogically declared freedom as its prime value while pushing for hegemonic interventionism. In this, neoliberalists artfully illustrates hegemonic vision by harmonizing state and market values as opposed to neoliberal claims that state has no positive value for market. The compelling reasoning is that, state and market inexorably inspires each other because they are equivalent, but for neoliberal social science claim that market has supreme value over state. Within the broader neoliberalism debate we conceive neoliberal doctrine to be arbitrarily illogical because of its weak ontological perception to comprehend that neoliberalism is not a first order reality. But absorbed in the scheming values of exceptionalism, Jim Callaghan, Margaret Thatcher, Jimmy Carter, and Ronald Reagan were proselytized by Friedman’s dogma as they consider it a sacred theory of global development.

Consistent with the Friedman’s self-absorbed assertion, Huntington (1993) and Fukuyama (1992) reemphasized that no future alternative to neoliberalism can emerge with certainty, and if any, it must be from the very occidental civilization respectively. Our perspective view this overconfidence to have been influenced by an extremely arrogant, rigid and fallacious social science that should be rigorously reviewed and resolved within the context and content of heterogeneous and inclusive scholarship. Doing this, we provided a thought in search of evidence from Freud (1930/2012) that “we are in danger of forgetting how variegated the human world and its mental life are”. This ‘danger of forgetting’ perhaps deliberately,exposed intellectual egotism of Friedman, Huntington, and Fukuyama to rejecting cognitive relativism within the context of diversity which our approach significantly recognized. For this, we confidently perceived diversity as a universal social fact like multiculturalism, constructivism, and relativism because they are first order realities that earthly beings should consider acknowledging as a rule rather than an exception. As historical beings in the process of self-realization (Fromm; 1961), we consider this outlook a manifestly consistent fact within the context of ontological origin of diversity. We are thoughtful of ontological relativism because neoliberal academics like Friedrich von Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, and Alan Greenspan, etc. artlessly think and behave as if neoliberalism came with the world or the world came with neoliberalism as a universal truth.

Considering neoliberal thinking to be profoundly prejudiced, it readily follows that neoliberalism is not a conscientious social science, but effectively a technical illusion to proselytize provincialism while artfully misleading the world. One aftermath of this technical illusion is the neoliberal claim to market neutrality while seeking neutralization of state. Logically, how can neutrality seek neutralization if it is not a social actuality that is structured by epistemological diversities in contradistinctions? Neutrality by our take means that neoliberalism has no prejudices; hence it is not prejudicial, while neutralization which we assumed to be an active feature of neoliberalism frustrates any conflicting and or competing reality. Coherently, all realities are “individually constructed and there are as many realities as there are individuals” (Scotland; 2012:11) and as many perspectives as there are civilizations as part of the purposeful value of diversity in their unique constructivism without jeopardizing relativism. On this, we set up methodological outlook to review neoliberal claim that it has definitive answers on how to construct social organization (Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao; 2016) regardless of unique context, content, and culture that cognitive relativism values. Thus the proposition: if neoliberalism is a universal value, it certainly would not require fascism to universalize it, because it is a state universalizing project for the proselytization of market capitalism unto others’ living consciousness and praxis. However, to “broadminded social science” (Mishra & Kumar; 2014), diversity is a distinctive universal resource of all civilization and a universality to all societies.

Perceptibly, we deduced that the neoliberalists’ attitude to neoliberalism foster incentives for extremism and, perhaps, counter-extremism. This may be compelling a reasoning because neoliberalists invalidly think that the habitable world exist independent of diverse knowledge and knowledge system (Nonaka & Takeuchi; 1995); so, other civilizations are effortlessly available to be thought for because they are incapable of thinking for themselves let alone for others. This *faux pas* probably persuaded occidental social science to untenably think that culture precedes knowledge as against the latter being the forebear of the former. This idea enthuse political chauvinism while invalidly seeing neoliberalism as a universal knowledge, a reality that fosters a delusion that feeds on anxious, bigoted, illiberal, and nationalistic policies that are ignorant of unique diversities. These inspired policies do not fit into the constructivist perspective (Ford; 1999) and ontological relativism (Scotland; 2012) of our methodology. At a broader reading, we viewed theory, social science, hegemony, and or neoliberalism as socially constructed values in their “cognitive relativism” (Guba & Lincoln; 1994) and as subcategories of universality because they are legacies of individuals or group. For this, we developed two hypothetical models, namely, natural alternative and inherent variation as first order reality as against neoliberal theory which we situated as second order theory.

Our model of natural alternative states that, non-recognition of diversity as a first order reality within the discourse of occidental social science that is totalitarian and a liberal market ideology creates illusion of diversity thereby inspiring ignorance of cognitive relativism which deductively causes hegemonic thought for extreme policies. This model is premised on the effortless reasoning that there is no absoluteness in human

categories and neoliberalism cannot be exception. Further, we contend that neoliberalism is a constructed project that emerged from a structured context by synthesis of vested character tempered with chauvinistic and grasping desire against others for the purpose of exploitation and hegemonic control. If this characterization is reliable, we further assume that it is aptly consistent with the assertion that every idea from human mind like neoliberalism is governed by Marx and Engels' (1848/2011) "principle of movement". So, can we further presume that the social science that takes this seriously cannot be value free even when the neoliberal positivists would fantasize about value freeness? We are consistent with the fact that neoliberalism is inspired by the prejudiced values of positivism since our deeper reflections is also consistent with Holzner (1972) and Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao (2016) that all human efforts are constructed efforts. But, can neoliberalism be immune from the imperfections and inconsistencies that are organically intrinsic to all human vocations as a constructivist reality?

As a dynamic experience in search of value a pervasively ideological neoliberalism cannot be free from contradictions that are both internal and external to it because it is a goal driven movement with its own limitations. Reason is every reigning ideological project with reputation for pretended consciousness struggles for and against others' essence and existence in the process of manifesting and realizing its essence and existence. This reality presumes that there is always an internal surviving mechanism for or against to which neoliberalists like every other social force experience in the process of self-realization as a universality (Hegel; 2001) but partly realized externally. Again, these limitations and contradictions as natural experiences are usually acknowledged to help provide alternatives to these imperfections and inconsistencies as we so thought as part of honestly thinking through the psychology of continued existence. If we agree with Bohm (1996) that every social transactions surely emerge from human mind through effort as a second best experience, it may be self-evident that neoliberalism is a value-imprisoned theory that is relativistic, inconsistent, and innately capable of being replaced. The presumption is that neoliberalism is a hegemonic conversation that survives on shifting reality thereby making it to experience evolution, revolution, review, expansion, and crisis in that cyclical change.

Again, one conformist inconsistencies of neoliberalism is that, while it constructs its own reality other practically competitive ambition must not construct theirs even if it's consistent with their individuality, foresight, and challenges. One reason is to avoid power that is or will be a snag to its geopolitical strategy and moral and psychological self-indulgence and progression. Evaluating our propositions, neoliberal ambition would seek to illiberally construct reality for others to avoid being subsidiary without reflecting on the predictability of the rise and fall of hegemonic ideologies and powers. The plausible effect of this illogicality is the further effort that neoliberal social science must not be open to critical discourse to avoid laying bare the speculative theory. By this irregularity can we presume that neoliberalists lack ontologically cognitive tolerance for an insightful and highly reflective social science that gives open expression to diversity, dynamism, distinctive epistemology, individuality, competition, and sophistication? In this, societies natively contend and are contended with and transform and are transformed in that predictable circle. Aptly, it ontologically suggests that societies and states are inexorably confronted with the Arendt's "problem of beginning" (1963) as a first-order-reality thereby using knowledge internal to it for the entire society without being greedily and clannishly individualistic. Falsely denying this explicit experience to validating export of neoliberal project and policy as a universalized value rather than a universalizing value is an inspiration to fabricated social science which instigates state extremism in defence of market capitalism.

Our perception of neoliberalism as a constructivist knowledge is its geostrategy within the context of "class and national power" (Chomsky; 1998) relations with presumed mercenary effort at neoliberalization. This questions the neoliberal claim that neoliberalism is basically economic and not political, a claim that is in itself political as it belies the existential realities that constitute the knowledge variables of this research. Cohen et al. (2009:27) make clear that "what counts as knowledge is defined by the positional power of that knowledge" without perceiving other civilizations as unintelligent and unfit to build state or market. If this proposition is scientific with conviction in the future, it suggests that *ab initio* neoliberalism has taken its ambition to bigoted extremes in means political. In the face of these divergent deductions, we got the conviction to take on dialectical inquiry method to clear out these probable ambiguities toward possibilities of articulated and constructive form of social science discourse. Notably, for a research work like this to make honest contribution to the development of theory for healthy practice we assume that it take seriously dialectical inquiry approach (Seligman; 2013; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars; 2000) as a diagnostic approach.

Hopefully, the approach has the aptitude to interrogate assumptions in theory and practice (Crotty; 1989); hence, we introduce neoliberalism to the values of dialectical knowledge, science and inquiry. This is consistent with one of the propositions of dialectical inquiry because it scrupulously grasp that fact and value are inseparable (Seligman; 2013). This dialectical inquiry and review is done from the practical premise of interventionism, fundamentalism, empire building, regime change, geostrategy, propaganda, and bigoted social science which are absorbed in, valued, endured, and marketed by neoliberalism, a project neoliberalists claimed

has no alternative. This approach sees the drive for competent social organization in development as dialectical requiring dialectically opposing philosophies to bring it about like the Confucian Ying Yang. This effort is to equitably bring to light the wisdom or irrationality of a bizarre social science that produced neoliberalism for the repression of others without rational thought on the dialectical harmony and the dynamics that are the very sources of the world variegated culture, diversity and beauty but continual trade-off between public spirit and private profit, valued and devalued practices, domination and inspiration, and equitable and inequitable power relations. This approach draws insights from the dialectics of Socrates, Plato, Heraclitus, Aristotle, Ibn Sina, Ibn-Khaldun, Kant, Hegel, and Marx and Engels.

Clearly, we have no pretense against pragmatic bias because it is unviable to so do by our credence to cognitive relativism that all paradigms are subjective with cognitively relativistic values in search of a balanced and harmonious social science of diversity. Our task is to know if neoliberalism is avidly conceived for illiberalism, tyrannically prescriptive and intolerant of coexistence, and hypocritically chauvinistic, selfish, and neomercantilist. Is neoliberalism unreflectively an open adversary to a democracy that treats “humanity as a thing” (Freire; 1973)? We seek to know whether hegemonic neoliberalism is a universal problem-solving theory or a provocatively reactionary empire building indoctrination that negates the self-belief, self-creation and self-realization of other civilizations. Finally, we evaluate the propositions in the paper to know how valid they are for insightful social science as a paradigm to know if truly neoliberalism has no alternative and if it can logically be alternative unto itself.

