

States of Discipline

Transforming Capitalism

Series Editors: Ian Bruff, University of Manchester;
Julie Cupples, University of Edinburgh; Gemma Edwards,
University of Manchester; Laura Horn, University of Roskilde;
Simon Springer, University of Victoria; Jacqui True, Monash University

This book series provides an open platform for the publication of path-breaking and interdisciplinary scholarship which seeks to understand and critique capitalism along four key lines: crisis, development, inequality, and resistance. At its core lies the assumption that the world is in various states of transformation, and that these transformations may build upon earlier paths of change and conflict while also potentially producing new forms of crisis, development, inequality, and resistance. Through this approach the series alerts us to how capitalism is always evolving and hints at how we could also transform capitalism itself through our own actions. It is rooted in the vibrant, broad and pluralistic debates spanning a range of approaches which are being practised in a number of fields and disciplines. As such, it will appeal to sociology, geography, cultural studies, international studies, development, social theory, politics, labour and welfare studies, economics, anthropology, law, and more.

Titles in the Series

The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt, edited by Simon Springer, Marcelo de Souza and Richard J. White

Theories of Resistance: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt edited by Marcelo Lopes de Souza, Richard J. White and Simon Springer

The Practice of Freedom: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt, edited by Richard J. White, Simon Springer and Marcelo Lopes de Souza

States of Discipline: Authoritarian Neoliberalism and the Contested Reproduction of Capitalist Order, edited by Cemal Burak Tansel

(Re)producing the Multiple Crises: Theorizing the Imperial Mode of Living, Ulrich Brand and Markus Wissen (forthcoming)

A Sense of Inequality, Wendy Bottero (forthcoming)

Workers Movements and Strikes: Global Perspectives in the 21st Century, edited by Jörg Nowak, Madhumita Dutta and Peter Birke

States of Discipline

Authoritarian Neoliberalism and the Contested Reproduction of Capitalist Order

Edited by
Cemal Burak Tansel

ROWMAN &
LITTLEFIELD
INTERNATIONAL

London • New York

Published by Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd
Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB
www.rowmaninternational.com

Rowman & Littlefield International Ltd. is an affiliate of Rowman & Littlefield
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706, USA
With additional offices in Boulder, New York, Toronto (Canada), and Plymouth (UK)
www.rowman.com

Selection and editorial matter © 2017 Cemal Burak Tansel
Copyright in individual chapters is held by the respective chapter authors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

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

ISBN: HB 978-1-7834-8618-2
PB 978-1-7834-8619-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN 978-1-78348-618-2 (cloth: alk. paper)
ISBN 978-1-78348-619-9 (pbk: alk. paper)
ISBN 978-1-78348-620-5 (electronic)

™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	ix
1 Authoritarian Neoliberalism: Towards a New Research Agenda <i>Cemal Burak Tansel</i>	1
2 Authoritarian Neoliberalism and the Disciplining of Labour <i>Mònica Clua-Losada and Olatz Ribera-Almandoz</i>	29
3 Commodified Pacification: Police, Commercial Security and the State <i>Kendra Briken and Volker Eick</i>	47
4 Bodies in Resistance: Conversations on Gender, Body Politics and Authoritarian Neoliberalism <i>Wendy Harcourt</i>	67
5 The Right to Starve: Hunger, Discipline and Labour Market Restructuring under Authoritarian Neoliberalism <i>Sébastien Rioux</i>	87
6 Urban Transformation under Authoritarian Neoliberalism <i>Annalena Di Giovanni</i>	107
7 From Mare Nostrum to Triton: Humanitarian Emergencies and Neoliberal Migration Management in the Mediterranean <i>Luca Manunza</i>	129

8	Cease to Exist? The European ‘Social’ Model and the Hardening of ‘Soft’ EU Law <i>Ian Bruff</i>	149
9	The Authoritarian and Disciplinary Mechanism of Reduced Sovereignty in the EU: The Case of Greece <i>Panagiotis Sotiris</i>	171
10	Antinomies of Authoritarian Neoliberalism in Turkey: The Justice and Development Party Era <i>Bariş Alp Özden, İsmet Akça and Ahmet Bekmen</i>	189
11	Resistance and Passive Revolution in Egypt and Morocco <i>Brecht De Smet and Koenraad Bogaert</i>	211
12	Klepto-Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and Patronage in Cambodia <i>Simon Springer</i>	235
13	Variegated Neoliberalization as a Function and Outcome of Neo-authoritarianism in China <i>Kean Fan Lim</i>	255
	Postscript <i>Cynthia Enloe</i>	275
	Index	279
	Notes on Contributors	285

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the *Transforming Capitalism* series editors Ian Bruff, Julie Cupples, Gemma Edwards, Laura Horn, Simon Springer and Jacqui True for the extremely helpful editorial input they provided throughout the preparation of this volume. At Rowman & Littlefield International, Dhara Patel, Anna Reeve and Michael Watson showed great care and patience in managing the book. I am grateful to Chun-yi Lee, Adam David Morton and my colleagues in the Department of Politics at the University of Sheffield for their feedback, support and involvement at various stages of this project. Finally, I would like to thank the contributors for their generous contributions and unwavering commitment to the book.

—**Cemal Burak Tansel**, Sheffield

Abbreviations

AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
AKP	Justice and Development Party (Turkey)
AMDH	Moroccan Association of Human Rights
ANAP	Motherland Party (Turkey)
ANCI	National Association of Italian Municipalities
ANDCM	Moroccan National Association of Unemployed Graduates
AST	Alternativa Sindical de Trabajadores
CARA	Hosting Centre for Asylum Seekers
CBPP	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
CGT	Confederación General del Trabajo
CIRI	Civic Innovation Research Initiative
CNPA	Cambodian National Petroleum Authority
CoBas	Sindicato de Comisiones de Base
COESS	Confederation of European Security Services
CPC	Communist Party of China
CPP	Cambodian People's Party
CPPCC	Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference
CRI	Italian Red Cross
CTNE	Spanish National Telephone Company
CUP	<i>Candidatura d'Unitat Popular</i> (Popular Unity Candidacy)
ECB	European Central Bank
ECOC	European Capital of Culture Initiative
EES	European Employment Strategy
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
ENA	Emergency North Africa
EPI	Economic Policy Institute
ERC	<i>Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya</i> (Republican Left of Catalonia)

ERE	<i>Expedientes de Regulación de Empleo</i> (Labour Force Adjustment Plans)
ERSAP	Economic Reform and Structural Adjustment Program
ERT	European Round Table of Industrialists
ESM	European Social Model
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HDP	Peoples' Democratic Party (Turkey)
IACP	International Association of Chiefs of Police
IFI	International Financial Institution
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INDH	National Initiative for Human Development
IRP	Institute for Research on Poverty
ISI	Import Substitution Industrialization
KBE	Knowledge-based Economy
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MÜSİAD	Independent Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association
NDP	National Democratic Party (Egypt)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NPC	National People's Congress (China)
NPM	New Police Management
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
OPCM	Presidency of the Council of Ministers in Italy
PCI	Italian Civil Protection
PJD	Party for Justice and Development (Morocco)
PKK	Kurdistan Workers' Party
PMSC	Private Military Security Company
POLISARIO	Popular Front for the Liberation of the Sahara and the Rio de Oro
PP	People's Party (Spain)
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act
PSOE	Spanish Socialist Workers' Party
PYD	Democratic Union Party (Syria)
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
SEZ	Special Economic Zone
SME	Small or Medium-Sized Enterprise
SNAP	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
SOE	State-Owned Enterprise
SPRAR	Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees
SRI	Sexuality Research Initiative
SSI	Supplemental Security Income

TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TFP	Thrifty Food Plan
TNC	Transnational Corporation
TOKİ	Turkish Mass Housing Development Administration
TUSKON	Turkish Confederation of Businessmen and Industrialists
TÜSİAD	Turkish Industry and Business Association
TVE	Town-Village Enterprise
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UPI	Union of Italian Regions
USDA	US Department of Agriculture
USDHHS	US Department of Health and Human Services
WIC	Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children

