# The Americans Neocolonialism Masters in the Global Economy

## Abstract

Neocolonialism is a strategy employed by the developed countries to indirectly control less-developing nations or a strategy practiced by countries to express power over its people (Halperin, 2018).

Thesis statement: The Americans are masters of neocolonialism in the global economy.

## Arguments:

The Americans use their power muscles to win political battles and acquire more support from other nations against their war-mates. The Truman doctrine offered to Greece and Turkey in 12th March, 1947 at the expense of Soviet Union supports this evidence (Evered, 2010). The Americans are promoters of development with vested interest. The Americans upheld the Liberians independence on discovering the raw gold mines in the country (Kieh, 2012). America is the home and depot of drug trafficking, yet it presents itself as the primary fighter in drug trafficking (The Financial Times, 2018).

## Rebuttals:

McArthur and Wercker (2016) the Americans are peace promoters. The U.S. did pioneer a Marshall plan since 1950 to stabilize Europe after WW2 and subsequent Turkey and Greece. The U.S. is the engine of global economy. Research shows that, policy formulations, economic development success stories in most developing nations have the Americans backing (McArthur & Wercker, 2016). The U.S. government not only has it increased the budget and size for agencies working to cut-off drug trafficking routes, but also ensure border enforcement (Michelle & Guadalupe, 2015).
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Introduction

 Neocolonialism is a strategy employed by the developed countries to indirectly control less-developing nations. Neocolonialism is also practiced by countries to express power over its people.

Thesis statement: The Americans are masters of neocolonialism in the global economy.

Argument 1: The Americans use their power to win political battles and gain more support from other nations than their adversaries.

* Passed on 12th March, 1947, The Truman doctrine was to offer military and economic support to Greece and Turkey.
* Turkey and Greece were almost succumbing to communist threat.
* The U.S. decision to offer these support was motivated by the fact that it was losing its political battle to Soviet Union

Argument 2: Developments engineered by the Americans have strings attached and where there is economic growth opportunity the heart of Americans is there.

* After WW2, the U.S. attracted unemployed Black people to propel its economic growth.
* Increased number of black people became a threat to the Americans ruling class and called for repatriation.
* Repatriates were settled in Liberia, which would later be targeted by the U.S. to supply gold raw material, but not stabilizing the nation.
* In the Arctic council, the U.S. sees the polar ice cap melting threat as an opportunity for trade and commerce with a limited agenda to successfully end climate change problem.
* Argument 3: The U.S. is a promoter of drug trafficking yet it presents itself as the front fighter.

Rebuttal 1: Americans are peace promoters.

* The Truman doctrine was passed on realizing an existence of an emergence political turmoil state in Turkey and Greece.
* The U.S. was the first to come up with a Marshal plan to help stabilize countries aftermath of WW2.

Rebuttal 2: The U.S. is the engine of global economy.

* Policy, economic development success stories in most developing nations have the Americans backing.
* The U.S. involvement in policy formulation and economic stabilization goals explains the reasons behind improved living standards in developing nations

Rebuttal 3: The U.S. has stretched its budget, policing, and border protection to curb drug trafficking menace.

Conclusion

The Americans are masters of neocolonialism in the global economy. The Americans might be viewed as promoters of global economy, free trade champions, policy formulations and foreign aid supporters. However, the reality remains the Americans always have strings attached with the countries they plan to work together.

## Introduction

Neocolonialism is a strategy employed by the developing countries to indirectly control less-developed countries or a country to over control its citizens. Neocolonialism terminology was used immediately after World War II meaning continuing dependence of colonies to their colonialist. The neocolonialism meaning was later expounded largely to include a country’s use of power to colonize its people in one way or the other. Today, neocolonialism is broadly theorized as a contributor to capitalism enabling capitalist powers (both corporations and nations) to dominate subject countries using indirect means of international capitalism. Later, neocolonialism has been viewed as the use of coordinated effort by the developed countries and former colonials to avert growth in developing countries as they maximize their cheap labor and cheap raw materials. Broadly, neocolonialism uses indirect models particularly trade, financial and economic policies (Halperin, 2018).

Thesis statement: The Americans are masters of neocolonialism in the global economy.

Arguement1: The Americans use their power to win political battles and gain more support from other nations than their adversaries. From the Truman doctrine, on 12th March 1947, the U.S. President Harry S. Truman did declare that the U.S. was to offer immediate military and economic aid to the Greece government who were under Communist rebellion threat. Similar support was directed to Turkey which was under Soviet expansion pressure in the area of Mediterranean. As the balance of power struggle between the Soviet Union and the U.S. continued during the cold war, Great Britain communicated that they were not able to continue supporting those Mediterranean countries with aid. As the West feared they might fall under Soviet influence, the U.S. congress promised to provide both material and military aid to those countries. The Truman doctrine initiated universal objective developments which linked the project of development in Greece and Turkey indistinguishably to geopolitics cold war of imposing and seeking a uniquely international American vision security (Evered, 2010).