II. CONCEPTUALIZING NEOLIBERALISM WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF “NO ALTERNATIVE TO NEOLIBERALISM”

Conceptualization as an intellectual exercise is as old as man in the search to persist, preserve, rationalize, understand, interpret or explain observable reality. All conceptualizations unquestionably emerge from diverse culture, value, knowledge structure, and experiences and thus, result in sundry generalizations. On the word of Scotland (2012:10), “conceptualization like meaning is discovered but constructed between consciousness and the world”. If plausible, it thus arise that generalization is one fixed feature of conceptualization where either subjectivity or subjectivism is featured. If subjectivity is promising for discursive social science it follow that conceptualization is a cognitive effort at being coherently profound with conscientious regard for all individuality in diversity. But is it so with subjectivism which activates narrow social science? Perhaps, no! So, we hold up that effort at conceptualization of neoliberalism need not rigidly follow from theory to reality because it likely inspires narrow social science against one that is broad. Broad and insightful social science is a profound epistemology that is ontologically thorough through the use of critical discussion where deductive and inductive processes of conceptualization are valued and used. Thus, conceptualization done here is based on concrete experiences of state and market and not much on any specious theory.

Using dialectical inquiry method to conceptualize neoliberalism we contend that there is prospect of experiencing risk of balance and logic as against intuition. This risk inspires rigidity and parochialism in the conceptualization of neoliberalism that stirred the no-alternative-to-neoliberalism. We conceptualize that if there is no alternative to neoliberalism it suggests that the theory is free of any other existentiality. With further review we perceived that this assertion is likely to be a corollary of intuition, intolerance or self-glorification than rationality. But, our dialectical inquiry method makes clear that no human civilization is not in relation to another, either in opposition to or harmony with, intrinsically linked or otherwise. This is a categorical compliance with our model of universal vulnerability because “there is always a causal link to other existence because of necessity” (Ibn Sina; 1025/1999). What this evokes is that all theories including neoliberalism are in movement to affirm or negate extant idea or reality or emerging social construction of other civilizations without wanting to be disproved. This viewpoint validates Marx & Engels (1845/2011) “principle of movement” as inescapable in every human life-form in the process of self-realization. That is, all movements in their inexorable forms are driven by diverse knowledge, a thought which both were partly oblivious of. The point is movement of humans, ideologies, etc. in all geographies are driven by knowledge, but meaningful only in socialization and affirmation of this universal diversity.

In our attempt at conceptualization, if we take neoliberalism as a theory it requires as an obligation to know the level of scientific rationality of no-alternative-to-neoliberalism. Such conceptualization would require whether the explanatory value of neoliberalism has universal application without hegemonic and chauvinistic effort to enforce its application in real world. Can we contend that the assertion of no alternative to neoliberalism was motivated by arrogance of exceptionalism which is not free from prejudiced values and ideas in their extremism thereby inspiring a framework of social science that tended towards irrationality? If indeed neoliberalism is a system of ideas in a movement governed by men with sense of history and balance, we imagine that its efforts and claims should be “capable of being corrected and so inherently capable of being wrong” (Stewart, Harte, & Sambrook; 2011:222), else it is not a theory but probably an obsessive indoctrination

that is less deserving of rational inquiry in its dialectical forms. Our conceptualizing inquiry effort into the no-alternative-to-neoliberalism is a search for reflective, coherent, and problem definition and solving social science which the world truly need. Is this not *de rigueur* to drive down extremism in geopolitics which fixatedly regiments the creative thinking powers of others to the detriment of integral purpose of multi-resourceful diversity?

To the rabid defenders of neoliberalism, the reality of a thing resides in what a concept professed to be and not what it is like ontological reality. In the 21st century neoliberal social science, there is a gap between meaning given to neoliberalism and the propaganda associated with its real world application including manifestations and the ensuing problems it creates. But, this by no mean implies that the struggle to expand neoliberalism into universal civilizations has not been extremely constant, meticulous, innovative, interventionist, prescriptive, and illiberal. To a point, the defenders perceived neoliberalism to be the only reality that is pervasively illustrative of and functional for the world. Is this not part of the policy of foisting a totalitarian methodology instead of a broad based methodology which ought to make the world intellectually motivating for social science research? To illustrate this viewpoint as part of conceptualizing neoliberalism, it is instructive to grasp the general precepts of neoliberalism, namely, profit over people, unregulated business (Chomsky; 1999), dependent macroeconomic policy sovereignty, market-determined resource production, distribution and social organization, (Chussudovsky; 1997), and conformity to all prescribed values and roles without holding contrary goals. These precepts, to be sure, constitute the foreground rationalized by defenders of occidental civilization as part of the groundwork for the rationalization of neoliberal exceptionalism and its masked totalitarianism.

Repeatedly proudly, Naipaul (1957) had said that occidental civilization is the “universal civilization that is healthy for all men in all ages, and we will inscribe our future there and impose our own form of life for these lesser people to follow”. Similarly, Huntington (1993:26) in his superciliousness voiced that “the West is at the peak of power that none can reach”. Within the same ubiquitously fragmented and ahistorical vision Fukuyama (1992) artlessly envisioned that “liberal democracy may constitute the endpoint of mankind’s ideological evolution and the final form of human government and as such constitute the end of history”. For Churchill’s (1923), exceptionalism, “I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher race, a more worldly-wise race, has come and taken their place”. Friedman (1962) who inspired Jim Callaghan, Jimmy Carter, Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan declared: “neoliberalism has no alternative”. And for Bush Jnr. (2003), speaking to US allies and the rest of the world during the United State hegemonic war on Iraq, “it is either you are with us or against us”. As “a definitive subject in occidental exceptionalism” (Lipset; 1996) what if we consider these bigoted and timid articulations as ideological protest against civilizations that possesses effortless capability to be coherently tolerant?

If we consider these as nervous and bigoted geopolitical articulations in defence of the ideology of national security, how do they constitute the values that properly conceptualize neoliberalism? Giroux (2013), Harvey (2007), Chomsky (1999), and Said (1977) have variously articulated that neoliberalism is the depoliticization of state, repression of public minds against self-willed sovereignty, unleashing unregulated business, and devaluation of organized obligation basic to human essence and existence. These are contrasting conceptualizations of neoliberalism that speak to unambiguous reality and not to the theory of neoliberalism that is more or less a hegemonic indoctrination (Nye; 2001). We think through neoliberalism as a hegemonic project in continuity but confronted with shifting conversations and attention in the global balance of power. To reinforce these thoughts, neoliberalism would conceitedly act true to type because of irrational optimism nurtured by exceptionalism that it has the distinctive power to determine universal theory, value and practice of global politics and relation even as they undergo restructuring. Curiously however, dialectical inquiry approachoblges that any theory or reality that is amenable to review because it is a constructivist materiality must also be open to the law and dynamics of weakness, inadequacy, uncertainty, and prone to general crisis consistent with our model of universality in and of diversity.

On this view, we conceptualize that neoliberalism is a constructivist project and far from being ontological because the constructivist origin is not “independent of being constructed” (Ford; 1999:481), a conceptualization resting on the reality of extremist values of neoliberalism. But for Buchanan (2007), Friedman (1962), and Hayek (1944) neoliberalism is a policy paradigm with the normative rule that society and state exist for and not to be existed for by individual persons. In other words, state and society should be subservient to market greed and thus corrupting collective wisdom in order to lengthen the life span of empire’s imperial vision. Could Higgott (2002) be more apt in his conceptualization of neoliberalism as a “contest of state power” where state is called upon to mutually build and protect particularized market interests for the “restoration of class dominance by creative destruction” (Harvey; 2007)? If this is reliable, could it be that neoliberalism is *ab initio* contemptuous of evolving formidable economic power of the collective thereby requiring the narcissist goal of retrenching state sovereignty? One true reality of neoliberalism is that it cannot do without the interventionist politics of global economics which integrally transformed neoliberal capitalism. Could this be

part of the reason conglomerates and oligopolies orbit the universe riotously and menacingly like roving and materialistic plunderers (Olson; 1993) as if they are unconscionable masters of the universe?

In their prescient conception of capitalism strictly penned, neoliberalism was carefully summarized:

The need of constantly expanding markets for its products chases the bourgeoisies over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere and establish connections everywhere (Marx & Engels (1848/2011).

Market expansionism is not for its own sake but what it can bring to the expansionist domain of and this cannot be a reality without “constantly revolutionizing the instrument and relations of production and with them the whole relation of society”(Marx and Engels; 1848/2011). This is one resourceful merit of capitalism, but not much a feat because it is a first order reality at the heart of problem-solving social science which must be an experience in all societies. To inventively revolutionize means of production couldn't have been without the role of the state and the logic driving it forth, but depending on the prevailing vision, independent capability to adapt to new liberating opportunities, risking the unusual, and the cognitive aptitude to insistently struggle against the “world of conformity and convention” (Healy; 2011). So, as repeatedly articulated, “there was nothing natural about of *laissez faire*; free markets could never have come into being merely by allowing things to take their course...*Laissez faire* was enforced by the state”(Polanyi; 1957/2001:139). Validating Polanyi, Olson forthrightly emphasized that ‘there is no private property without government in a world of roving bandits’ (Olson; 1993:572).

Does neoliberalism stimulates the riotous *Darwinian* survival of the fittest by brutally undercutting states and societies that are suspicious of hegemonic consensus, namely, Wall Street and Washington Consensus because of their self-perception? Klein (2007), convinced of the bigotry of neoliberalism conceptualized it as the freedom to expose workers to the limits of poverty, reduce democracy to an exhibition, and the license to cause crisis around the globe, etc. History has it that there is usually a warning of future global crisis even when some are purposely plan out as agreed by Kiyosaki's (2009) conspiracy of banking monopoly. Klein (2007) further described neoliberal freedom as the “paved stones required to construct the road to serfdom for some and the road to power for others”. So, we think Hayek, Friedman, and Buchanan's theory of neoliberalism was nervously articulated against communism and socialism and not against the institutional state *per se*. This is because, validation of the latter, persuasively or not to hegemonic consensus and disingenuous idea of security (Berger and Luckmann; 1966) has made some states to be part of the evolutionary expansion of the market for neoliberal legitimation and legitimization. Yet, since the world has not been broadly humanized by neoliberalism into a profound social science has this not disclaim the false premise of neoliberalism's business freedom or is it prescribed freedom?

III. NEOLIBERAL SOCIAL SCIENCE: A BIGOTED AND NIHILISTIC SCIENCE?

Is neoliberal social science a bigoted science? What manner of inspiration has this science provided neoliberalism as activated by capitalism to become a tyrannical and hegemonic force? Has neoliberal vision being proudly made the vision of and for the world as if they own the world and not a prejudiced subject of the world? Has this science arrogated to itself the role of social theorist, architect, and change agent of and for the world? Is there a neoliberal obsession against existing or prospective diversity that possesses cognitive autonomy and knowledge system to craft its own vision of the world? Is cognitive or potential cognitive autonomy of others causing anxiety for neoliberal hegemony to a point of intolerance against open, broad and innovative competition? Can imperial vision and project of empire be sustainable without absurdity and bigotry, and if so, is there a place for open society in a neoliberal hegemony? Lastly, if social science is a problem-solving science, is neoliberalism a deceit and crisis to the world? Practical answers with facts to these questions, hopefully, depend on the epistemological and ontological conception of value and fact by neoliberalism. Granting that facts like science are not value-free, but it is truer that all values are not universal values; in other words, all values are not facts universally because value is reducible to perception but not so with fact. There are values that speak to specificity and not generality, but fact speaks to both because fact is not only common sense, it is irresistible, for instance, dealing with the Arendt's problem of beginning. Thus, values and facts are immanent in all societies, but in the struggle to nourish hegemony employing value to take the place of fact is to foist bigotry and extreme view and disposition on the world.