Chapter 1

Authoritarian Neoliberalism

Towards a New Research Agenda

Cemal Burak Tansel

For a brief period in the aftermath of the political and financial turmoil of the 2007–2008 economic crisis, the established patterns of global economic governance seemed exceptionally vulnerable to increased critical scrutiny. The crisis seemed to have undermined the legitimacy of the policies that are grouped under the rubric of ‘neoliberalism’ as the ultimate template of economic management for a world that had ostensibly reached the end of its history. Sanguine critics firmly pronounced the demise of neoliberalism by stating that ‘the neoliberal era lasted until August 2008 when the liberalized system of global financial markets imploded’ (Altvater 2009: 75), and its imminent disintegration was cautiously heralded as signalling ‘a transition to a new social order, a new phase of modern capitalism beyond neoliberalism’ (Duménil and Lévy 2011: 326). For some, the crisis fulfilled the crucial function of accelerating an extant push—especially in the global South—towards ‘postneoliberal’ models.¹ The resultant post-crisis image of neoliberalism as a mode of economic governance in its dying moments was augmented by the budding crisis of its political counterpart. Political parties that have stood at the forefront of neoliberal restructuring over the last three to four decades faced a continuous haemorrhaging of their voter base, while the authoritarian regimes with kindred neoliberal credentials were confronted by popular upheavals—often provoked by the questions of social reproduction, that is, the crises of household, employment, indebtedness and access to services and public spaces (Schäfer and Streeck 2013: 17–23; Hanieh 2013). Yet despite the severity of the crisis of social reproduction and the widespread aversion towards austerity policies which have been unleashed by fiscally disciplined governments across the heartlands of neoliberalism it is difficult to maintain that neoliberalism has lost its position as the dominant blueprint of global economic governance. As Miguel Centeno and Joseph Cohen stipulated in the

aftermath of the financial meltdown, ‘The crisis and ensuing Great Recession may have shaken neoliberalism’s supremacy, but it remains unchallenged by serious alternatives and continues to shape post-2008 policy’ (2012: 312; Crouch 2011). Given the extent and scope of popular protests against the variegated products of neoliberalism as well as the rapid rise of anti-austerity parties and movements, the enduring hegemonic position of neoliberalism leaves us with a rather curious puzzle. While, as Nancy Fraser recently put it, the key political and economic ‘institutions face legitimation deficits at every scale’ (2015: 181), efforts to challenge and reform those institutions, as well as the broader ideas and practices that underpin them, seem to be facing insurmountable difficulties. This picture forces us to reconsider the strengths and weaknesses of neoliberalism and to take seriously the wide range of economic and political tools at the disposal of those who are committed to the survival of capital accumulation. In short, we need to revisit two fundamental questions: (1) What makes neoliberalism such a resilient mode of economic and political governance? (2) What are the mechanisms and processes with which the core components of neoliberalism effectively reproduce themselves in the face of popular opposition? In the light of the increasing recognition of the failure of neoliberal model of governance since the crisis—even by those responsible for the diffusion of neoliberal policies (Ostry, Loungani and Furceri 2016)—we also have to explore at which sites and areas neoliberalism is most fraught with contradictions, cracks and fissures.

This book responds to these questions by reasserting the exigency of understanding neoliberalism as a regime of capital accumulation and of recognizing the key role that states play in its protection and reproduction. Accordingly, we interrogate and unpack the modalities of ‘authoritarian neoliberalism’, a set of state strategies with which the variegated processes of neoliberalism are maintained and shielded from popular pressure. We argue that contemporary neoliberalism reinforces and increasingly relies upon (1) coercive state practices that discipline, marginalize and criminalize oppositional social forces and (2) the judicial and administrative state apparatuses which limit the avenues in which neoliberal policies can be challenged. This argument should *not* be read to the effect that the deployment of coercive state apparatuses for the protection of the circuits of capital accumulation is a *new* phenomenon, nor should it lead to the assumption that the pre-crisis trajectories of neoliberalization have been *exclusively consensual*. In advancing the analytical utility of authoritarian neoliberalism, we are not asserting that the violent, disciplinary and anti-democratic means with which the capitalist states remove the barriers to accumulation should be understood as an innovation of neoliberalism. Not only are authoritarian forms of governance and neoliberal management compatible, but, as Wendy Brown has asserted,

neoliberalism is ‘even *productive* of, authoritarian, despotic, paramilitaristic, and corrupt state forms as well as agents within civil society’ (2005: 38, emphasis added).² We begin our exploration by recognizing the various ways in which the ‘so-called free-market reforms and globalisation’ have been ‘accompanied by political repression’ (Mitchell 1999: 465) and emphasize the immanent tendency of the capitalist state to deploy its coercive, legal and economic power if/when ‘strategies for the reproduction of capital-in-general are being challenged in significant ways’ (Ayers and Saad-Filho 2014: 4). While acknowledging these important criteria, we underscore two qualifiers of ‘authoritarian neoliberalism’ which highlight how its tendencies and techniques of governance represent (1) a transformation of the ‘normal’ operation of the capitalist state (cf. Poulantzas 1978/2014: 80) and (2) a qualitative shift from the intrinsic ‘illiberal’ propensities of neoliberalism. Accordingly, we posit that authoritarian neoliberalisms

1. operate through a preemptive discipline which simultaneously insulates neoliberal policies through a set of administrative, legal and coercive mechanisms and limits the spaces of popular resistance against neoliberalism (Bruff 2014: 116);
2. are marked by a significant escalation in the state’s propensity to employ coercion and legal/extra-legal intimidation, which is complemented by ‘intensified state control over every sphere of social life ... (and) draconian and multiform curtailment of so-called “formal” liberties’ (Poulantzas 1978/2014: 203–204).

Building on these premises, the book aims to initiate a conversation defined not only by an intellectual motivation to identify more accurately the contemporary mechanisms of neoliberal governance, but also, and perhaps more so, by a *political* impetus necessitated by the exigencies of what Barry K. Gills (2010: 169) has called a ‘unique conjecture of global crises’ comprising socioeconomic, political and environmental fallouts. As such, we present the book as an initial step towards formulating a new research agenda underpinned by ‘authoritarian neoliberalism’ as a conceptual prism through which the institutionalization and employment of a number of state practices that invalidate or circumscribe public input and silence popular resistance can be illuminated. This vantage point renders possible the explanation of such practices as part of a broader strategy inherently linked to the reproduction of capitalist order and of its logics of exclusion and exploitation operating at the intersections of class, gender, race and ethnicity.

This orientation also provides the rationale for the two themes that constitute the book’s title. As the following introductory discussion and the sub-

sequent analyses will accentuate, the state—and more specifically the *capitalist state*—emerges as the key organizational structure through which the authoritarian enshrinement of neoliberal accumulation regimes is facilitated. Tracing the state's constitutive role in these processes is imperative for two reasons. First, this appreciation allows us to negate the still enduring view that neoliberalism signals an unconditional withdrawal of the state from the realm of the 'economy'.³ Second, and more importantly, it brings into focus the necessity of confronting neoliberalism politically by devising concrete strategies to challenge its mechanisms at the various levels of state structures and interstate organizations as well as at the level of everyday life.

Accompanying this emphasis on the state as a political organization that acts as a custodian of capital accumulation, the usage of the term in the title also refers to an embodied condition whereby authoritarian neoliberalism subjects individuals, collectives and populations to economic, financial and corporeal discipline. As authoritarian neoliberal strategies are marked by an explicit predisposition to insulate policymaking from popular dissent through coercive, administrative and legal deployment of state power, we tentatively claim that these manoeuvres have a particular disciplinary effect, not only on those who actively struggle against such policies, but also on the broader polity in which they operate. As Ian Bruff has suggested, the governance techniques that comprise authoritarian neoliberal regimes are not merely 'reactive', but 'are also increasingly preemptive, locking in neoliberal governance mechanisms in the name of necessity, whatever the actual state of play' (2014: 123). In other words, the panoply of neoliberal policies enacted in different spatial and scalar contexts—for example, the imposition of austerity, restructuring of public spaces and services, technocratic shifts in macroeconomic policymaking—are increasingly geared towards protecting the pillars of neoliberal accumulation. To paraphrase Marx's comments on the English state's efforts to confront pauperism in the nineteenth century, authoritarian neoliberalism does not conjure policies to solve specific problems (e.g. fiscal deficit, the lack of affordable housing, failing public services), but it does so increasingly to 'discipline' those who confront such policies and 'perpetuate' the underlying conditions that give rise to these predicaments (cf. Marx 1975: 409). When analyzed together with the constitutive role of state power in maintaining capitalist order, these disciplinary effects do not signal the substitution of 'direct' (or physical) repression with 'indirect' forms of violence, nor do they emerge merely as the contemporary 'methods of power', which—borrowing from Poulantzas's critique of Foucault—'rest not on right but on technique, not on law but on normalization, not on punishment but on control' (Poulantzas 1978/2014: 77). On the contrary, such disciplinary effects complement and coexist with 'the repressive apparatuses (army, police,

judicial system, etc.) ... that are located at the heart of the modern State' (Poulantzas 1978/2014: 77).

The book, thus, refocuses attention on the question of state power and highlights the preemptive discipline instilled by authoritarian neoliberalism not only as necessary qualifiers to the extant academic literature, but also as a step towards informing radical political practice. We contend that the recognition of the state's indispensable role allows us to move from a position of reacting against neoliberalization to proactively building mobilizations, strategies and policies to counteract not merely its symptoms but also the actors and processes that engender those through the active utilization of state apparatuses. This introductory chapter conceptually and empirically maps the emergent patterns of authoritarian neoliberalism and the signal continuities they represent vis-à-vis the structural and intersecting inequalities inherent in capitalist societies.

TRACING THE LINEAGES OF AUTHORITARIAN NEOLIBERALISM

Despite its widespread employment and its successful grafting onto the analytical vernacular of a broad spectrum of social sciences research, neoliberalism is a heavily contested term.⁴ Branded as an 'oft-invoked but ill-defined concept' (Mudge 2008: 703), the theoretical status and utility of neoliberalism has been a subject of intense dispute and constant reassessment.⁵ In its broadest sense, a comprehensive definition may be utilized to situate neoliberalism as both 'a form of political economy and a political ideology' (Gamble 2001: 127), yet the ambiguity regarding the specific content of this formulation—that is, to what extent and under which circumstances a disparate set of economic policies and political strategies constitutes a consciously driven project of neoliberalization—negates any one-size-fits-all solution to its definitional entanglement. Given its recognition as a somewhat nebulous construct by many scholars, one could challenge the urgency of further qualifying neoliberalism with an additional set of criteria, as we do in this book with the 'authoritarian' prefix.