Argument 2: Developments engineered by the Americans have strings attached and where there is economic growth opportunity the heart of the Americans is there. It is true that the U.S. were champions of development aid, but the Americans can only be referred to as promoters of development with vested interest. Kieh, (2012), Neo-colonialism is driven by economics and colonial ideologies. During Cold War, African countries were transformed by various imperialist powers into their respective neo-colonies. The main function was to serve the strategic, political, economic and other interest from the former colonials. For instance, the state of Liberia was created via unique state formation route. Initially, the Americans, established Liberia objectively to help solve ‘race problem.’ From a slave-based economy transition to a capitalist economy, the U.S. attracted high number of unemployment Black people. This got the Americans ruling class by surprise. “The American fears were escalated since they thought pulling more unemployed Black people could result to serious political, economic, and social-cultural problems likely to affect the ruling class interest” (Kieh, 2010, p.168). Thus, the Americans came up with the repatriation agenda for the Blacks from Africa. The repatriates were relocated to Liberia. After years of push-and-pull game, with the U.S. unable to recognize Liberians’ independence, in1862 the attitude of the U.S. against Liberia shifted. They recognized Liberia’s independence, with a renewed economic interest on the nation. This was so as the Americans came to know of the gold mines pools in the nations. Further, when they flocked into the country as gold miners and profit making champions, they failed to industrialize the country with an objective that Liberia would remain a raw material supplier. The Liberian’s case is no different from the derailed and slowed climate change move in respect to U.S. position. According to the International Society Advisory Board (ISAB) (2016), climate change battle is a global concern where nations including the U.S. aim to address the polar ice caps melting menace. The U.S. aims at ensuring that maritime governance, security, safety of the indigenous people and research in climate change is successfully addressed. However, the U.S. mission has hidden agenda on economic growth and trade in the Arctic region. This is of significance since the indigenous people have been sidelined from the policy frameworks and their opinion does not count. The Americans mixed strategy possibly will ensure no sustainable development on climate change is achieved anytime soon.

Argument 3: Americans have been focusing on fighting drug trafficking from various developing nations. However, this is only an idealism that is likely to await a little bit longer for the reality to unravel. America is the leading largest drug market in the world. Although about four decades ago then, the U.S. president Richard Nixon launched a policy prohibiting drugs, “War on drugs”, to-date this has failed. In Latin America, the known biggest trading and production center, the failure consequences are recordable. In Mexico, more than 40,000 people have been killed since the launch of ‘assault on drug crime grouping’ by President Felipe Calderon. Political and social peace is under threat as a drug-trafficking tsunami hit the region. The U.S. no longer certifies countries in line with their drug production curbing systems with California now being the largest producer of Marijuana cash crop (The Financial Times, 2018).

Rebuttal 1: The Americans are peace promoters. The Truman doctrine was passed when it was highly needed. According to Evered (2010), Greece and Turkey were in an emergency state of political instability, and needed both material and financial aid for their survival otherwise these countries would have succumbed to political pressures. McArthur and Wercker (2016) argues that back after WW2 in 1950, the United Nations was made of 60 member states with the U.S. being the richest state. The U.S. Pioneered a Marshall plan to help stabilize other nations, starting with Western Europe nations, after WW2. By 1950, no development aid existed except for financing and creations of the Rehabilitation Agency, United Nations Relief and the International Refugee Organizations. The development aid was made to help stabilize Europe after WW2 effect and thereafter Turkey and Greece. The World Bank, though existed by 1946 as an International Bank for development and Reconstruction, funded post-war reconstruction with an assurance for private investment. As time went on, foreign aid systems became professionalized among most rich nations and multilateral organizations own agencies. Subsequently, ‘development’ slowly began replacing political alliances with the primary goal of aid provision that gave birth to western donors.

Rebuttal 2: U.S. is the engine of global economy. Labelling the Americans as interest driven is still not sufficient enough to support them as neocolonialist. Research shows that, policy formulations, economic development success stories in most developing nations have the Americans backing. The U.S. involvement in policy formulation and economic stabilization goals explains the reasons behind improved living standards in developing nations. For instance, by 2000, about 28% of global population was living in poverty standard that were below a dollar/day. Further, by 2015 this share dropped to 10% with middle class families earning $US10-1100/day all because of technology and economic advancement (McArthur & Wercker, 2016). According to Dees and Saint-Guihem (2009), upcoming larger economic players in the market like China, appear to pull-down the U.S. role in global economic growth. However, to a greater extend, the U.S. influences other economies more than it does in direct trade. “Third-market effect hand in hand with increased financial integration does foster the cyclical development of the international transmission” (Dees & Saint-Guihem, 2009, p.5). Further, Gady (2010), U.S. has championed international free trade for many decades. Free trade allows domestic market enlargement conquering challenges that come with domestic market frameworks such as protective barriers to trade. Free trade promote peace and stability in the international system.

Rebuttal 3: The U.S. should be remembered for fighting drug trafficking menace than any other nations in the world. The U.S. government not only has it increased the budget and size for agencies working to cut-off drug trafficking routes, but also ensure border enforcement. In the past one decade, border security investment has gone beyond U.S. $100 billion, with double reinforcement of Border Patrol officers, Federal law enforcement officers and ICE agents. Further, the Congress has expanded greatly on its spending on technology, infrastructures and fencing to ensure border security (Michelle & Guadalupe, 2015).

## Conclusion

The Americans are masters of neocolonialism in the global economy. The Americans are seen as economic supporters, global economy engine, free-trade champions, policy formulators and foreign aid supporters. However, the truth remains that the U.S. mission is always attached to their intended benefit(s). The Americans decision to partner with any developing country is always guided by vested interests. The case of Turkey and Greece opens the doors to the Americans political inclination as they feared that the Soviet Union would politically overpower them. The case of Liberia and climate change in the Arctic region is all economic driven. This is important because the Americans indirect colonial strategy does not aim at stabilizing the nations they have interest in, but exploiting them. The Americans do not look forward to ensure that the target countries are economically stable, but in the long run become too dependent to the Americans rather than being sustainable.
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