We argued that neoliberalism is much determined and inspired by value than by fact, expectedly. Friedman's “there is no alternative to neoliberalism” is a doctrinaire illustration of value against fact required in defence of neoliberalized hegemony. Factually descriptive was Harari (2011), that proliferation of thoughts, institutions, conventions, rules, and norms is not only planned but that hegemony cannot be under the illusion of tolerating nation-states to liberally determine formulation and implementation of policies. The purpose is to guillotine any form of free-will, the very source of diversity that will threaten hegemonic rule. In this, neoliberal social science categorized neoliberal market as universal value and a social fact with neoliberals as masters of the universe in its expansionism that has been and still is, been promoted to be for the good of all. To clear this

conceptual doubt, Allchin (2015) make clear that science is developed from value while Ake (1979) succinctly said that science makes the scientist and the scientist who produce science and scientific work all have values. So, is the assertion that neoliberalism is scientific and has no egoistic value bigoted and a “subjectivism” (Freire; 2002)? What is the subjectivism of neoliberalism? In this context it means states have no coherent and apposite paradigm except the ones prescribed by others. The effect of this is prescriptive interventionism, weakened sovereignty, perpetual compliance, and policy and regime change. Of course, the spreading of neoliberal values, norms, rules, etc. as “gratifying but pernicious inclination”(Freud; 1930/2012) is part of subjectivism. But, this does not deny that neoliberalism is a subjectivity representing a dictatorial and fundamentalist determination to struggle for the greater share of the world’s strategic resources including geopolitical power. Perhaps, subjectivity is competently illustrated:

To deny the importance of subjectivity in the process of transforming the world and history is naïve and simplistic. It is to admit the impossible: a world without men. World and men do not exist apart from each other, they exist in constant interaction (Freire; 2002).

In search of a neoliberal social science we are persuasive that interaction at the level of production, exchange, distribution, and consumption between civilizations undeniably requires subjectivity but certainly not subjectivism. Subjectivism is heedless to productively democratic interactions, and with it enters greed, bigotry, extremism and tyranny. Ultimately, they manifest as neoliberal values to decide who produce, possess, process, exchange, distribute, consume, and recycle what, where and how. Thus, it will be cognitively incoherent to call the conflict that ensues between two determined civilizations, one driven by subjectivism and the other, subjectivity as “clash of civilizations” (Huntington; 1993) as opposed to tyranny of civilization. Cognitively, a conflict that emerges as a product of subjectivism and not from subjectively objective or objectively subjective contestations no longer qualifies as a clash of, but despotism or tyranny of civilization. To pigeonhole these two characterizations, it means that while conflict by subjectivity is a first order reality in its predictability, conflict that arose from subjectivism in its falsity is a second order reality which must be tackled as a task of a broadminded, rigorously and insightfully predictive social science. But, Huntington’s clash of civilization merely referred to the former and not the latter that he should have invested his intellect. These clashes are between civilizations of greed and need, subjectivism and subjectivity, extremism and moderation, private and public, ignorance and knowledge of diversity and between deliberate misjudgment and restraint. They were transformed into tyranny of civilization that seeks the liquidation of nonconforming state in tackling Huntington’s ostensible clash of civilization.

Like every tongue-in-cheek theory, the capture of state regulatory mechanisms is consistent with neoliberalism. This is a possibility when the wild covetousness of individual lead to “corporate domination of society” (Chomsky; 1999). State capture as a feature of hegemony begets weak state institutions which undermine democracy, rule of law, social justice, accountability, and national cohesion, interest and security. Yet neoliberals could not rise above cognitive bigotry to realize that market like state is a requisite to creating a moderate society-state relation where the greed of the market is regulated and moderated for a mutually tolerant and satisfying state-society-market relation. Regulation like the Freudian superego (Freud; 1930/2012) is an ontological fact and thus takes precedent over and above deregulation which we classified as second order reality; else it is anarchy of dedicated narcissism and endless bloodbath. The inexorable role of regulation is to mediate between two extremes in the ontological interactions such as state-market relations. This is one social fact that neoliberals duplicitously do not appreciate because to them market interaction is the only interaction as integrity and equity norms must not matter. One fact remains, that is, if a fact like regulation is discounted in its ontological value, of course, critical attention may not be given to deregulation whenever it tended towards irrationality during which all things falter and dissolve.

Two critical inferences follow from this exploratory conclusion; perpetual inequality is internal to neoliberal thought in order to open up the market. Where this is made difficult to realize, trade sanction, regime change or war becomes handy to open up societies to neoliberal values and market. So, it is not that neoliberal market can equitably moderate itself because it ontologically exists to be moderated by the state. The viable argument that should be interrogated is, between the state and market which should build or moderate the other? Does market have the thought process let alone equitable wisdom to make coherent decision to determine the propriety of class value and interest? This is not to mean that neoliberal market cannot rely on state persuasion or the latter making itself available to be inequitably illogical to advance same interest. But the crux of the review is that neoliberal individualism has no competency in self-control; it goes to extreme pursuit of market goals like the grasping Freudian *id* (Freud; 1930/2012) let loosed by profiteered *ego*. If this as intellectual possibility it tells that neoliberalism is not only an intolerant theory but apprehensive of robust competition without seeking the role of the state that Sartori (1970) bigotedly described as lethal to freedom. However, without a politically guaranteed public realm, freedom, including market freedom “lacks the worldly space to make its appearance” (Arendt; 1977:149).

Strangely enough, neoliberalism's theoretical inefficiency of the state requests state to become attraction, that is, promising business environment for investment because it artlessly perceived profiteering as ultimate civilization. To wit, state should be a terminus for foreign investment without being a foundational investor in titanic investment like the basic industries of iron and steel, metallurgy, etc. for export of capital and intermediate goods because of its demand elasticity. Thinking through, this neoliberal thought is in the main founded on the false hypothesis that state building is negligible to market building. Can market exist without state? The agitated neoliberalist would argue that market can exist without state because the latter according to them is nothing while the former is something for or against the nothingness of the state. Our theory building effort suggests that these are social science issues; so, it requires a perceptive and thorough one to progressively resolve them, afterall, political act affecting state-market-society relations are issues for social science. By our premise, we put forward that the social science that exists prior to neoliberalism did not seek to set up society against individual and vice versa; rather it recognizes society and individual towards a fuller awareness of the inexorable multifaceted diversities in productive relations.

We thus discern that the neoliberal effort at forcing everyone to internalize monolithic value as if social science is not a minefield of critical discourse for problem-solving is a nihilistic knowledge that instigates fascism. We presume that this type of knowledge lacks “cognitive respect” (Berger; 1974) for others thereby fostering nihilistic view of market superiority to state without knowing that both constitute evolutionary process of development. All in all, are state and market not vulnerable to periodic crisis? If this follows, is it coherent to propose that neoliberal theory was inspired by bigoted anxiety, illusion of differences (BAID), and Hawking's “illusion of knowledge” (1988) in building and sustaining hegemony with neoliberal values? This is compelling because neoliberal civilization especially its social science developed phobia for diversity with cognitive free-will whenever it is imagined that a competent one is practically challenging extant global balance of power. Since being at the summit of global balance of power is the ultimate goal, we argue that the authoritarian anxiety required to achieve this would dependably tolerate bigotry that risk extremism. Thus, our proposition: anxiety and bigotry avoidance (ABA) in international relations and politics of neoliberal civilization is very low, the reason it goes to extremes of Harvey's “creative destruction” (2005).

With low ABA, is neoliberal social science thoroughly a problem-solving social science? If profit is extremely more imperative than people (Chomsky; 1999) of which neoliberalism is proud of, is it persuasive to suggest that neoliberalism is extremely particularistic? One feature of neoliberal social science is recreating itself by rejecting society's ethical values within its networks of transactions to avoid being equitably regulated. Neoliberal canon ensures that all transactions in others' political economy must be done within neoliberal market prescribed conditions, rules, norms and values because the practicability of exploitation is dependent on broad adoption of and adaptation to neoliberal protocols. For instance, structural adjustment programme, debt sustainability, debt moratorium, debt forgiveness, debt swap, debt buy back, Evian Approach, Brady Plan, Baker Plan, heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) initiative, Policy Support Instrument, and Virtual Poverty Fund (VPF), Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the successor SDGs, etc. are prescriptive norms of neoliberalism within the context of debt in order to maintain hegemony. Thus, to make neoliberal rules, norms, and values universal is a “political act driven by political will of a state” (Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao, 2016) different from a universal value not determined by political act because it is a first-order reality. This reinforces our argument that the production, control, and prescription of norms for states with prescribed consciousness in the global political economy is a necessity for building a feasible and stable hegemonic power base and empire.

This is one challenge against Arendt's problem of beginning which on its own is naturally universal and universally natural to societies because man's intellect to discover and apprehend diversity is determined by universality of diversity itself. But, neoliberal social science proudly failed to realize that mankind's intellect does not require universalization, for it is organically a universality that does not require being universalized; hence, it is intellect in diversity that universalizes. To make a value universal is certainly different from a universal value, a fact which neoliberalism validates through hegemonic prescriptions. So we ask: is this neoliberal tyranny always in a state of universalizing its values and norms and cannot be a universal value and norm because of the limitations internal and external to it? Any wonder that neoliberalists would not envision a heroic, self-confident, and pragmatic society that run against self-indulgence which neoliberalist encourage in others? Or wouldn't the world be much better if neoliberal tyranny is reinforced by rationality of diversity and of problem-solving systems? But, given that foisting imperious knowledge is an obsession for neoliberalists against creative self-reliance and sovereignty of others, Easton (1956) bigotedly conceptualized politics as authoritative allocation of value as if production of value does not precedes allocation. Easton's conceptualization expresses contrasting value to Arendt's problem of beginning because of the needed capacity to create, engineer, and maintain development towards sovereign production of value (Yasin; 2010) consistent with national challenges and needs.

But where did this thought process emerge from? Mont Pelerin Society (MPS), founded in 1947 by Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman created neoliberal market opposed to state either to weaken state for neoliberal market or creating a ‘state’ within a state, that is, creating a market that is as powerful as or even more than a state. Moved by Hegelian dialectics, Darwinian survival of the powerful against the weak and Machiavellian political morality, neoliberals were convinced that neoliberalism is a universal value unhindered; thus, the reason for illiberalism in making the value universal. But relatedly, if the value of neoliberalism is universal why were neoliberals despotic by corrupting, sanctioning, overthrowing, waging war through regime change, cultural obliteration, geopolitical redrawing, and ideological asphyxiation to illiberally making others internalize neoliberal values forcefully? If this inquiry is any rational guide it follows that to be illiberally prescriptive is to provoke adversarial dictatorship into political fascism which is oftentimes illustrated by despotic and hegemonic occidentals when neoliberal prescriptions are being rejected. Though, neoliberal social science arrogates distinctiveness to itself as if it has the exclusive merit, the logic of distinctiveness presumes that diversities are universal features needing effortless acknowledgement of all towards a liberal and not a repressed space for competition, because a stifled space and open competition are adversarial contradictions.