This quandary leads us to the following question: What is the utility of the concept of authoritarian neoliberalism? Should the concept be deployed in a manner to highlight that the emergent/existing forms of illiberal governance in capitalist societies (notwithstanding their spatial and scalar divergences) represent a watershed, or herald a new dynamic in the history of the capitalist mode of production? Should we understand the current conjuncture as a radical mutation in the relationship between the state, (varying forms of)

democracy and capitalism, a transfiguration that leads to a clear demarcation between prior modes of capitalist management and the current configuration defined by an authoritarian drift? Such demarcations always represent a degree of ambiguity, as the complex forms of human interactions and the socioeconomic contexts within which these relations appear are bound to defy clear-cut categorizations. Nor should any classifications based on the observation of such social phenomena be seen as ossified categories, incapable of undergoing revisions. With this proviso in mind, we position authoritarian neoliberalism as a historically specific set of capitalist accumulation strategies that both exacerbates the existing, structural trends in the political organization of capitalism and embodies distinct practices geared towards unshackling accumulation at the expense of democratic politics and popular participation. Nevertheless, we stress that it is imperative to perceive authoritarian neoliberalism as a *spectrum* of disciplinary strategies, ranging from the more explicit demonstrations of coercive state power (e.g. policing and surveillance) to more diffuse yet equally concrete manifestations of administrative and legal mechanisms that entrench extant power relations and inequalities.

The rationale for focusing on the ‘authoritarian’ dimension of neoliberalism becomes more evident once we move away from the conventional accounts that posit a gradual ascendancy of neoliberal *ideas*, starting with the advocacy of the Mont Pèlerin Society to their worldwide adoption by policymakers from the late 1970s onwards. The focus in this particular, what Raewyn Connell and Nour Dados (2014) have called, ‘origin story’ of neoliberalism is the formulation of a political will to undermine the post-war welfare states in the West with a blueprint devised explicitly on the precepts of a group of thinkers variously associated with the neoliberal doctrine. In Marxist versions of this particular narrative as best exemplified in the account of David Harvey, the focus on neoliberal ideas and their transplantation onto the policy realm are accompanied by the argument that the political dimension of neoliberalism—symbolized by the administrations of Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Ronald Reagan in the United States—materialized as a ‘project to restore class power’ (Harvey 2005: 62) which, among other things, targeted the socioeconomic power of the organized labour movement. In non-Marxist versions of the same narrative, the neoliberal triumph is attributed not necessarily to the conscious or latent class offensive of leading policymakers, but to the successful dissemination of neoliberal ideas by the ‘neoliberal thought collective’: an epistemic community that has ‘carefully connected and combined key spheres and institutions for the contest over hegemony—academia, the media, politics, and business’ (Plehwe 2009: 22).⁶ The ‘ideas-centred explanation’ of neoliberalism (Cahill 2014: 44), thus, charts a through line

from early neoliberal thinkers to the current dominant model of governance, a position which grants a causal significance to the *ideas and theories* of neo-/ordo-liberal thinkers for the emergence and popularization of concrete neoliberal *policies* (e.g. austerity, see Blyth 2013: 142).

While these accounts capture a number of important aspects related to the ideational trajectories of neoliberalism as well as the specific class interests towards which many neoliberal reforms are oriented, their explanatory powers diminish significantly once we shift our focus to the manifestations of neoliberal restructuring outside its North American and Western European heartland. As Connell and Dados (2014: 118) have suggested, the conventional accounts are ‘grounded in the social experience of the global North, which is in fact only a fragment of the story’. Extrapolating neoliberalism as the global diffusion of market-oriented ideas and policies based on the particular North American and Western European trajectories of capitalist development significantly reduces the analytical value of these accounts in contexts where the building blocks of the Western post-war development (e.g. the welfare state) have been historically weak or non-existent (Connell and Dados 2014: 123).⁷ Recognition of this variety in developmental trajectories should not lead to the conclusion that the concept of neoliberalism holds value only in the study of certain contexts (e.g. the West), nor should it lead to its abandonment as an object of inquiry. Yet the above-outlined accounts hit a significant barrier not only when they attempt to explain the localized instances of neoliberal restructuring beyond the West, but also when they retrace the connections between neoliberal ideas and *Western* policies that are supposedly designed to realize such theoretical claims. To borrow from Connell and Dados (2014: 120) once more:

There is a tendency in this whole literature ... to separate neoliberal theory from neoliberal practice. The theory is treated as pure neoliberalism, the practice as its always-imperfect realization. No doubt this is partly because the theory is so easily available, in hardline texts such as Friedman’s *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962). It is partly because neoliberal policy entrepreneurs themselves talked this way, frequently lambasting politicians who lacked the courage to implement the hard line. But this separation has the unfortunate effect of diverting our attention from the practical problems (possibly very different from those that preoccupied Friedman or Hayek) to which neoliberal practices seemed to offer solutions.

From the perspective of those who focus on the ‘neoliberal thought collective’ as the causal dynamic behind the universalization of neoliberal models, the dissonance between pure theory and messy practice could be interpreted as a sign of neoliberalism’s ability to adapt and mutate in the face of change

and adversity (see Mirowski 2013: 52–53). Such an incongruity might not even register as a problem for the proponents of this account since, as Mirowski (2013: 53) has argued, ‘neoliberals do not navigate with a fixed static Utopia as the astrolabe for all their political strivings. They could not, since they don’t even agree on such basic terms as “market” and “freedom” in all respects.’ Yet, again, this account does not provide significant insights into non-Western cases of neoliberal restructuring where, in most contexts, it is difficult to find traces of local policymakers actively seeking neoliberal remedies *because* they are grounded in a much-coveted economic theory, hence the difficulty of elevating ‘neoliberal ideas and think tanks as the chief causal variable driving processes of neoliberal state transformation’ (Cahill 2015: 206).

The shortcomings of the above-discussed accounts accentuate the urgency of advancing alternative conceptions of neoliberalism that do not (1) assume an automatic translation of neoliberal ideas into policy and (2) prioritize specific (i.e. Western) transition to a neoliberal accumulation regime as a global blueprint adopted in each and every local context without modifications. In other words, such an account should be able to recognize and explain the universal—yet not uniform—manifestations of neoliberalism while taking into account the ways in which local trajectories of socioeconomic development, state power and class politics affect the implementation of neoliberal restructuring.

In line with these preconditions, a plausible alternative to the ‘ideas-centred explanation’ is to conceptualize neoliberalism as a contingent response to the recurring crises of the capitalist mode of production.⁸ Such an account requires conceptualizing neoliberalism as a mode of accumulation in the ‘path-dependent sequence of accumulation regimes’ (Fraser 2015: 167n.13) that comprises the history of capitalism. Linked directly to the crises and contradictions of capitalism, neoliberalism could be understood as a structural response adopted by state managers to offset and minimize the impact thereof and, thus, not exclusively as a set of economic ideas that has diffused outwards from a particular geopolitical and economic setting *because* these ideas have been articulated and promoted by a powerful transnational elite bent on advancing their own class interests. In this perspective, the rise of neoliberalism as a viable accumulation strategy is linked to ‘the internal problems encountered by different advanced capitalist states as a result of their participation in an interdependent world economy, and the repercussions that the solutions adopted by some would have for the managerial capacities and options of the others’ (Germann 2014: 707). By following this logic, we can also reinterpret the adoption of neoliberal reforms in the global South as a response to the same pressures and crises tendencies that enabled

neoliberal policies to supersede the institutional and ideational supremacy of the preceding Keynesian post-war compromise. In this account, the materialization of neoliberal policies across the global South ceases to be an act of diffusion crafted *exclusively* by Western states and international institutions, but it is understood as a strategy deployed by state managers to tackle extant or budding economic and/or political crises.⁹ As Connell and Dados (2014: 123, original emphasis) illustrate *vis-à-vis* the paradigmatic Chilean case (cf. Klein 2007; Harvey 2005: 39–63):

The Chicago Boys—and the other players in the making of the dictatorship’s economic policy—were not offering General Pinochet a textbook of economic theory. They were offering a solution to his main political problem: how to get legitimacy by economic growth, satisfy his backers in the Chilean propertied class, and keep the diplomatic support of the United States, without giving an opening to his opponents in the political parties and labor movement. Neoliberalism *as a development strategy* met those needs.

The ‘structural’ account is, thus, not only capable of addressing variegated paths to neoliberalization as contingent responses to capitalist crises (in both their economic and political forms), it also helps us better contextualize and assess the degree to which neoliberal ideas, as well as the agency of advanced capitalist states and international institutions, have played a role in globalizing neoliberal governance. As such, the account does not downplay the often violent and constitutive role of international political, economic and financial organizations in imposing neoliberal reform in the global South—and, increasingly, in the North. It does, however, rebalance the effect of such organizations by recognizing the constitutive role of local state strategies, socioeconomic conditions and class struggles in shaping the trajectories of neoliberalizations.¹⁰

Our inquiry follows this sensitivity to the examination of ‘actually existing neoliberalisms’ so as to underscore more explicitly their constantly evolving character, which increasingly appropriates spheres of social production and reproduction (Brenner and Theodore 2002: 354). Neoliberalism, as employed in this book, thus refers to a specific mode of capital accumulation and political rule that instrumentalizes the extant state apparatuses to de/re-regulate economic activity in a manner that privileges the commodification of labour, environment and social reproduction in both a seemingly ‘self-regulating’ market domain and a ‘competitive’ public sphere. The policy routes that enable these processes of appropriation range from ‘the transfer to “the markets” of several functions of the state, especially the intersectoral and intertemporal allocation of resources’ to ‘the elimination of strategic planning and the abolition of controls on most intermediate and consumer goods

prices' (Mollo and Saad-Filho 2006: 101). It is for this central role played by the state in entrenching neoliberalism that we affirm that the state is 'a permanent and necessary part of neoliberal ideology, institutionalization and practice' (Bruff 2016: 115) and that neoliberalism does not dismantle but thrives upon the institutional infrastructure of the state apparatuses through their remodelling in a competitive orientation and (re)positioning them as custodians of accumulation.¹¹

Understanding neoliberalism as a mode of accumulation and its adoption in different contexts as responses to capitalism's economic and political crises also offers a contextualization of why neoliberal governance increasingly embodies an authoritarian rule underpinned by the erosion of democratic politics and the deployment of coercive state power. The endeavour to unmask these authoritarian practices, as stated above, should be accompanied by the recognition that (1) the political organization of capitalism regularly clashes with democratic politics—that is, capitalism's non-democratic impulses are not new (Fraser 2015)—and (2) the concrete episodes of neoliberal restructurings across the world are often constructed through authoritarian state power. As the book will explore in depth, the shifts from Keynesian welfare regimes or import substitution industrialization (ISI) strategies to neoliberalism in the global South and North were often made possible and regularly reproduced by non-democratic, illiberal and, at times, outright violent means. Examples of the non-democratic or authoritarian constitution of neoliberalism exist at various levels. At the international level, the institutional and ideological hegemony of the Washington Consensus brought about what Stephen Gill has called 'new constitutionalism', a 'move towards construction of legal or constitutional devices to remove or insulate substantially the new economic institutions from popular scrutiny or democratic accountability' (Gill 1992: 165, 2015). Where the imposed market discipline maintained by the panoptic micromanagement of the states and international organizations has faced popular challenges—as hegemonic 'habitualization and internalization of social practices ... provokes acts of resistance' (Morton 2007: 171)—the disciplinary mechanisms have resorted to more aggressive forms of control, including 'strategies of incarceration, military surveillance, organized violence and intervention' (Gill 2008: 222, 221–232). At the national level, paths to neoliberalism in many countries have been paved by the direct involvement of the military (e.g. Turkey and Brazil) and through the deployment of authoritarian state power (e.g. Thailand and Egypt).¹²

Authoritarian neoliberalism, thus, neither signifies that spatio-temporally variegated processes of neoliberalization have all been underpinned exclusively by authoritarian state power, nor suggests that, in cases where authoritarian state power was a prevalent trigger, we can understand those processes

as unfolding in a linear, predetermined trajectory dominated by the state but unperturbed by social struggles. Moreover, the concept, as we envision in this book, does not follow a definition of authoritarianism in which the coercive apparatuses of the state are privileged and understood as *external* to liberal democracy. Subscribing to a coercion-oriented understanding of authoritarianism risks not only obscuring the ways in which authoritarian state power is enmeshed with capital accumulation, but also reifying a Eurocentric North–South binary whereby a ‘liberal’ capitalism in the global North is positioned as a model to be emulated by the ‘authoritarian’ capitalisms/state socialisms of the global South.¹³ As opposed to enshrining an ossified separation of liberal democracy and authoritarianism, we maintain that it is important to recognize that state responses to the economic and political crises of capitalism can—and increasingly do—assume similar forms both in formal democracies and in traditionally defined authoritarian regimes. Accordingly, the authoritarian bent in state practices can work in tandem with institutions and legal frameworks that sustain a ‘minimalist’ democracy, that is, a political regime defined by ‘the less demanding criterion of electoral competition’ (Møller and Skaaning 2010: 276).¹⁴ The essential components of representative democracies themselves could be subverted to execute policies beyond the public purview. As Ahmet Bekmen has elaborated vis-à-vis the Turkish case:

Rather than direct repression, though it may be employed from time to time as in the case of Turkey, authoritarian statism is inclined towards a gradual transformation that has critical effects on the functioning of the liberal democracy by incapacitating political parties, the parliament, the judiciary and some sections of the bureaucracy, and empowering the technocratic-minded elite within the executive branch. (Bekmen 2014: 47)

Such transformations at the state level are often accompanied with the suppression of popular opposition and resistance through a combination of draconian policing, lawmaking, surveillance and the ‘exclusion of dissident social forces’ from participating in established arenas of political representation (Amoore et al. 1997: 181). In this regard, authoritarian neoliberalism marks a significant shift away from consensus-based strategies to a model of governance in which ‘dominant social groups are less interested in neutralizing resistance and dissent via concessions and forms of compromise’ but, instead, opt for ‘the explicit exclusion and marginalization’ of oppositional political and social forces (Bruff 2014: 116). Yet while we highlight the increasing ubiquity and scope of such coercive and disciplining practices, the presence of authoritarian neoliberal strategies does not always correlate to a declining hegemonic leadership. As Brecht De Smet and Koenraad Bogaert explain in this book, ‘The difference between domination and hegemony

is not the quantitative *proportion* between coercion and consent needed to maintain class power, but the extent to which force is successfully *grounded* in popular consent.’ It is, thus, important to recognize that authoritarian neoliberalisms can encompass cases where the interest-based alliances between social groups that constitute the lifeline of neoliberal hegemonies are maintained through excessive force and repression even by democratically elected governments.

Recognizing the spectrum of authoritarian neoliberal strategies, from the utilization of direct coercion to indirect legal, administrative and political reform, also accentuates the question of which social forces, communities and individuals find themselves at the receiving end of the disciplinary statecraft. While neoliberal reforms clearly advance specific class interests—while limiting the others—the concrete effects of state policies on individuals and collectives vary significantly based on sociopolitical markers of gender, race, ethnicity, age and (dis)ability. The effect of neoliberalization on women, minorities, LGBTQ and other marginalized communities has intensified considerably after the economic crisis of 2007–2008 as the downturn not only triggered a deepening of austerity programmes that had a disproportionate impact on these groups, but also aggravated the concomitant crisis of social reproduction, most acutely felt in households. Increasingly ‘masculine’ and competition-oriented state responses to the crisis have either fallen drastically short of alleviating women’s deteriorating working conditions and job prospects, or actively helped further disadvantage racialized minorities, people with disabilities and the LGBTQ (Hozic and True 2016; Smith 2016; Cross 2013; Reed and Portes 2014).

Downscaling from a state-level analysis to studying the concrete effects of authoritarian neoliberalism on everyday lives helps us understand the manifold ways in which the enshrinement of a particular ‘economic’ discipline shapes subjectivities and defines the conditions of possibility for resistance and designing political alternatives. If, for example, we rethink the ‘constitutionalisation of austerity’ (de Witte 2013: 589; Oberndorfer 2015) across Europe not purely as an economic programme designed to meet fiscal demands but also as a way to reconfigure public participation and citizenship, we can disentangle the various threads through which neoliberalism has paved the way for the further marginalization of dissenting subjectivities (Tyler 2013). As Liam Stanley (forthcoming) argues, through austerity policies, ‘those lives that deviate from [a] form of liberal life are devalorised, while the bodies that are associated with this deviation are disciplined’. Given the expanding scale of the crisis of social reproduction in Europe, it is no coincidence that we are witnessing a deployment of popular rhetorical devices that discipline and criminalize the working classes, minorities and, increasingly, the racial-

ized figure of the ‘migrant’ to whitewash austerity policies—which further aggravate this crisis—and shift the blame onto already marginalized communities.¹⁵ Recognizing the inherently political character of contemporary neoliberalism and the utilization of its disciplinary tools to neutralize dissent further helps us draw important parallels between the austerity programmes in the global North and the structural adjustment programmes imposed upon the global South by the IMF and World Bank. In many ways, European societies are now being subjected to the same pressures and disciplinary conditions that numerous countries in the global South have faced through conditions attached to their internationally sanctioned debt and bailout programmes. The emergent linkages between these cases expose the common strategies employed by states and international organizations, as well as the shared disciplinary experiences lived by the subjects of those strategies.

MAPPING THE REPERTOIRES OF AUTHORITARIAN NEOLIBERALISM

As the book is concerned with constructing a research agenda aimed at identifying and exposing the violence of neoliberal governance, the individual chapters are designed to offer overviews of the key themes and processes with which authoritarian neoliberalism is constituted as well as the specific spatial/governmental contexts in which these processes unfold. Given that the topics and concepts we engage with traverse disciplinary boundaries, the book hosts contributors whose research draws on interdisciplinary practices as well as those who are grounded in different branches of the social sciences. In addition to this rich disciplinary variety, the following analyses employ a wide range of methods, from the operationalization of more recent approaches in qualitative research such as ‘facet methodology’ to ethnography. As such, the book aims not only to establish a genuine interdisciplinary dialogue but also to highlight the value of different methodologies and research tools in examining, explaining and unmasking the mechanisms of authoritarian neoliberalism.