Then, our model argues that one social value cannot be distinct in itself; what is distinct does not stand alone but in relation to another social value that is uniquely distinct in context, culture, content, and history. Again, the comparative value of a development must be approved in their context and uniqueness because individuality itself is logically and competitively unique as contexts are unique in their uniqueness for competition. The argument is: one practice cannot compare itself and still claim to be of distinct value to the universe except to itself alone. Also, a theory cannot be in relation to itself and claim to be distinct while seeing itself as the basic value that must be imbibed. Relatedly, a theory claiming distinctiveness must as a condition cognitively does so within the rationality of comparativeness insofar that the basis for comparisons exists. So, the theory of uniformity of all societies is ridiculous because there is no reasonable basis to accept that as true given that diversity is inexorably a social fact. This speaks to the perceptible reality that diversity and individuality makes meaning in social relations since the value of anything human and material cannot be properly proven without relating it to another value in social relation. The plain logic is, to push for liberalism or neoliberalism with illiberalism in a world of multidiversity against universal values is bigoted, a bigotry equivalent to extremism. Oddly enough, illiberalism founded on exceptionalism provokes adversarial contradictions and fictions when it suitably takes conformity and nonconformity as features of individualism. Reason is, the value of conformity is consistent with neoliberal prescription yet nonconformity is not consistent with neoliberal individualism but with state drive for self-reliance.

Deeply, the history, survival, and expansion of neoliberalism doubtlessly survives on prescription of adversative values, norms and rules as cultural requirement of the prescriber for the prescribed to internalize as a frame and tools for cognitive, economic, and political control. This purpose is not necessarily for growth of the prescribed but primarily for cognitive subservience and dependence within the broader context of social relations not of production but of prescription of which IMF/World Bank are famous. Succinctly illustrated below is the role of prescription in global capitalist political economy:

Every prescription represents the imposition of one man’s choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the man prescribed to into one that conforms to the prescriber’s consciousness, thereby making the behaviour of the prescribed, a prescribed behaviour, following as it does the guidelines of the prescriber (Freire; 2002).

At the core of neoliberalism is the social relationship of prescription obsessed by subjectivism and exceptionalism to shape and reshape politics, policies and the world for a new world order towards a probable disorder. Chomsky’s “unaccountable private tyrannies taking decisions on behalf of the state” (1999) would evidently possess prescriptively authoritarian character for hegemony. One feature of prescriptively authoritarian neoliberalism is that, it prescribes for others but intolerant of prescription from the prescribed. So, we declare that the creed of subjectivism, exceptionalism and prescriptivism (SEP) formed the core of neoliberal science. This reality works against the required liberality for growth because prescribed consciousness of nations cannot inspire creativity and competitive powers for global development in the fullness of diversities that are to be challenged. For this, the creed that foreign investment is flawlessly dependable is a creation of prescribed consciousness; thus making them to live by the prescribers’ prescription which eventually endangers creative sovereignty that devalues statehood. This tyranny of prescription also hinders the crucial possibility of coherent social science and of course, intelligently prognostic and problem-solving-critical-discourse as typified by neoliberalism’s tyranny and hegemonic power politics.

IV. SORTING OUT THE ADVERSATIVE CONTRADICTIONS IN NEOLIBERALISM:TOWARDS A RIGOROUSLY INSIGHTFUL AND DIAGNOSTIC SOCIAL SCIENCE

We argued earlier that neoliberalism couldn't be a "hegemonic discourse" (Harvey; 2005) with impact without illogicality reinforcing chauvinism because of its frivolousness with paradoxes. The making of hegemony and neoliberalism as a dictatorial discourse is a reaffirmation of Said's (2004) perception that "bigotry spread faster than reason" in a world driven by greed of the few against the need of the many. Stewart, Harte, and Sambrook (2011) argued that any social theory claiming to be incorrigible is unscientific and impermeable to rationality. As a policy model of social studies and a hegemonic experience in international relations and politics, divestment of economic power from public to private component of society (Plehwe, Neunhoffer, and Walpen; 2006) is no license for broader development. Exploring diversity in geopolitics is a perceptive social science goal, so it is realistic to acknowledge the creativity internal to both state and market, explore and develop rather than the neoliberalists' duplicitous demonization of the state. Neoliberal social science, for instance, failed to prudently realize that it is the character and purpose given to an ideology that in the final analysis governs it and not what it claims to be, after all, ideology can be deliberately deceptive. But, profiteering without end has not enabled neoliberalists to know this in the process of capitalist restructuring of the world leading to the "reshaping of the global economic map" (Dicken; 2004).

Curiously, can empirical facts determine the true character of a theory as against its assumptions and reality? And, could Berger and Luckmann's "a thing is what it is called, and could not be called anything else" (1966) be empirically persuasive and correct? Our model says that a thing is what it is, not by its assertion but by its experiential action. So, the claim that there is no alternative to neoliberalism is a reason for the doctrinarian spirit to take neoliberalism to the world and the world to neoliberalism since the follow-on claim is that the world would not experience freedom from war, crisis, and hunger without it (Wolfson & Roberts; 2004). Strangely, from where are 21st century hegemonic wars, state and insurgent terrorism, corporate banditry, greed-induced corruption, transborder money laundering, global inflation, and sovereign debt default? What of the prevalence of global capital flow volatility, high unemployment, increasing inequality in poverty, weak competition, financial crisis, and decline in global trade in spite of increasing global wealth (Schwab and Sala-i-Martin, 2017)? Going by these crises, if indeed neoliberalism is the solution to the world's problems, does it logically follow that it must also be the problem or are these crises part of the values of neoliberalism? Could the seeming illusion of neoliberal strength by its wild perceptions and attitudes be a problem that makes possible these crises? In line with knowledge creation theory (Nonaka; 1991), our model think the world as a workroom for realistic solutions in their diversity because the world is useful only in diverse solutions. This goes against neoliberal illusion of inviolability spiced with exceptionalism, prescriptivism, and interventionism as cognitive contempt that irrationally breeds these crises.

To illustrate, cognitive contempt for self-assertive sovereignty initiated the superficiality that state and freedom are irreconcilable, that is, "state is toxic for freedom" (Satori; 1970) but neoliberal market is not incompatible with freedom. Misleading as this is, it failed to cognitively speak to specific actualities of Deng Xiaoping's China, Lee Quan Yew's Singapore, etc. from the diversity framework of state experiences reputed for resourceful independence to the pain of neoliberalists. Likewise, Alexis Tsipras' Greece approved that state in the Satorian consciousness is indeed toxic for market freedom; however, the result is that the Greeks "had their economic future stolen from them because public properties were privatized by force and have also lost their sovereignty to IMF, EU, foreign monopoly banks, and Wall Street speculators" (Roberts; 2018). For diagnostic social science, state and market are and can be compatibles, but such compatible unification is not to replace one with the other in so far that market building would not take precedence over state building. In any case, the development of neoliberal market in all openness is by no means free from the planned and prejudiced role of the state. This makes Norbert's subscription to the fact that "a successful economic liberalism presupposes active intervention by states to carry out reforms" (1992:22) is beyond question, but is bigotedly and falsely ignored and never acknowledged as the source of vitality neoliberalism benefits from since its birth.

Perhaps, it is not a remarkable experience that neoliberalism confronts a large population of the world with the "cruel choice between bread and dignity" (Berger; 1974) like the Hobson's choice: it is either market or nothing as if bread and dignity are not balancing demands. We think through this to suggest fundamentalism as a defining feature of neoliberalism to making it lack the staying power to be non-interventionist, non-prescriptive and non-tyrannical which distrust the open society claim. But, for a perceptively diagnostic social science with goals for exploring, reviewing, and making best of diversity, bread and dignity are joined at the hip of humanity. To abandon the quest for excellence while being bogged down with mere means of survival is to be a perpetual victim of neoliberal subjectivism, exceptionalism, prescriptivism and tyranny. With this, we proceed with another social science goal of testing and refining theories. To do this, we utilize the conceptual origin and values of neoliberal individualism as connected to both state and market. In one of the confusing

conceptualizations, neoliberalists are certain that individualism is unique only to capitalism without the least cognitive idea that state can be individualistic in the struggle for self-reliance in international relations and politics. While the former is cognitively inventive for exchange value by greedily trading society's bread and dignity to produce very few individual billionaires; the latter is tolerant and regulatory with democratic duty to both individuals and society. In the former, society exist not, the reverse is the case with the latter.

As a cultural reality state has the capacity for independent initiative and protected individuality, a reality that neoliberal theory failed to know is not unique to capitalism's individualism. Geopolitically, state expresses broadminded individualism by projecting identity and ambition required for crafting enduring efforts for progress. This is practicable in state to state, state to individual, and state to TNCs, etc. as consciously enacted by states. Consciously protective of its national culture because it is core to internal social harmony, China ensured that its Google must not be same with occidental Google in order not to endanger her national sovereignty. Thus, international diplomacy is simply state individualism advancing her interest abroad as a representation of public investment, security, and development. In few cases, the interest of ruling elites sometimes coincides with or overwhelms the interest of the state, no doubt. But, it is naive of neoliberalists to allow narrow comprehension of facts to oversimplify realities like the unimaginative individualism of African states that negated the pursuit of dynamic self-reliance. With few exceptions, much of state and market individualisms in Africa were sterile because of cognitive anxiety, unintelligible purposes, and primitive accumulation, etc. spurred first by the introduction of liberalism by the colonizers followed by present day neoliberalism foisted by IMF, etc. Believably, the needed balance between state and market individualism for constructive social relations were initially, maybe till date, mismanaged in postcolonial Africa. So, is it not disingenuous for neoliberalists to rationalize the failings of Africa to pragmatically and strategically make her choice on how to resolve the problem of beginning as a pretext to adopt and adapt to neoliberalism?

As part of social science brief to interrogate theories and bring to light, if any, fairy tales, we seek to prove the falsity of neoliberalism's assertion that its values and policies overwhelmingly spread to other civilizations through the market because of its superior persuasive rationality. A diagnostic social science would have it that absolutization of prescriptive knowledge through undercover undertakings (Perkins; 2006), regime change, Transnational Corporation's bribery of state ruling elites, intercultural knowledge sharing, etc. played roles in this regards. A diagnostic social science also considers Africa's irrationality against social organization, education, learning, risk taking, and the crucial value of political power as factors. So, the power to unilaterally spread neoliberal values lies not with market but with the shared role of state as it were. Like the state, the interventionist character of neoliberalism promotes extremist policies in manners that are less democratic, highly bigoted, sadistic, and more despotic. The 2003 and 2011 brutal regime change in Iraq and Libya respectively predictably illustrates greatly the neoliberalists' despotic and self-indulgent vision to thwart these resourceful states efforts in defence of their organic sovereignty. These realities have yet again proved that in a neoliberal world, peace, justice and order are hardly legitimate values insofar that despotic profiteering is against others' civilization (Senghaas; 2002).