The first part of the book features thematic chapters on the key processes, sites and actors that both constitute and are shaped by authoritarian neoliberalism. Setting out the thematic analyses with an examination of contemporary labour struggles, Mònica Clua-Losada and Olatz Ribera-Almandoz reveal the key role of the state in disciplining the working classes through anti-labour legislations and the enforcement of ‘wage discipline’ through low-income, precarious jobs. Zeroing on the Spanish Telefónica/Movistar workers’ mobilizations, the authors stress that, despite the wide-ranging disciplinary effects

of authoritarian neoliberal regimes, the working-class agency is still capable of resisting and subverting the conditions of exploitation. While the authors discuss the ways in which extensive privatization efforts and anti-labour legislations have fragmented the collective power of labour movements, their account of the Spanish mobilizations highlight that workers continue to find innovative ways with which to build common organizational links and fronts to challenge neoliberalism.

Kendra Briken and Volker Eick expand our engagement with coercive state power by historicizing the modes of policing in capitalist states and demonstrating the unique reconfiguration of ‘public’ and ‘private’ policing under authoritarian neoliberalism. While stressing the fact that the commercialization of security provision has not resulted in a withdrawal of the state from providing means of pacification, Briken and Eick demonstrate that states increasingly ‘rely upon private and commercial/corporate means’ to uphold their coercive functions. As the discussion of new organizational models of policing signals, even the state’s own coercive apparatuses are now subject to the discipline of neoliberal rationality as ‘police forces are managed more or less like police companies or enterprises’. Inasmuch as contemporary forms of policing are built upon ‘an intimate intertwining of the state and corporate security’, the authors also bring to our attention the ways in which pacification strategies are increasingly reinforced by projecting individualized responsibility and by exhorting citizens to police themselves and each other.

Wendy Harcourt’s curation of female researchers’ experiences of working in/against authoritarian neoliberal regimes display the disciplinary effects on individuals in brutal detail. Refocusing our interrogation of authoritarian neoliberalism at the level of body politics, Harcourt invites us to unmask the disciplinary strategies of neoliberalism and authoritarian state power by focusing on resistance from ‘the position of the intimate, personal and political’. Vignettes of five women’s research experiences that constitute the narrative of the chapter not only reveal the particular gendered effects of neoliberalism but also, as Harcourt powerfully argues, ‘open up space for a wider understanding of what constitutes valued and validated knowledge in academe’.

The impact of authoritarian neoliberalism on social forces and their reproduction is further investigated in Sébastien Rioux’s chapter on welfare provisions and the management of hunger. Zooming in on the United States to chart the historical trajectory of state responses to the recurrent crises of social reproduction, Rioux offers a detailed analysis of how food insecurity is manufactured in wealthy capitalist countries through state (in)activities. Underscoring the inherent class character of neoliberal reforms, Rioux elucidates the linkages between declining profitability, wage stagnation and the state-led shift from welfare to workfare. As the chapter concludes grimly,

neoliberal reforms have succeeded in restoring the key circuits of capital accumulation. This restoration, however, has resulted in the expansion of ‘an army of working poor for whom food and economic insecurity have become the norm’.

The focus on the state’s role in shaping the accumulation processes is further sharpened in Annalena Di Giovanni’s chapter on urban transformation under authoritarian neoliberalism. In line with our broader emphasis on understanding neoliberalism as an accumulation regime, Di Giovanni carefully unpacks the contradictions of ‘neoliberal urbanism’ and reasserts that state apparatuses are increasingly monopolizing decision-making powers to commodify public spaces. Tracing the concrete manifestations of this trend in the case of Istanbul’s urban restructuring, Di Giovanni reveals that ‘a planning model of fragmentation, private contracting and the centralization of local decision-making’ undermines independent auditing mechanisms and excludes the public from influencing key decisions made about their living spaces. Under authoritarian neoliberalism, cities are thus shaped by the state’s ‘juridically authorised (if not legitimised) administrative domination’ (Davies 2014: 3225).

Echoing the hitherto discussed themes of the commercialization of pacification and space, Luca Manunza’s ethnographic research into refugee camps demonstrates the extent to which the management of borders has become an extension of ‘humanitarian warfare’ abroad and the regulation of the labour market within the European Union. Unpacking how a nexus of private providers and local administrations controls the ‘hospitality business’ of asylum seekers in Italy, Manunza reveals that EU border management is increasingly shaped by the desire to prevent a ‘surplus population’ from accessing the labour market and operates on deeply racialized premises.

The second part of the book opens with two chapters that continue to focus on the European Union’s role in maintaining and reinforcing disciplinary mechanisms across various socio-spatial levels. Ian Bruff interrogates the European Union’s legal infrastructure and highlights its role in insulating key decision-making processes from the purview of the public and enforcing neoliberal discipline. While the criticism of the European Union’s ‘democratic deficit’ and its role as ‘a supranational anchor for the domestic pursuit of market freedom’ (Bonefeld 2015: 869; van Apeldoorn 2009) is well established in the critical literature, Bruff brings into fresh focus how non-binding ‘soft’ laws have become crucial tools with which to disseminate, institutionalize and enforce neoliberal policies. The chapter employs insights from the emerging literature on ‘facet methodology’ and deconstructs the European Social Model, as well as a number of EU initiatives, to evaluate their role in enshrining neoliberal common sense.

Shifting the focus from the European Union's own architecture to the effects of its disciplinary policies, Panagiotis Sotiris delivers a powerful indictment of the Troika-enforced fiscal austerity in Greece and exposes the extent to which the Greek case signals the establishment of a new European-wide 'permanent economic emergency'. Reflecting the book's overall aim in redefining neoliberalism as a contingent response to capitalist crises, Sotiris reconceptualizes EU integration as a 'class strategy' to alleviate the crisis of the European 'social model' and retraces the ways in which the imposition of austerity in Greece has been accompanied by tactics that have short-circuited the 'normal' political organization of the capitalist state (e.g. parliamentary process) and silenced the popular will of the Greek people. Sotiris's wide-ranging critique of the European Union's structural deficiencies results in a call for a decisive rupture with the Union and a reimagining of national and international communities based on social alliances of subaltern classes.

The remaining case studies offered in the book reveal how a broadly defined neoliberal macroeconomic policy has been installed upon established political regimes and utilized the existing or emerging authoritarian tendencies—despite variations in state forms/political structures—to enshrine capital accumulation.¹⁶ In the particular cases of Cambodia, China, Egypt, Morocco and Turkey, the chapters argue that the transitions to a neoliberal regime of accumulation were often encouraged by the state elites and policy-makers to address not only economic woes, but also political crises brought about by intensified class conflict and loss of legitimacy. As such, retracing the histories of neoliberalization in those cases through the lens of authoritarian neoliberalism becomes paramount to contextualize and understand more accurately 'how (authoritarian) modalities of government have changed over the years and how these changes have an impact on the government of particular peoples and places' (Bogaert 2013: 216). This manoeuvre also allows us to move away from essentializing the nature and influence of authoritarian state power in the global South and retain a sharper analytical sensitivity to the economic processes through which such state forms have reproduced themselves.

The reconstitution of authoritarian state power in Turkey over the last decade arguably represents the archetypal case of authoritarian neoliberalism. Barış Alp Özden, İsmet Akça and Ahmet Bekmen unpack the modalities of authoritarian neoliberalism in Turkey and carefully retrace how the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) has risen upon a threefold strategy of enforcing neoliberal reforms, demobilizing the organized working classes and displaying an instrumentalist political activism against the military tutelage. The authors bring together key aspects of the economic, political and social components of the party's hegemonic activities into a single narrative

that charts the interplay between populist and disciplinary strategies that paved the way for the marginalization and criminalization of oppositional forces against the backdrop of an increasingly authoritarian, de facto single-party regime.¹⁷

If the Turkish case embodies the ease with which neoliberalism can transform democratic—however limited that democracy might be—variants of capitalist states, Brecht De Smet and Koenraad Bogaert remind us that authoritarianism is already latent in the political organization of capitalism and that authoritarian states have excelled at embracing neoliberal reforms. Providing a comparative overview of Egypt's and Morocco's paths to neoliberal restructuring, the authors argue that neoliberalism was adopted as a response to fiscal, political and social turbulences triggered by the particular postcolonial configuration of these countries and their relationship to the world economy. In both cases, the extent to which the ruling classes managed to exert hegemonic leadership over the subaltern classes shaped the trajectory of their neoliberal programmes and the scale of popular resistance to them.

In the final two chapters, the utilization of existing patterns of control and regulation appears as a key factor in reinforcing neoliberalism. Simon Springer underscores the ways in which patronage and clientel relations in Cambodia have been remodelled to justify the status quo of a ruling class that has benefitted tremendously from the country's transition to a 'free market economy'. Labelling the symbiosis of Cambodia's hierarchal patronage structures and the neoliberalization of its economy *neoliberalism*, Springer unmasks the violence continuously perpetrated by 'a kleptocratic system of nepotism'. While Springer accentuates a particularly localized component in reproducing neoliberalism in Cambodia, his analysis reasserts the importance of 'retaining the abstraction of neoliberalism as a "global" project' to map out the commonalities between 'geographically diffuse phenomena like inequality and poverty'. Kean Fan Lim's discussion of the paths to variegated neoliberalism in China captures a similar dynamic by underscoring the extent to which the Communist Party of China (CPC), through neoliberal restructuring, has redefined and repurposed a plethora of existing institutions and policies to entrench its political power. Lim shows that 'the strategies to effect market-like rule in China are first and foremost a legacy of authoritarian capacities and policies instituted *prior* to the launch of marketization in the 1980s'.

The book is concluded with a postscript by Cynthia Enloe, who encourages us to remain attentive to the questions of agency. Complementing our focus on the state, Enloe draws attention to the questions of *how* and *why* those who occupy key positions within the state apparatuses have promoted authoritarian

neoliberal policies, and thus offers a crucial new avenue within which to devise future research projects on authoritarian neoliberalism.

CONCLUSION

States of Discipline acts as an exploration into the increasingly visible and salient symbiosis of neoliberalism and authoritarian state power. As such, we present the book neither as a definitive statement nor as the culmination of a done-and-dusted research project, but as a step towards analyzing the reciprocal relationship between neoliberalism and the often overlooked authoritarian political power that co-constitutes it. Beyond the themes and spatial/governmental contexts we explore in the book, the particular gendered, racialized and localized effects of authoritarian neoliberalism, as well as their relationship with the contemporary forms of indebtedness, financialization, migration and globalized conflict, require greater scrutiny.¹⁸ While chapters in this book engage with many of these topics, we believe that additional in-depth case studies that take authoritarian state power seriously can illuminate the specific constellation of neoliberalism and state strategies that exploit the existing gendered, racial and class-based hierarchies as well as strengthen the analytical purchase of the concept.

We hope that the analyses provided in this book will speak to and inform concrete political struggles currently waged against authoritarian neoliberal strategies across the world. The road from theoretically informed research to political practice is always uneven and offers no guarantees, but we do hope that the book will make constructive contributions to the ongoing debates on tactics and strategies to challenge neoliberalism.¹⁹ Chief among these contributions is reasserting the importance of retaining state power as the focal point of critique and radical political practice. While our thematic and country/region-specific analyses demonstrate that the concrete forms in which social movements and communities confront neoliberalism are always shaped by their local context, histories and forms of mobilization, we maintain that struggles against authoritarian neoliberalism ultimately need to address the question of state power. This should not be read to the effect that we prioritize one form of political practice over another (e.g. we are not advocating a side in the well-trod debates on whether the ‘horizontal’ versus ‘vertical’ organizations offer the best tools to practice radical politics) but rather as a call for a critique of and disruptive engagement with state power to confront neoliberalism strategically, that is, at its political–organizational heart.

How best to construct such a strategic engagement with the state and mobilize grassroots responses is, once again, heavily contingent upon where the

state in question lies in the spectrum of authoritarian neoliberalism. While the entrenched neoliberal economic rationality in the West continues to close off avenues for socioeconomic alternatives and manifests predominantly as ‘a technocratic transfer of power’ (Lowndes and Gardner 2016: 15), those struggling for alternatives in the global South often face a whole set of different challenges that originate not necessarily from neoliberal economic management itself but from its symbiosis with authoritarian statisms. We should, therefore, remain open to embracing a variety of political tactics and practices just as authoritarian neoliberalism operates on a spectrum of disciplinary strategies. Recognizing the importance of this strategic receptivity would allow us to mitigate some of the existing fault lines in radical politics and lead to the reinvention and utilization of ‘traditional’ organizations.²⁰ Such tactics and practices, however, need to be informed by the lessons of past struggles and organizations, as engaging with the state—however critical the terms of that engagement might be—often risks becoming ‘entangled with, and within, the institutions of the state and ever more distant from the traditional social base’ (Boito and Saad-Filho 2016: 204) from which movements emerge. Finally, notwithstanding our focus on the constitutive role of authoritarian state power and the utilization of state apparatuses in maintaining capital accumulation, consent-making activities and efforts by the states, policymakers and transnational organizations to (re)constitute neoliberal ‘common sense’ should still be seen as integral components of the hegemonic status neoliberalism continues to enjoy.²¹

This book has been conceived and prepared within a turbulent conjuncture at which the economic and political crises of capitalism resulted in both the resurfacing and extension of authoritarian statisms in the Middle East and Latin America, the disintegration of the established centrist politics in Europe and the fragmented, yet forceful, rise of the xenophobic right and populist left across crisis-stricken countries. The exigencies of this conjuncture force us to reconsider and challenge neoliberalism not as a set of economic policies, but as a regime of governance that continues to undermine democratic politics and amplify latent authoritarian tendencies of capitalist states. We present this book as a contribution to the struggles waged for a democratic future unshackled by the economic and political chains of neoliberalism.

NOTES

1. See Leiva (2008); *Development Dialogue* (2009); Grugel and Ruggirozzi (2009); Macdonald and Ruchert (2009); Panizza (2009); Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2010); Schmalz and Ebenau (2012); Springer (2015).

2. For analogous articulations of this point in different disciplinary contexts, see Lovering and Türkmen (2011: 73); Topak (2013: 567); Aydın (2013: 106); Tansel (2015).

3. While the once-dominant state withdrawal thesis has lost its influence to a large extent, it is possible to detect a symptomatic reincarnation of the ‘state/market dichotomy’ (Bruff 2011) in the recent literature on the BRICS (Stephen 2014: 929–30). For refined discussions of the relationship between the state and neoliberalism, see Konings (2010); Delwaide (2011); Dardot and Laval (2013: 216); Cahill (2014: 141); Soederberg (2014: 46).

4. This chapter will not provide a thematic review of the different ways in which the concept has been defined, given that a significant portion of the literature has focused on historicizing and retracing the conceptual and intellectual trajectory of neoliberalism. See, *inter alia*, Harvey (2005); Mirowski and Plehwe (2009); Peck (2010); Burgin (2012); Stedman-Jones (2012); Mirowski (2013). For recent interventions in neoliberalism’s theoretical boundaries and the definitional struggles around the concept, see Peck (2013); Flew (2014); Springer (2014).

5. See also Dean (2014: 153–157); Eriksen et al. (2015: 912–914).

6. Philip Mirowski further suggests that the Mont Pèlerin Society, the kernel of this collective, ‘evolved into an exceptionally successful structure for the incubation of integrated political theory and political action outside of the more conventional structures of academic disciplines and political parties in the second half of the twentieth century’ (2013: 42–43).

7. The absence/weakness of Western-style welfare states, of course, does not signal a corresponding absence/weakness of different types of poor relief and social welfare.

8. The word ‘contingent’ is used here to highlight that neoliberalism is but one response to the recurring economic and political crises of capitalism. While it has taken a universal quality over four decades of implementation and enforcement, its structural linkage to capitalist crises should not be understood as a trigger of uniform reactions across different countries and socioeconomic contexts.

9. As Henk Overbeek (2003: 25–26, original emphases) has correspondingly interjected, ‘There is a complex and dialectical relationship between neo-liberalism as *process* and neo-liberalism as *project*. Certainly, there is such a thing as a neo-liberal project that is pushed consciously and purposefully by its protagonists (organic intellectuals, entrepreneurs and politicians, organizational representatives, etc.). ... But of course, as critics of this approach will quickly point out, these programmes have never been simply put into practice. A hegemonic project or comprehensive concept of control is shaped, and continuously reshaped, in the process of struggle, compromise and readjustment.’

10. For the various ways in which organizations such as the World Bank and IMF install and sanction the ‘discipline of the market’ (Overbeek 2002: 80), see Weller and Singleton (2006); Bedirhanoglu (2007); Harrison (2010); Güven (2012); True (2012, chs. 5–6).

11. As Nancy Fraser (2015: 184.n42) clarifies: ‘This intensification and enlargement of repressive state power proceeds even as other state functions are being

eliminated, downsized, outsourced to private firms, or kicked up to transnational governance structures. Thus, the recalibration of the polity/economy nexus in financialized capitalism is in no way tantamount to the “disappearance of the state”. On the contrary, states continue to exercise their historic repressive functions and to monopolize the means of violence—indeed, they do so in ever new and creative ways.’

12. See, *inter alia*, Boratav, Türel and Yeldan (1996); Beinin (2009); Wurzel (2009); Connell and Dados (2014: 122–129); Tansel (forthcoming). The role played by the military regimes in such transitions signals the extent to which restoring the pillars of capital accumulation was perceived by the juntas as a key—if not *the* key—step towards securing order, stability and the survival of their respective nation states. Neoliberal policies offered exactly the type of expeditious remedy the regimes were looking for after protracted economic and political crises. As Poulantzas (1976: 92, 106) illustrated in his analyses of Portugal, Spain and Greece, in such major ‘crises of hegemony’, ‘the role of political parties for the bourgeoisie is replaced by that of the military’.

13. The decoupling of violence and liberal democracy has a deep-rooted antecedent in social theory. As Karl von Holdt has stipulated, ‘Western social theory assumes that overt violence declines with the formation of the modern state and democracy through a combination of the consolidation of the modern state and its monopoly of legitimate coercion identified by Weber, the political technologies of Foucault’s governmentality, and Bourdieu’s gentle violence of symbolic power, with the result that the study of violence is reduced to studies of deviance, criminality or war’ (2014: 130).

14. Upholding the freedom of markets at the expense of democratic politics was not an idea anathema to early neoliberal thinkers, as Hayek (1978: 143) himself suggested that ‘an authoritarian government might act on liberal principles’. See also Dean (2014: 155); Bonefeld (2015: 872–874).

15. This should not be read to the effect that neoliberalization simply results in the dismissal of progressive causes or marginalized groups and communities. On the contrary, emancipatory goals shared and advanced by progressive movements continue to be adopted and subsequently neutralized by powerful transnational organizations as well as nation states and companies. In such cases, as feminist political economists have incisively demonstrated, the co-optation of progressive ideals such as ‘gender equality and women’s empowerment’ are repurposed to fit the requirements of neoliberal rationality and ‘only understood in relation to [their] ability to serve the market’ (Elias 2013: 166–167; Dauvergne and LeBaron 2014; Roberts 2015).