The neoliberal profiteering rationality is a self-seeking anarchy where “what is to the interest of the capitalist interventionist is for the people to continue in a state of submersion, impotent in the face of oppressive reality” (Freire; 1973:53). Why would market neoliberalism prefer to have a Russia, China, Cuba, Singapore, North Korea, Mahathir's Malaysia, Allende's Chile, etc. with weak institutions, executing neoliberal prescriptions, and finally converting them into territories? To become territories would mean not daring to express self-preservation instinct and ambition to build global power structures let alone threaten the hegemony. But, even as states, the morality, economy, and society of these countries have had to persistently contend with neoliberal tyranny. In any case, Thatcher in her self-preoccupation said: “society does not exist, only individuals”, (1981) without contemplating the effect of individuals without regulation. As Camus would have it and consistent with our diagnostic social science “a man without ethics is a wild beast loosed upon the world”(1954/1988). But, the Nordic states of Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and Iceland would develop state-driven market economy with the integration of social welfare and economic efficiency. The outcomes are productive economic efficiency, fair income distribution, social cohesion, robust social security system, strong social capital, and huge investment in human capital (Hirschl; 2011). Does this take wraps off neoliberal paradox, that is, if the Nordic social science is a review of the weaknesses internal to neoliberalism?

One claim of neoliberal market individualism is that nonconformity is its singular feature without knowing that nonconformity is also a feature of heroic states with intelligibly confident ambition to progressively transform political power for progress. State nonconformity provokes, contest and retrench hegemonic power of neoliberalists' corporatism in private property, currency domination, and free market. But the anxiety-driven inconsistency of neoliberal capitalist is to escape the thought of a civilization using a variant of nonconformity to frighten her hegemony. But if neoliberalism is nervously inconsistent, should the apostles still pontificate about exceptionalism? If this follows, can neoliberalism be a theoretical framework with explanatory and predictive powers to properly understand global reality? But even if theoretical framework at

the level of social science knowledge is not a neoliberal goal, is hegemonic effort to frustrate others from operating from the point of power in international relations and politics (Yasin; 2010) not a bigoted goal? If so, is it not misleading a claim that neoliberalism is value-blind when there are no invisible market forces but hidden forces with prejudiced ideas fretfully menacing the birth of diagnostic social science that has the heroic task to liberating morality, economy, society, and state to making the world competitively better?

If Maxton and Randers (2016) are reliable, the claim that neoliberalism was formulated by Mont Pelerin Society (MPS) in 1947 by Fredrick Hayek and Milton Friedman questions the objectivity claims. The MPS argued that state role in development policies brings human dignity and freedom under threat; hence, resistance to state intervention, combating Keynesian planning, promote classical liberalism, and strengthen the principles and practices of free society. To legitimize free market economics, econometrics, and neoliberal researches, the MPS established the doctrinal Nobel Award. Coherently, these efforts are mere political subjectivities expressing variant of knowledge in diversity; taken together, all human knowledge is political. To Stedman-Jones (2012), global network of politicians, academics, entrepreneurs, public intellectuals, stockbrokers, mediemen, bankers, and spy bodies, etc. played various roles in the making of neoliberalism. To continuously review, improve, and market neoliberal ideology, succession of think tank and monetary institutions, namely, the American Enterprise Institute, Bank of England, Cato Institute, Institute of Economic Affairs, Center for Policy Studies, Adam Smith Institute, Universities of Chicago and Virginia, Wall Street, Center for Global Development, IMF, World Bank, IFCs, Foundations, Plutocrats, and Governments to birth and keep up neoliberalism. Can these institutions be described as invisible forces or hidden forces of, for, and in the market? Is this not consistent with the assertion that social forces were recruited to obsessively-forcefully market neoliberalism for “power, money, and natural resources” (Perkins; 2006)? So, is it still speculative to say that neoliberal market is politically created, funded, directed, reviewed, and improved upon for politically directed goals?

The diagnostic social science model speaks to the value that all human vocation not excepting neoliberal state and market need directions. Logically, if neoliberal market insists that it needs no direction because it is unforced, it means that it has no material sense of purpose. To wit, market can neither have sense without purpose nor purpose without sense because it has goals, yet goals are not ontological but constructivist as all constructivist reality experience deviations requiring intervention to achieve set goals. A test case was the Obama administration’s bail out for the not-too-big-to-fail and too-big-to-indict US banks, namely, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, etc. in 2008 financial crisis illustrates the relativistic nature of even neoliberal government and markets. Even if the financial crisis was a plan out, but because it is already a crisis that negatively impact on the purpose and survival of the state, intervention becomes the rational task because survival of the state is antecedent to market. Curiously, greed and imprudence of the banks led to the 2008 financial crash yet the US Government in 2009 rescued the banks with \$16.8 trillion of tax payers’ money and not the publicized \$700 billion (Amadeo; 2018). One bailout outcome was the merging of the seeming bankrupt banks into powerful oligopolies. Similarly, US Auto industry was rescued with \$80 billion to avert colossal closure and hundreds of thousands of job loss and before you yawn, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) was enacted to stimulate public works at the cost of \$831 billion (Amadeo; 2018).

In the age of paradox wouldn’t the Obama Administration get his inspiration to enact the Recovery Act, 2009 from the Keynesian economic theory which our diagnostic social science recognizes? Are the Recovery Act, 2009 and other direct state interventions in the market consistent with neoliberal economic theory? If these are facts enough, is it now settled that the private sector is conventionally dependent on the public sector to keep profiteering consistently going and productively too? Irrefutable is the fact that no private corporation can efficiently, productively, and profitably operate in the market when inflation rate is at its peak; it needs the macroeconomic role of state through Central Bank to manage and bring down inflation rate to a level that is healthy for both state and market. Like others, private banks in Nigeria illustrate a classic case of market dependence on state. Prior to 29th May, 2015, much of Federal funds were in private banks, free funds that gave them the *carte blanche* for unsustainable banking policies while declaring huge profit after tax. But, with the execution of Treasury Single Account (TSA), trillions of naira of the funds was moved to the bankers’ bank. Alas, most of these private banks were hit by the reality of real banking business for the first time. If indeed the state does matter to market, why would the global capitalist ruling class demand for autonomous Central Bank but not autonomous state? Is it to weaken state macroeconomic sovereignty to allow for effortless IMF, World Bank’s, etc. intrusive prescriptions?

It is not unusual that inconsistency and arbitrariness are at the core of global politics for hegemony and tyranny to endure; thus, what is good for one must not be good for another. If state macroeconomic sovereignty is not good for all, of course, deployment of 20,000 military and police officers by the state of Italy to defend WTO G-8 summit in Genoa, 2001, against protesters, is. Similarly, WTO G-8 meetings in Seattle, 1999, and Gleneagles, 2005, and other editions that were met with state brutality against protesting citizens in defence of

neoliberalism. So, when is it that the G-8 countries of France, Germany, Italy, UK, US, Japan, Canada, and Russia would even pretend to discuss issues confronting the world and how to resolve them? With the parochial character of neoliberalism how are issues of global security, economic growth, terrorism, global economy, energy, and crisis management be discussed and in whose interest? In reality, the G-8 is largely a neoliberal club of Presidents/Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers, Finance Ministers, and Central Bank Governors. As a steering club, it discusses strategies and formulates neoliberal policies that are pushed through prescription, bribery, and coercion. Trade liberalizations, removal of obstacles to neoliberal trade, macroeconomic threats, global distribution of power, the dynamics of such distribution and the social relations, and how it negatively affect members of the club are discussed (Rowan; 2001).

Laissez faire and tyranny are superficially not known to be identical; however, disingenuously, the former has helped in building the latter through neoliberalism, yet liberalism and tyranny are irrefutable elements of neoliberalism. For instance, the hegemonic US dollar was politically created, politically and economically managed, and politically protected by the US ruling class because the dollar is at the core of American hegemonic power. To ensure dollar hegemony, countries would have to sign on the dollar as foreign reserve but the value in relation to a country's currency must be determined not politically but by market. To contemplate currency that rivals the dollar would be met not with tolerance but with despotic violence. Norrlof (2014) identified three power capabilities the US had used to maintain dollar hegemony and tyranny: bargaining, structural, and socializing power. Bargaining powers are exercised using threat, reward or bribery to provoke conformity from passively weak nations but are forced to reckon with because of their global commodities. Spiro (1999) illustrated the bankruptcy of the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange rate in 1971 where the US insisted the Gulf states specifically Saudi Arabia must accept only the dollar in pricing Oil in the global market. In exchange for this conformity was military security (Zimmermann; 2002). But, if Saddam's Iraq and Gaddafi's Libya had not resisted the US dollar would they be met with pitilessly anarchic regime change?

Shaping structure of interactions between countries by prescriptions and modifying group behaviour towards group conformity to dollar hegemony are the goals of structural and socializing powers. The WTO, IMF, WB, BIS, IFI, etc. illustrates the three types of power through which “the US organized states around liberal and neoliberal agendas” (Norrlof; 2014:1063) and socializing them into neoliberal norms and involuntary consensus. Camouflaged as global institutions with pretended broad interest, World Economic Forum, G-8, etc. countries invite states through their Ministers of Finance and Central Bank Governors to interact with US Federal Reserve, Wall Street, big conglomerates, and other occidentals to endorse prescriptive policies. If this is any guide and consistent with our proposition that neoliberalism is extremely political, Strange's (1987) four interactional structures of power, namely, production, finance, security, and knowledge power structures were part of the making of neoliberal hegemony to ensuring Mill's (1869/1995) “tyranny of conformity”. These power structures individually or in combination are used by US to fortify dollar hegemony. The question is: is it impossible for global currencies not to be supported by strong security power structures while other countries' currencies are left for market to determine its value? Any wonder that WTO, IMF, WB, etc. constitute part of knowledge and finance structure to extract unnatural commitment from client countries to accepting neoliberal prescriptions to complement?

The World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) is one evident reality that belies neoliberalism. As a state-private Forum, it defined National Competitiveness as “set of institutions, policies, and factors determining the level of productivity of an economy” (Schwab & Sala-i-Martin; 2015:4). IMD and Atkinson explained same to mean “how an economy manages the totality of its resources and competencies to increase the prosperity of its population” (2012) and “the ability to export more value added item than it imports” (2013) respectively. As political decisions of state, the GCI evaluate country's overall performance, competitiveness performance of economies, and identifying drivers of productivity. For diagnostic social science model, production, productivity, export, import, efficiency, and prosperity are not values for neoliberal market to exclusively determine; the state has legitimate task to determine and lay foundation for productivity from which private market begin its egoistical transactions but under required regulations detested by neoliberalists. Mao Tse Tung's conceptualization of politics as “war without bloodshed” may partly be alluding to the critical value of production, productivity, and being productive. To this effect, the Forum identified 12 pillars of productivity of national economies, namely, strong institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, health and primary education, and higher education and training. Other determinants are goods market efficiency, labour market efficiency, financial market development, technological readiness, market size, business sophistication, and innovation (Schwab & Sala-i-Martin; 2015).

A review of the indicators shows the mutual role of state and market in determining productivity, economic growth, national development, capability for self-reliance, cognitive respect among nations, freedom from fascist prescription, single-minded determination for future prosperity, and “freedom for human completion” Freire (2002). A further review indicate that the first listed five set of GCI pillars including

technological readiness are basic obligations of state because they are subjects for the prejudices of market profiteering, after all, state building is antecedent to market building (Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao; 2016). Aside, the latter seven pillars derive their root, inspiration, strength, direction, and regulation from the robust quality of the former five pillars. Contrary to neoliberal social science, Schwab & Sala-i-Martin (2015) acknowledged that the 12 pillars are interrelated and reinforcing. Dialectically implying a weakness in or absence of one negatively impacts the other. Confident of GCI, it follows that a strong regulatory, individualistically self-reliant, and innovation-driven like Singapore exemplified the values of diagnostic social science to enable it consistently came 2nd and 3rd most competitive economy in the world out of 144 and 137 countries between 2012 and 2015 and 2016 and 2017 respectively, including being ranked 2nd in the Global Ease of Doing Business for 2017 (World Bank; 2018).

More evidence against “no alternative to neoliberalism” emerged with the public and private sectors of Singapore rated as the best in the world for the fifth year. In 2017 Singapore was ranked first in global public sector performance with excellent lead in education/training and market efficiency pillars (Schwab & Sala-i-Martin; 2017). For Qatar and Ethiopia, ownership and operation of airlines are 100% while in Singapore public holding is 56%. In 2017, the Qatar airline was declared best in the world by the Annual Skytrax Survey of 24 million passengers with Singapore coming second. This ranking was however, interchanged in 2018 with Singapore coming 1st and Qatar 2nd. For Ethiopian Airline founded in 1945, fully owned by government, and for various years declared the best in Africa and ranked the 11th most punctual Airline in the world in 2017 by beating most privately owned and managed Airlines. This Ethiopian feat of many years was conceitedly described as “capitalist success in Marxist Ethiopia” (CSM; 1988) as if governments in Africa cannot manage business. Nigeria, in 2016 established Presidential Enabling Business Environment Council (PEBEC) with 3 Executive Orders on business regulation reforms for ease of doing business (EDB) leading to gradual removal of bureaucratic constraints. The 2018 EDB Index showed Nigeria moved 24 points from 170th in 2016 and 169th in 2017 to 145th out of 190 countries in 2018 (World Bank; 2018). Also in 2018, Nigeria moved ten (10) places in the Global Competitiveness Index from 115th position at the global level to its preceding 125th position in 2017 with overall 47.6%. In specifics, indicators for infrastructure, health, innovation capability, and business dynamism (Schwab & Sala-i-Martin; 2018) shows that the Nigerian state did provide the necessary environment for business and economic competitiveness as these indicators showed appreciable improvement.

Compelling is Olson’s (1993) organic metaphor – stationary and roving banditry of state and market respectively in constant collusion. Our model consider this relevant because roving banditry is equivalent to Perkins’ (2006) recruited intellectual spies as economic Hit Men sent to the rest of the world by the pact between states and conglomerates. Oddly enough, the duplicity of neoliberalism is that, it could send over 2000 spies as economic Hitmen on roving banditry mission to states that are governed by the values of stationary banditry but would not take likely with states that do not allow room for both stationary and roving banditries. Thus, John Perkins participant’s observation of both bandits colluding to build neoliberal market and by association the neoliberal state has helped to reveal the weaknesses and limitations internal to neoliberalism. The Machiavellian neoliberals may proselytize the illusion of business freedom as the most efficient form of social organization; but, banditry cannot take place without being interventionist like migratory mercenary ruthlessly intruding into others’ reality. Using this metaphor, we categorized states with the controlling votes in IMF/World Bank and Wall Street into stationary banditry and IMF/World Bank as roving banditry, that is, if Chussudovsky’s (2017) evidential claim that the latter are controlled by the former.

Rodney (1981) had employed the banditry model to describe capitalist colonialism as “one-arm-bandit”, but is the portrayal equivalently consistent with capitalism’s new world tyranny? The world is a diversity of values yet neoliberal ‘order’ through the illiberality of Wall Street and Washington Consensus would imperiously appropriate both the descriptive and prescriptive macroeconomic task, respectively that is, the means money *isused* and *shouldbeused* to allocate work and rewards of work among members of economy. The phrase it takes two to create order or disorder is apt; the neoliberal order is built by roving banditry (conglomerates) and stationary banditry (states) by formulating neoliberal policies with indoctrinated technocrats as roving bandits around the globe and recruitment of these bandits as financial technicians from IMF/World Bank to implements these policies respectively in countries whose leaders are stationary bandits. Curiously, how conceivable is it that the bombing of Muammar Ghaddafi to death is rational to Obama administration and Wall Street’s neoliberals when the former within the values of diagnostic social science exemplified state individuality in developmental leadership to his people by having 100% gold reserve and protective of macroeconomic sovereignty? *Ab initio*, the survival and expansion of neoliberalism could not be possible without hyper fundamentalism, subjectivism, exceptionalism, anarchic greed, parochialism, fascism, prescriptivism, and unaccountability in global relations. *Democracy where art thou?*

Consistently in perspective, neoliberal social science values have empirically and paradoxically confirm that occidental society where state emerged is far off from being an open society with democratic values as conceitedly claimed. These occidental values that may not qualify for a diversity-promoting model do

not bear in mind let alone “guarantee and protect rational exchange” (Popper; 1999) between and among civilizations. For one, unregulated global capitalism has no tolerance for intellectually diverse rational transactions because like a beast of burden it is let loosed against the world, and if Bessner is sincere, surely, an open society is that which envisions a world where diverse humanity is cognitively acknowledged in rationally legitimate transactions (2018). Is this not why subjectivism and exceptionalism of the occidentals are enough to negate critical discourse of coherent social science that the world is in need of to heal it of unreflective irrationality? The “transformation of truth into lie, lie becoming truth, and lie into consensus, consensus that must not be questioned” (Chussudovsky; 2017) is the tragedy that the world is reduced to as if problem-solving intellect is anathema to healing the world against anarchic irrationality. Our reflective and diagnostic social science model values Popper’s and Bessner’s rational exchange and recognition of human diversity for purpose of healthy but dynamic balance among diverse worldview, a reality that makes checks and balances inexorable in truth and fact.

Home truth, checks and balances are not features of liberal democracy as claimed but inherently basic features of the dialectics of the tangible world. Reason is, it speaks to the need for rational individuality as admission of inherent weakness, yet checks and balances don’t mean that irrationality should act as checks on wisdom or corruption as checks on integrity because the former cannot balance out the latter. Like Harari said, “nature is a bundle of inevitable checks and balances and without this the strong would have driven the world into extinction” (2011:45) to the pain of the weak without the latter ever becomes strong in the cyclic order. Our attitude to this is basic because of the need for profound and analytic social science to become disincentives to market fundamentalism and hegemony that tends near ideological irrationality. Cycling-Door-Approach as a value of diagnostic social science is a required disincentive to ideological chauvinism of neoliberalism which dishonestly rejects Keynesian values but remain inexorable to neoliberal political economy. This approach assumes that dialectics, mutuality, obligation, dynamism, and sequencing are inexorably straddling between the fluid nature of state and market and conversely, a reality of Nordic social science in their praxis. Individualities of states and the unique problems of market in relation to states require innovative problem-solving as a primary condition. Doubtlessly, states irrespective of the level of productive forces of society will be able to exercise choice in global relations and politics within the values of diversity and broadmindedness against neoliberalism that negates sovereign choice.

V. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Return to the start, we developed propositions for methodological inquiry into neoliberalism in the background to the research. Conceptualization of neoliberalism within the context of “no alternative to neoliberalism” leads us to whether neoliberalism is bigotry or scholarship? Since ideology is a variant of philosophy in contradiction, we sought for profound and diagnostic social science to identify and resolve the paradoxes of neoliberalism. The developed propositions were explored and interrogated, and following this was the discovery that neoliberalism was matter-of-fact heavily inspired by Hegelian dialectics, Darwinist survival of the strong in crudity, the Machiavellian political morality, and the Marxist prophecy. With literature review we resolved that these inspirations must have guided neoliberalism and its concomitant social science into living subjectivism, exceptionalism, and prescriptivism. But, cognizant that absolute market freedom is extremism we were guided by cognitive relativism since all human values are cognitively relativistic. The research objectives was provided, namely, to know if neoliberalism is emotionally conceived, intellectually illiberal, tyrannically prescriptive, rigidly intolerant of methodical criticism, and hypocritically despotic and neomercantilist. With Said’s “bigotry spread faster than reason in a world driven by greed” (2004), at least, it was observable that the objectives might not be difficult to come by, in the final analysis.

Making sense of secondary data, we qualitatively reviewed and lay bare the inner phenomena and prospects of neoliberalism using dialectical inquiry approach. Knowing that theoretical review for theory development is basic to research, our methodology took seriously that fact and value are mutually exclusive, notwithstanding the conceited claim that neoliberalism is a universal value rather than a value being brutally universalized. In other words, the dialectical review was idea and facts oriented with the use of dialectical logic to examine values and ideas that emerged from neoliberal practices. We contended that if neoliberalism must be the only solution to humanity’s problem it must also be the only cause of the global anarchy let loosed. Following the claim that neoliberalism has no alternative we consider the thought to be caused by ignorance: ignorance of the theory of natural alternatives and inherent variation, with the former leading to illusion of diversity while the latter to ignorance of cognitive relativism. Finding the ignorance scary, we resolved that diagnostic social science has a huge task to cure neoliberal fundamentalism. Doing this require Deng Xiaoping’s irrefutable lessons that irrespective of how principled, sure, accepted, illustrious, and credible, optimisms, prospects, popular belief, diktat from scriptural experts, and simple ideology respectively, truth cannot be deduced from all of them, but from facts (Mohamad; 2000).

Although there are limitations in research and this is no exception, we thought that providing useful direction is basic in order to avoid perennially endangered world. And since the world like man is inevitably and permanently in need of growth and improvement, we identified reflection, regulation and direction as three features of diagnostic social science if it must be a problem-solving science. We affirmed that capitalist neoliberalism increased the sophistication of the world with the radical development of technological infrastructure. Not so with the social relations that inexorably ensued from the revolutionized means of production as it is sophistication without cognitive respect for purposeful humanity. Technological revolution is deeply tied to doing what is possible to reduce humanity to a thing than what is necessary to connect essence to existence and existence to essence in a continuum of endless interactions. The impact is a global social relation deeply entangled in extremism as if socially discursive relations for expression of diversity of knowledge through critical discussion are no longer human vocation. As Hartman (2005) would say, neoliberalism “limited the knowledge-driven solutions the world need” by foisting neoliberal ideology where the “connection between neoliberalism and democracy is tenuous at best” (Bessner; 2018) as in Chile (Fisher; 2009).