16. This is a trend that is also visible beyond the case studies we have covered in the book. See, for example, Jasmin Hristov’s (2014) account of the ‘parallel’ development of paramilitary activities and neoliberal restructuring in Colombia.

17. Chapters 6 and 10, the two chapters that focus on the Turkish case, were completed before the coup attempt on 15 July 2016 and, thus, do not explore the dynamics of the post-coup period. Nevertheless, the analyses provided in the chapters hold up well even after the coup attempt, since the subsequent crackdown ordered by the government represents not a new and unprecedented course but a significant intensification of the existing practices highlighted in those chapters.

18. These issues and the concrete ways in which they manifest in and constitute neoliberal governance have, of course, been subjects of many important studies. See,

inter alia, Bakker (2003); Bakker and Gill (2008); Goldberg (2009); Roberts and Mahtani (2010); Elias (2011); LeBaron (2014, 2015); Soederberg (2014); Bruff and Wöhl (2016); Montgomerie and Tepe-Belfrage (2016).

19. For a small selection of the recent discussions on extant/proposed radical political practices against neoliberalism from different perspectives, see Hall, Massey and Rustin (2013); Hanieh (2015); Huke, Clua-Losada and Bailey (2015); Dean (2016); Varoufakis (2016); Vey (2016); and Wigger and Buch-Hansen (2013).

20. See Bieler, Lindberg and Sauerborn (2010: 257); Bieler (2015); Huke, Clua-Losada and Bailey (2015); Fraser (2015: 188); Wigger and Horn (2015); Teivainen and Trommer (2016); Hesketh (2016).

21. Martijn Konings (2015: 112), for example, invites us to take ‘the cultural spirit of neoliberal capitalism’ more seriously and warns us against ‘[focusing] on the role of neoconservative elites and [portraying] the spiritual and cultural aspects of contemporary capitalism as oddly irrational moments in a process fundamentally driven by market imperatives and instrumental rationality’. On the role of ‘common sense’ in building neoliberal hegemony, see Soederberg (2006); Bruff (2008); Stanley (2014); and Roberts (2015).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altvater E (2009) Postneoliberalism or postcapitalism? The failure of neoliberalism in the financial market crisis. *Development Dialogue* 51: 73–86.
- Amoore L, Dodgson R, Gills BK, Langley P, Marshall D and Watson I (1997) Overturning ‘globalization’: resisting the teleological, reclaiming the ‘political’. *New Political Economy* 2(1): 179–195.
- Aydın Z (2013) Global crisis, Turkey and the regulation of economic crisis. *Capital & Class* 37(1): 95–109.
- Ayers AJ and Saad-Filho A (2015) Democracy against neoliberalism: Paradoxes, limitations, transcendence. *Critical Sociology* 41(4/5): 597–618.
- Bakker I (2003) Neo-liberal governance and the reprivatization of social reproduction: Social provisioning and shifting gender orders. In: Bakker I and Gill S (eds) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Human In/security in the Global Political Economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 66–82.
- Bakker I and Gill S (2008) New constitutionalism and social reproduction. In: Bakker I and Silvey R (eds) *Beyond States and Markets: The Challenges of Social Reproduction*. Abingdon: Routledge. 19–33.
- Bedirhanoglu P (2007) The neoliberal discourse on corruption as a means of consent building: Reflections from post-crisis Turkey. *Third World Quarterly* 28(7): 1239–1254.
- Beinin J (2009) Neo-liberal structural adjustment, political demobilization, and neo-authoritarianism in Egypt. In: Guazzone L and Pioppi D (eds) *The Arab State and Neo-liberal Globalization: The Restructuring of State Power in the Middle East*. Reading: Ithaca Press, 19–46.

- Bekmen A (2014) State and capital in Turkey during the neoliberal era. In: Akça İ, Bekmen A and Özden BA (eds) *Turkey Reframed: Constituting Neoliberal Hegemony*. London: Pluto, 47–74.
- Bieler A (2015) ‘Sic vos non vobis’ (for you, but not yours): The struggle for public water in Italy. *Monthly Review* 67(5): 35–50.
- Bieler A, Lindberg I and Sauerborn W (2010) After 30 years of deadlock: Labour’s possible strategies in the new global order. *Globalizations* 7(1–2): 247–260.
- Blyth M (2013) *Austerity: History of a Dangerous Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bogaert K (2013) Contextualizing the Arab Revolts: The politics behind three decades of neoliberalism in the Arab World. *Middle East Critique* 22(3): 213–234.
- Boito A and Saad-Filho A (2016) State, state institutions, and political power in Brazil. *Latin American Perspectives* 43(2): 190–206.
- Bonefeld W (2015) European economic constitution and the transformation of democracy: On class and the state of law. *European Journal of International Relations* 21(4): 867–886.
- Boratav K, Türel O and Yeldan E (1996) Dilemmas of structural adjustment and environmental policies under instability: Post-1980 Turkey. *World Development* 24(2): 373–393.
- Brenner N and Theodore N (2002) Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 34(3): 349–379.
- Bruff I (2008) *Culture and Consensus in European Varieties of Capitalism: A ‘Common Sense’ Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bruff I (2014) The rise of authoritarian neoliberalism. *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society* 26(1): 113–129.
- Bruff I (2016) Neoliberalism and authoritarianism. In: Springer S, Birch K and MacLeavy J (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Neoliberalism*. Abingdon: Routledge, 107–117.
- Bruff I and Wöhl S (2016) Constitutionalizing austerity, disciplining the household: Masculine norms of competitiveness and the crisis of social reproduction in the Eurozone. In: Hozic AA and True J (eds) *Scandalous Economics: The Spectre of Gender and Global Financial Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burgin A (2012) *The Great Persuasion: Reinventing Free Markets Since the Depression*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cahill D (2014) *The End of Laissez-faire? On the Durability of Embedded Liberalism*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Cahill D (2015) Representations of neoliberalism. *Forum for Social Economics* 44(2): 201–210.
- Centeno MA and Cohen JN (2012) The arc of neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38(1): 317–340.
- Connell R and Dados N (2014) Where in the world does neoliberalism come from? The market agenda in Southern perspective. *Theory and Society* 43(2): 117–138.
- Cross M (2013) Demonised, impoverished and now forced into isolation: the fate of disabled people under austerity. *Disability & Society* 28(5): 719–723.

- Crouch C (2011) *The Strange Non-death of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Dardot P and Laval C (2014) *The New Way of the World: On Neoliberal Society*. London: Verso.
- Dauvergne P and LeBaron G (2014) *Protest Inc.: The Corporatization of Activism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Davies JS (2014) Rethinking urban power and the local state: Hegemony, domination and resistance in neoliberal cities. *Urban Studies* 51(15): 3215–3232.
- de Witte F (2013) EU law, politics, and the social question. *German Law Journal* 14(5): 581–611.
- Dean M (2014) Rethinking neoliberalism. *Journal of Sociology* 50(2): 150–163.
- Dean J (2016) *Crowds and Party*. London: Verso.
- Delwaide J (2011) The return of the state? *European Review* 19(1): 69–91.
- Development Dialogue* (2009) Special issue: Postneoliberalism—A beginning debate. 51 (January): 1–212.
- Duménil G and Lévy D (2011) *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Elias J (2011) The gender politics of economic competitiveness in Malaysia's transition to a knowledge economy. *Pacific Review* 24(5): 529–552.
- Elias J (2013) Davos woman to the rescue of global capitalism: Postfeminist politics and competitiveness promotion at the World Economic Forum. *International Political Sociology* 7(2): 152–169.
- Eriksen TH, Laidlaw J, Mair J, Martin K and Venkatesan S (2015) Debate: 'The concept of neoliberalism has become an obstacle to the anthropological understanding of the twenty-first century'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 21(4): 911–923.
- Flew T (2014) Six theories of neoliberalism. *Thesis Eleven* 122(1): 49–71.
- Fraser N (2015) Legitimation crisis? On the political contradictions of financialized capitalism. *Critical Historical Studies* 2(2): 157–189.
- Gamble A (2001) Neo-liberalism. *Capital & Class* 25(3): 127–134.
- Germann J (2014) German 'Grand Strategy' and the rise of neoliberalism. *International Studies Quarterly* 58(4): 706–716.
- Gill S (1992) The emerging world order and European change: the political economy of European Union. In: Miliband R and Panitch L (eds) *Socialist Register 1992: New World Order?* London: Merlin Press, 157–196.
- Gill S (2008) *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*, 2nd edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gill S (2015) Market civilization, new constitutionalism and world order. In: Gill S and Cutler AC (eds) *New Constitutionalism and World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29–44.
- Gills BK (2010) Going South: capitalist crisis, systemic crisis, civilisational crisis. *Third World Quarterly* 31(2): 169–184.
- Goldberg DT (2009) *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grugel J and Ruggirozzi P (eds) (2009) *Governance After Neoliberalism in Latin America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Güven AB (2012) The IMF, the World Bank, and the global economic crisis: Exploring paradigm continuity. *Development and Change* 43(4): 869–898.
- Hall S, Massey D and Rustin M (2013) After neoliberalism: Analysing the present. *Soundings* 53: 8–22.
- Hanieh A (2013) *Lineages of Revolt: Issues of Contemporary Capitalism in the Middle East*. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Hanieh A (2015) Challenging neoliberalism in the Arab world. In: Pradella L and Marois T (eds) *Polarizing Development: Alternatives to the Neoliberalism and the Crisis*. London: Pluto, 226–236.
- Harrison G (2010) *Neoliberal Africa: The Impact of Global Social Engineering*. London: Zed.
- Harvey D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayek FA (1978) *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hesketh C (2016) The survival of non-capitalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (Online). DOI: 10.1177/0263775816639313.
- Hozic AA and True J (2016) Making feminist sense of the global financial crisis. In: Hozic AA and True J (eds) *Scandalous Economics: Gender and the Politics of Financial Crises*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–20.
- Hristov J (2014) *Paramilitarism and Neoliberalism: Violent Systems of Capital Accumulation in Colombia and Beyond*. London: Pluto.
- Huke N, Clua-Losada M and Bailey DJ (2015) Disrupting the European crisis: A critical political economy of contestation, subversion and escape. *New Political Economy* 20(5): 725–751.
- Klein N (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Konings M (2010) Neoliberalism and the American state. *Critical Sociology* 36(5): 741–765.
- Konings M (2015) *The Emotional Logic of Capitalism: What Progressives Have Missed*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- LeBaron G (2014) Reconceptualizing debt bondage: Debt as a class-based form of labor discipline. *Critical Sociology* 40(5): 763–780.
- LeBaron G (2015) Unfree labor beyond binaries: Insecurity, social hierarchy and labour market restructuring. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 17(1): 1–19.
- Leiva FI (2008) *Latin American Neostructuralism: The Contradictions of Post-Neoliberal Development*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lovering J and Türkmen H (2011) Bulldozer neo-liberalism in Istanbul: the state-led construction of property markets and the displacement of the urban poor. *International Planning Studies* 16(1): 73–96.
- Lowndes V and Gardner A (2016) Local governance under the Conservatives: Super-austerity, devolution and the ‘smarter state’. *Local Government Studies* (Online). DOI: 10.1080/03003930.2016.1150837.