Gagging the world to one theory against diverse facts unique to others is no liberalism but abuse of knowledge against the generous purpose of nature. We considered individuality’s interdependence, cognitive valuing, and comprehending differences, challenges, and dynamisms in their significant paradoxes as the ultimate of sophistication. If the dialectical inquiry method is a useful one because of its fidelity to critical discourse even if antagonistic, indeed, it provides confidence that a diagnostic social science will grow to heal the world. To heal the world of this growing disease, Stieglitz’ (2000) advised that ideology must not be given prominence over rigorous intellectual debate, perhaps, to avoid neoliberalism’s instrumental rationality for hegemony. This research has raised not so many basic propositions for future interrogation, affirmation or nullification. If this research is of value to problem-solving science, future research should ensure the need for “possibility of a constructive form of inter-social science dialogue” (Hartman; 2005) where crosscutting perspectives across civilizations are interrogated to avoid the strangulation of natural diversity, a short step to illusion of knowledge diversity. This research is not free from limitations; thus, future social science research may seek to explore the inner goal of hegemonic neoliberalism and why subjectivism, exceptionalism, illiberalism, prescriptivism, extremism, and mercantilism could be the fundamentals. Doing this is likely to enable the world make sense of what really constitute subsidy for bigoted social science that terrorizes humanity.

As a historic task for diagnostic social science using dialectical inquiry approach, the effort is to bring seemingly irreconcilable opposites together because the world cannot progress with hegemonic threat of war and violent war. The real fundamentals of neoliberalism as above makes the world more incoherent, yet the world is in need of preventive and curative values against compulsive optimism, like exceptionalism, etc. that makes the world fertile for extremism. Although, cognitive exchange of ideas through knowledge sharing (Nonaka & Takeuchi; 1995) with other civilizations unsettles Huntington’s ahistorical peak of power in his “End of History”, a sustainably dynamic global civilization is a possibility not with cognitive subjectivism, but with cognitive interdependence. As global power is gradually shifting to non-occidentals, hegemonic neoliberalism must not provoke the world to Nietzsche’s unconscionable nihilism before the inexorable shift. Diagnostic social science seeks “cognitive maturity through critical discussion” (Popper; 1999:83) where the unique paradoxes of centers of global power, traditional and emerging are interrogated with sense of equitable balance for the preservation of the most cherished good in the world social order. For global leadership to be sophisticated, modern, and useful it must not require hegemonic violence to unsettled the world in a bid to loot it, because in the age of paradox (Handy; 1994) competing antagonisms for progress is required to avoid complete apocalypse.

Drawing to close, “no alternative to neoliberalism” has had much devastating impact on methodical social science as unregulated crudity of force replaces reasonable exchange to understanding paradoxes in diversity. Governments are becoming weak in regulating the disaster that neoliberalism further brought the world into. The social science truism that everything in the world is in dialectical relation to making the world less cynically threatening is realistic, but this is when crude social Darwinism does not replace critical discourse. A dialectical social science in its coherence is what the world needs now because it moderates between two or more extremes where adverse alternatives are rejected and diverse alternatives are accepted. So, we resolved that it is a fact that one alternative is no alternative in a world of diverse alternatives, a fact that make possible the shifting global balance of power/relation that continues to shift *ad infinitum*. At least, the combination of Ferguson’s “great degeneration” (2013), how Kaplan’s “tragedy and optimisms” (2003) are perceived and managed, and Ford’s “shifting conversation” (1999) are significant to understanding the shift in global balance of power. The shifting global balance itself is an expression of democratic fact from the backdrop of equitable effort; thus, the illiberalism in neoliberalism is inconsistent with the democratic future of the world because neoliberalism itself lives a lie against democracy and liberality. Truth is, there is no liberality in capitalist

neoliberalism else the latter wouldn't have led the world into nihilistic devaluation of human lives that would have transformed challenging possibilities for fuller and richer drive for profound progress.

Thinking through, future research needs to interrogate Marx and Engels' (1848/2011) 19th century prophecy/inspiration for capitalist neoliberalism. At a minimum, the research should establish whether it was a contracted political prophecy or simulated ideological foe to drive Hegelian dialectics to create illiberal paradoxes for hegemony. If it is a prophecy out of intellectual introspection to let the world know of a coming roving banditry, why did they forewarned the imperial Europe of the “Spectre of Communism” coming to haunt it? Whichever, one question is pertinent: does despotism thrives on devious paradox and would neoliberalism have become very pervasive without despotism to a point of transforming into a predatory paradigm and project of the few against the many? In Hegelian logic, would the pervasive capitalist neoliberalism have been a possibility without the dialectical adversary of communism or socialism? So, we dare to propose for direction for future research that no nation develops without bringing together two or more different ideologies in their dialectics and paradoxes insofar that they are pragmatically sorted out and managed with broadminded vision as a condition for the progress of the world. China's gradual assumption in the global balance of power and politics is a cognitive test and proof that antagonistic social science in its paradox and not hegemonic social science in negation of cognitive paradox is the dialectics required for the world not to carry societal, governmental and state collapse on its head. The direction is that, if the world must exist for progress, progress must also be of the world, but this can only be if the neoliberal capitalist connections established almost everywhere will not be with illiberalism. But can it?

Since our diagnostic social science model seeks not to obscure fallacies, propaganda, illusion, and anarchism in theory, but providing directions for future research, thought may be spared for today's China that is establishing connections regionally and continentally. Is China likely to build a world political economy where diverse individuality for ethically equitable obligation to the world is possible without creating an ideology that has no alternatives like “neoliberalism has no alternatives”? This is to know if emerging powers can purposefully guide the diverse world with behaviour that preserves the human order for progress (Khalidun; 2010), work against hegemonic world order that criminalizes politics of creative independence (Chussudovsky; 2017) and interdependence, and to develop diverse value models across civilizations. For assured direction, there is need to immobilize the unfounded drift of humanity into a primitively egocentric anarchy; this requires not tolerating the neoliberal world that is ignorant of how the real world is, but only interested in how it should be (Clarke; 1988). “Nihilistic social science” (Klein; 2007) that nurtured hegemonic neoliberalism and thus takes unconscionable delight in using crisis to foist adverse policy knowledge and regime should be given a taste of the inevitability of alternatives. Future research may investigate if neoliberalism is more ideological with predetermined failed policy knowledge because it has a history of being visionless to contexts and ahistorical to diversities (Judt; 2010) in parts of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, etc.

Direction for future research demands that the ambitious diplomacy between China and Africa may be seen as a study in social science research since progress as a critical sociological value in all society is tied to the coherence, confidence, innovativeness, and pragmatism of its social science. But if truly neoliberalism is an enterprise for looting the resources of Africa, for instance, shouldn't alternative to neoliberalism be a settled subject? Also, should there be alternative to the alternative of neoliberalism whenever it is necessary as a feat of heroic social science? Alternative to alternative is dynamic but cannot be a possibility with ideological fixation and naiveté as it is with a gutless Africa. Neomarxian social scientists in Africa blamed African power elites for being too obsessed with neoliberal capitalism without the looking glass mirror to know that they were too obsessed with socialism. With this infatuation for ideology on both sides social science research for development became improbable because the twin forces were too naïve to know that the two ideologies were no alternative to each other because one is a deficit without the other. Describing “western social science as imperialism”, Ake's (1979) prodigious production of knowledge ended up suggesting an ideological African social science that is more or less socialism, like replacing one ideological social science with another. As Deng Xiaoping's pragmatist social science was treated with disdain the hegemonic neoliberals would deceive the Neomarxists like their power elites into holding tightly to the cognitive illusion that one ideology is enough for inclusive and sustainable progress of any society.

To close, as a condition for society in moderation, the world need open but critical discussion even with revolutionary antagonism that is cognitively tolerant of diverse others because despotism forecloses critical discussion. A paradigm for shared paradoxes in their dialectical forms require Aristotelian Mixed Polity (Aristotle; 1905/1999) consistent with clutching onto two antagonistic ideas at the same time and making best out of them (Schumpeter; 1976) as a guarantee to creating a world where dialectical differentiations are efficaciously appreciated and sorted out. This paradigm says: no one polity has absolute proprietorship of the accepted wisdom and truth required for governance in development (Zakaria; 2003). Popper's “critical discourse” (1999) between public and private can bring about standard perceptiveness of what makes the world content or wretched in the trajectory of progress. Ibn Sina would have it that, “all existence have enduring

causal nexus to each other in necessity” (1025/1999). Future social science research may consider the broad danger of Smith’s (1776/2001) instinctual values of neoliberal market, namely, unlicensed greed, unchecked gluttony, and unlimited wealth. Since unregulated market is extremism, the instinctual market values must be regulated to avoid negating Popper’s “all life is problem-solving” (1999).

A diagnostic social science rooted in methodological intersubjectivity is required against the crude and paternalistic joke: “Neoliberalism has no alternative”. The world cannot intelligently progress if the shibboleth “believing in exactly the same thing that we (neoliberalists) believe” (Ali; 2002) because it is wide off the mark against democratic and equitable progress. The needed wisdom for a dynamically stable world in the eternal rhythm of change is to heed the fact that spreading human beings into different nations, tribes, and races and divergent ideologies and distribution of natural resources were purposed, a brutal fact that requires profound wisdom to accept and appreciate. Interestingly, men and women of common-sense find it easy to comprehend the unique intention of diversity and learn from each and one another. In other words, learning, tolerance, moderation, and knowledge sharing are *given* to humanity to avoid deliberate cheapening of human spirit and of opposing ideas and realities. Thus, we construe that alternative as a derivative of diversity is natural and a certainty, and man’s attempt to deny this objectivity is to risk extremism. In all, “neoliberalism has no alternative” is a fantasy; of course, a doctrinal fallacy that fails to resolve the illusion of liberalism, the self-evident reason that neoconservatives are far from dealing with the intractable crisis of neoliberalism. Perceptive wisdom is dependably what neoliberalism and neoliberalists would require to persuading them to prudently know that prevention of totalitarian torture and injustice in their crude brutalities to others is and should be the most cultured value, ambition, civilization, politics, business, and leadership in the 21st Century and of all ages.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abba, et al. (2016) Constitution for the Institution of Resilient Social Organization: A Formulation of Political Will Perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 4, 7, 278-292.
- [2]. Ake, C. (1979) *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- [3]. Ali, T. (2002) *The Clash of Fundamentalism: Crusades, Jihads, and Modernity*. London: Verso Books.
- [4]. Allchin, D. (1988) Values in Science and in Science Education. In B.J. Fraser & K.G. Tobin (Eds.), *International Handbook of Science Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [5]. Amadeo, K. (2018) *Beyond the Great Recession: What Happened and How to Prosper*. New York: World Money Watch
- [6]. Arendt, H. (1977) *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: Penguin.
- [7]. Arendt, H. (1963) *On Revolution*. London: Penguin Books.
- [8]. Aristotle, N. (1905/1999) *Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [9]. Atkinson, R.D. (2013) *Competitiveness, Innovation, and Productivity: Clearing Up the Confusion*. Washington: ITIF.
- [10]. Berger, P. (1974) *Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change*. New York: Basic Book.
- [11]. Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [12]. Berniker, E. & McNabb, D.E. (2006) Dialectical Inquiry: A Structured Qualitative Research Method. *The Qualitative Report*, 11, 4, 643-664.
- [13]. Bessner, D. (2018) The George Soros Philosophy and its Fatal Flaw. [Accessed 17th October 2018 from World Wide Web: <http://www.theguardian.com/news/2018>
- [14]. Bohn, D. (1996) Order, Disorder, and the Absolute: An Experiment in Dialogue. *World Futures*, 46, 4, 223-237.
- [15]. Buchanan, J.M. (2007) *Economics from the Outside In*. Texas College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- [16]. Bush, G.W. (2003) Editorial. *Daily Trust*, 14th August.
- [17]. Camus, A. (1954/1988) *The Stranger*. New York: Vintage Books.
- [18]. Chomsky, N. (2003) *Hegemony and Survival: America’s Quest for Global Domination*. USA: Metropolitan Books.
- [19]. Chomsky, N. (1999) *Profit over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- [20]. Christian Science Monitor, (1988) Ethiopian Airlines: What Others Wish they were. [Accessed 6th October 2018] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.afritraveller.com>
- [21]. Churchill, W. (1923/2007) *The World Crisis: 1911-1918*. London: Penguin Books.
- [22]. Chussudovsky, M. (2017) “Neoliberalism and the New World Order: IMF-World Bank “Reforms”, the Role of Wall Street”. (Interview by Bonnie Faulkner, *Guns & Butter*). *Centre for Research on*

- Globalization*. [Accessed 19th September 2018] Available from World Wide Web:<http://www.globalresearch.ca>
- [23]. Chussudovsky, M. (1997) *The Globalization of Poverty: Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms*. London: Zed Books.
- [24]. Clarke, S. (1988) *Keynesianism, Monetarism and the Crisis of the State*. Cheltenham & Vermont: Edward Elgar.
- [25]. Cohen, G. L., et al. (2009). Recursive Processes in Self-affirmation: Intervening to close the Minority Achievement Gap. *Science*, 324, 400–403.
- [26]. Crotty, M. (1989) *The Foundation of Social Research*. London: Sage.
- [27]. Dicken, P. (2004) *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century*. London: Sage Publications.
- [28]. Easton, D. (1965) *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley.
- [29]. Ferguson, N. (2013) *The Great Degeneration: How Institutions Decay and Economies Die*. London: Allen Lane – Penguin Random House.
- [30]. Fisher, K. (2009) The Influence of Neoliberalism in Chile Before, During, and After Pinochet. In P. Mirowski & D. Plehwe (Eds.), *The Road from Mont Pelerin: The Making of Neoliberal Thought*. : Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [31]. Ford, J.D. (1999) Organizational Change as Shifting Conversations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 6, 480-500. *MCB University Press*.
- [32]. Friedman, M. (1962) *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [33]. Freire, P. (2002) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Books.
- [34]. Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In. C.K. Wilber (Ed.), *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*. London: Random House
- [35]. Freud, S. (1930/2012) *Civilization and its Discontent*. London: General Press.
- [36]. Fromm, E. (1961) *The Nature of Man*. [Accessed 9th March 2014] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/fromm/works>
- [37]. Fukuyama, F. (1992) *End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press
- [38]. Giroux, H. A. (2013) *Public Intellectuals against Neoliberal University*. [Accessed 23rd November 2015] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.trithout.org>
- [39]. Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994) Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage. Pp.105-17.
- [40]. Hampden-Turner, C.H. & Trompenaars, F. (2000) *Building Cross Cultural Competence: How to Create Wealth from Conflicting Values*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [41]. Handy, C. (1994) *The Age of Paradox*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [42]. Harari, Y.N. (2011) *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. London: Random House.
- [43]. Hartman, Y. (2005) Bend with the Economy: Some Ideas on the Connection between Neoliberalism and the Welfare State. *Current Sociology*, 53, 1, 57-73.
- [44]. Harvey, D. (2007) Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 22-44. London: Sage Publications
- [45]. Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [46]. Hawking, S. (1988) *A Brief History of Time: From Big Bang to Black Holes*. New York: Bantam Dell Publishing Group.
- [47]. Hayek, F. (1944/1999) *The Road to Serfdom with The Intellectuals and Socialism*. London: Routledge Press.
- [48]. Healy, K. (2011) *The Uncommon Life: Six Ways to be Independent-minded in a World of Conformity and Convention*. [Accessed 12th August 2014]: Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.theuncommonlife.com>
- [49]. Hegel, G.W.F. (1837/2001) *General Introduction to the Philosophy of History*. Toronto: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- [50]. Higgot, H. (2002) Re-thinking the Southeast Asia Development Model (SEADM): Bringing Ethical and Governance Questions. In *CSGR Working Paper, No.92/02, January*. United Kingdom: Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization.
- [51]. Hirschl, R. (2011) The Nordic Counter-narrative: Democracy, Human Development, and Judicial Review. *I.CON*, 9, 2, 449-469.
- [52]. Holzner, B. (1972) *Reality Construction in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- [53]. Huntington, S.P. (1993) The Clash of Civilizations & the Remaking of World Order. *Foreign Affairs*, 72, 3. New York: Touchstone.
- [54]. IMD (2012) *World Competitiveness Yearbook 2012*. Switzerland: World Competitive Centre.
- [55]. Judt, T. (2010) I am not Pessimistic in the Very Long Run, *The Independent*, (March 24.)

- [56]. Kaldun, I. M. (2010). *Al Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. New York: Pantheon Books. (Originally in 1377) (Translated from Arabic by Franz Rosenthal).
- [57]. Kaplan, R.D. (2003) America and the Tragic Limits of Imperialism. *The Hedgehog Review*, 5, 1, 56-67. Academic OneFile. [Accessed: 30th December 2018] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.go.galegroup.com/ps/>
- [58]. Kiyosaki, R.T. (2009) *Rich Dad's Conspiracy of the Rich: The 8 New Rules of Money*. New York: Business Plus.
- [59]. Klein, N. (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Canada: Random House of Canada.
- [60]. Lipset, S. M. (1996). *American Exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- [61]. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848/2011) *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Penguin Books.
- [62]. Maxton, G. & Randers, and J. (2016) *Reinventing Prosperity: Managing Economic Growth to Reduce Unemployment, Inequality, and Climate Change*. Canada: Greystone Books. P.77.
- [63]. Mill, J.S. (1869/1995) *On Liberty*. London: Longman, Roberts & Green.
- [64]. Mishra, S. & Kumar, C.B. (2014) Understanding Diversity: A Multicultural Perspective. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19, 9, 62-66.
- [65]. Mohamad, M. (2002) *Globalization and New Realities: Selected Speeches of Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia*. Malaysia: Pelanduk Publications.
- [66]. Naipaul, V. S. (1957/2002) *The Mystic Masseur*. London: Picador.
- [67]. Nonaka, I. (2007) The Knowledge-Creating Company. *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 162+
- [68]. Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995) *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press. New York.
- [69]. Norbert, L. (1992) The Transformation of Politics. In F. Agüero and J. Stark (Eds.). *Fault Lines of Democracy in Post-Transition Latin America*. Miami, FL: North-South Center Press.
- [70]. Norrlof, C. (2014) Dollar Hegemony: A Power Analysis. *Review of International Political Economy*, 21, 5, 1042-1070. London: Routledge.
- [71]. Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. USA: Basic Books
- [72]. Nye, J. & Donahue, J.D. (2001) *Governance amid Bigger, Better Markets*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- [73]. Olson, M. (1993) Dictatorship, Democracy and Development. *The American Political Science Review*, 87, 3, 567-576.
- [74]. Perkins, J. (2006) *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*. London: Penguin.
- [75]. Plehwe, D., Neunhoffer, and Walpen, B. (2006) *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. London: Routledge.
- [76]. Polanyi, K. (1957/2001) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- [77]. Popper, K. (1999) *All Life is Problem-solving*. London: Routledge.
- [78]. Ragin, C. (2010) *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity Method*. London: Sage Publication Inc.
- [79]. Rodney, W. (1981). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Abuja: Washington DC.: Howard University Press.
- [80]. Rowan, J. (2001) *Ordinary Ecstasy: The Dialectics of Humanistic Psychology*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- [81]. Said, E. (2004) *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press. P.70.
- [82]. Sartori, G. (1970) Concept Misinformation in Contemporary Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 64 4, 1033-1053.
- [83]. Schwab, K. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (2018) *The Global Competitiveness Report: 2018-2019*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- [84]. Schwab, K. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (2017) *The Global Competitiveness Report: 2017-2018*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- [85]. Schwab, K. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (2015) *The Global Competitiveness Report: 2015-2016*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- [86]. Schumpeter, J.A. (1976) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd.
- [87]. Scotland, J. (2012) Exploring the Philosophical Underpinnings of Research: Relating Ontology and Epistemology to the Methodology and Methods of the Scientific, Interpretive, and Critical Research Paradigms. In *English Language Teaching*, 5, 9. Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- [88]. Seligman, J. (2013) Dialectical Inquiry – Does it Deliver? A User-based Research Experience. *Qualitative Report*, 18, 78, 1-23

- [89]. Senghaas, D. (2002) *Clash within Civilization: Coming to Terms with Cultural Conflicts*. London: Routledge.
- [90]. Smith, A. (1776/2001) *An Inquiry into the Wealth and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Collier & Son.
- [91]. Soros, G (2006) *The Age of Fallibility: Consequences of War on Terror*. New York: Public Affairs.
- [92]. Spiro, D.E. (1999) *The Hidden Hand of American Hegemony: Petrodollar Recycling and International Markets*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- [93]. Stedman-Jones, D. (2012) *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman, and the Birth of Neoliberalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- [94]. Stewart, J., Harte, V. and Sambrook, S. (2011) What is Theory? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35, 3, 221-229. Emerald Insight.
- [95]. Stieglitz, J. (2000). More Instruments and Broader Goals: Moving Towards the Post Washington Consensus. *WIDER Annual Lectures 2*,. Helsinki.
- [96]. Strange, S. (2000). Rethinking Structural Change in the International Political Economy: States, Firms and Diplomacy. In Richard Stubb, (Eds.), *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*. Canada: Oxford University Press.
- [97]. Strange, S. (1998) *States and Markets*. United Kingdom: A&C Black
- [98]. Thatcher, M. (1987) No Such Thing as Society. *Woman's Own*. [Accessed 17th October 2018] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.margaretthatcher.org>
- [99]. Watzlawick, P. (1984) *The Invented Reality: How do we Know what we Believe we Know*. New York: Norton.
- [100]. Wolfson, P. & Roberts, G. (2004) The Rediscovery of Recovery: Open to All. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 10, 37-49.
- [101]. World Bank (2018) *World Report on Ease of Doing Business 2018*. [Accessed 10th September 2018] Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.doingbusiness.org/ranking>
- [102]. Yasin, K. (2010). *Struggle for National Identity and Civilization in the Age of American Imperialism*. Canada: Sage Publications.
- [103]. Zakaria, F. (2003) *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [104]. Zimmermann, H. (2002) *Money, and Security: Troops, Monetary Policy, and West Germany's Relations with the United States and Great Britain, 1950-1971*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Abubakar Sadeeqe Abba. "Reconceptualizing Neoliberalism within The Context of “No Alternative to Neoliberalism”: The Need For Diagnostic Social Science." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 03, 2019, pp. 01-21.