- Macdonald L and Ruchert A (eds) (2009) *Post-Neoliberalism in the Americas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marx K (1975) Critical notes on the article 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform. By a Prussian'. In: *Early Writings*, Livingstone R and Benton G (trans). London: Penguin, 401–420.
- Mirowski P (2013) *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown*. London: Verso.
- Mirowski P and Plehwe D (eds) (2009) *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mitchell T (1999) No factories, no problems: the logic of neo-liberalism in Egypt. *Review of African Political Economy* 26(82): 455–468.
- Møller J and Skaaning SE (2010) Beyond the radial delusion: conceptualizing and measuring democracy and non-democracy. *International Political Science Review* 31(3): 261–283.
- Mollo MLR and Saad-Filho A (2006) Neoliberal economic policies in Brazil (1994–2005): Cardoso, Lula and the need for a democratic alternative. *New Political Economy* 11(1): 99–123.
- Montgomerie J and Tepe-Belfrage D (2016) A feminist moral-political economy of uneven reform in austerity Britain: Fostering financial and parental literacy. *Globalizations* (Online). DOI:10.1080/14747731.2016.1160605
- Morton AD (2007) *Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy*. London: Pluto.
- Mudge SL (2008) What is neo-liberalism? *Socio-Economic Review* 6(4): 703–731.
- Ostry JD, Loungani P and Furceri D (2016) Neoliberalism: Oversold? *Finance & Development* 53(2): 38–41. Available at: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2016/06/pdf/ostry.pdf>
- Panizza F (2009) *Contemporary Latin America: Development and Democracy beyond the Washington Consensus*. London: Zed.
- Peck J (2010) *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peck J (2013) Explaining (with) neoliberalism. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 1(2): 132–157.
- Peck J, Theodore N and Brenner N (2010) Postneoliberalism and its malcontents. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 41(S1): 94–116.
- Plehwe D (2009) Introduction. In: Mirowski P and Plehwe D (eds) *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1–42.
- Poulantzas N (1976) *The Crisis of the Dictatorships: Portugal, Spain, Greece*, Fernbach D (trans). London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas N (1978/2014) *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.
- Oberndorfer L (2015) From new constitutionalism to authoritarian constitutionalism: New economic governance and the state of European democracy. In: Jäger J and Springler E (eds) *Asymmetric Governance and Possible Futures: Critical Political Economy and Post-Keynesian Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, 186–207.

- Overbeek H (2002) Neoliberalism and the regulation of global labor mobility. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581(1): 74–90.
- Overbeek H (2003) Globalization, neo-liberalism and the employment question. In: Overbeek H (ed) *The Political Economy of European Employment: European Integration and the Transnationalization of the (Un)employment Question*. London: Routledge, 13–28.
- Reed H and Portes J (2014) *Cumulative Impact Assessment: A Research Report by Landman Economics and the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) for the Equality and Human Rights Commission*. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report 94. Available at: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/cumulative_impact_assessment_full_report_30-07-14.pdf
- Roberts A (2015) The political economy of ‘transnational business feminism’: Problematizing the corporate-led gender equality agenda. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 17(2): 209–231.
- Roberts DJ and Mahtani M (2010) Neoliberalizing race, racing neoliberalism: Placing ‘race’ in neoliberal discourses. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 42(2): 248–257.
- Roberts P (2015) Passive revolution in Brazil: Struggles over hegemony, religion and development 1964–2007. *Third World Quarterly* 36(9): 1663–1681.
- Schäfer A and Streeck W (2013) Introduction: Politics in the age of austerity. In: Schäfer A and Streeck W (eds) *Politics in the Age of Austerity*. Cambridge: Polity, 1–25.
- Schmalz S and Ebenau M (2012) After neoliberalism? Brazil, India, and China in the global economic crisis. *Globalizations* 9(4): 487–501.
- Smith N (2016) Towards a queer political economy of crisis. In: Hozic AA and True J (eds) *Scandalous Economics: Gender and the Politics of Financial Crises*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–20.
- Soederberg S (2006) *Global Governance in Question: Empire, Class, and the New Common Sense in Managing North–South Relations*. London: Pluto.
- Soederberg S (2014) *Debtfare States and the Poverty Industry: Money, Discipline and the Surplus Population*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Springer S (2014) Neoliberalism in denial. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 4(2): 154–160.
- Springer S (2015) Postneoliberalism? *Review of Radical Political Economics* 47(1): 5–17.
- Stanley L (2014) ‘We’re reaping what we sowed’: Everyday crisis narratives and acquiescence to the age of austerity. *New Political Economy* 19(6): 895–917.
- Stanley L (forthcoming) Governing austerity in the UK: Anticipatory fiscal consolidation as a variety of austerity governance. *Economy & Society*.
- Stedman-Jones D (2012) *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stephen MD (2014) Rising powers, global capitalism and liberal global governance: A historical materialist account of the BRICs challenge. *European Journal of International Relations* 20(4): 912–938.

- Tansel CB (2015) The politics of contemporary capitalism in Turkey (and the politics of its interlocutors). *Development and Change* 46(3): 570–584.
- Tansel CB (forthcoming) Ties that bind: Popular uprisings and the politics of neoliberalism in the Middle East. In: Işıksal H and Göksel O (eds) *Turkey and the Middle East in an Age of Turbulence*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Teivainen T and Trommer S (2016) Representation beyond the state: Towards transnational democratic non-state politics. *Globalizations* (Online). DOI:10.1080/14747731.2016.1160599
- Topak ÖE (2013) Governing Turkey's information society. *Current Sociology* 61(5): 565–583.
- True J (2012) *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tyler I (2013) *Revolting Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed.
- van Apeldoorn B (2009) The contradictions of 'embedded neoliberalism' and Europe's multi-level legitimacy crisis: The European project and its limits. In: van Apeldoorn B, Drahočoupil J and Horn L (eds) *Contradictions and Limits of Neoliberal European Governance: From Lisbon to Lisbon*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 21–43.
- Varoufakis Y (2016) *And the Weak Suffer What They Must? Europe, Austerity and the Threat to Global Stability*. London: Bodley Head.
- Vey J (2016) Crisis protests in Germany, Occupy Wall Street, and Mietshäuser Syndikat: Antinomies of current Marxist- and anarchist-inspired movements and their convergence. *Capital & Class* 40(1): 59–74.
- von Holdt K (2014) On violent democracy. *The Sociological Review* 62(S2): 129–151.
- Weller CE and Singleton L (2006) Peddling reform: The role of think tanks in shaping the neoliberal policy agenda for the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. In: Plehwe D, Walpen B and Neunhöffer G (eds) *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. Abingdon: Routledge, 70–86.
- Wigger A and Buch-Hansen H (2013) Competition, the global crisis, and alternatives to neoliberal capitalism: A critical engagement with anarchism. *New Political Science* 35(4): 604–626.
- Wigger A and Horn L (2015) Uneven development and political resistance against EU austerity politics. In Pradella L and Marois T (eds) *Polarising Development: Alternatives to Neoliberalism and the Crisis*. London: Pluto, 348–359.
- Wurzel UG (2009) The political economy of authoritarianism in Egypt: Insufficient structural reforms, limited outcomes and a lack of new actors. In: Guazzone L and Pioppi D (eds) *The Arab State and Neo-liberal Globalization: The Restructuring of State Power in the Middle East*. Reading: Ithaca Press, 97–123.