

NOTICE CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The material copied here may be protected by copyright law in the United States and/or in other jurisdictions. This copy was made in compliance with U.S. copyright law and is provided to you for the purposes of private study, scholarship, or research.

If you use the copy for a different purpose, such as posting on a course website, the copyright analysis that supported making the copy does not apply. It is your responsibility to address copyright for any other uses. For assistance, you may wish to consult the library's guides to [Copyright Basics](#) and [Copyright and Course Websites](#). You can also contact the University of Michigan Library Copyright Office at copyright@umich.edu.

Conceptualizing the Post-Liberalization State

Intervention, Restructuring, and the Nature of State Power

LEELA FERNANDES

“The gap between the haves and the have-nots globally is now at the same level as in the 1820s, the OECD said Thursday, October 2, warning it was one of the most ‘worrying’ developments over the past 200 years. In a major report on global well-being over the past two centuries, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) noted inequality shot up after globalization took root in the 1980s.”¹

Introduction

The 2014 report from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) provided a stark warning about the rise in inequality.² The growing concentration of wealth and the intensification of inequality has in fact become one of the distinguishing features of the twenty-first century. Public and academic debates on questions of economic inequality and exclusion have centered on the paradigm of “neoliberalism.” Popular usage of the term has broadly centered on key features that have dominated contemporary global economic practices. These features include the restriction of state controls of economic activities (and the corresponding dismantling of the welfare state), a belief in the self-regulating power of the market in economic, social, and cultural spheres (and corresponding trends of privatization), and a range of policies of economic liberalization that have been designed to spur economic growth in comparative contexts. Proponents of the model of neoliberalism argue that restricting the state to a market-enabling force is necessary to spur economic growth (Bhagwati 2004).

Indeed, policies of economic liberalization over successive decades have been implemented in varying forms and with varying paces in comparative contexts in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. Such policies have constituted a new developmental model that presumes that inequality and poverty can only be addressed through economic growth and an expansion of upward mobility and middle-class membership. Meanwhile, critics of neoliberalism have pointed to both the negative economic effects of such policies (Harvey 2005; Piketty 2014) as well as the deleterious political and sociocultural implications as logics of privatization have transformed the texture of both civil society and subjectivity in the twenty-first century (Brown 2005; Gambetti and Godoy-Anativia 2013; Greenhouse 2009; Hall and Lamont 2013).

The ideological paradigm of neoliberalism is invested in models of economic growth that both restrain and retrain the state. The state, in this hegemonic conception, must be restrained from its past regulatory and interventionist impulses and retrained to serve a limited market-enabling role. Critics of this paradigm have analyzed the effects of the ideological paradigm of neoliberalism and its material effects (such as cutbacks on welfare states) as well as the broader normative effects on societies that are structured through the logics of market behavior. There is, for instance, a vast scholarship on various dimensions of neoliberalism and its impact on inequality and identity. Interdisciplinary studies of neoliberalism have primarily focused either on declining state sovereignty in the face of corporate power and institutional forms of national and global governance that enhance the power of political and economic elites (Ong 2006) or on the ways neoliberalism has seeped into civil society, producing new forms of neoliberal subjectivity and disciplinary regimes of power (Laurie and Bondi 2005). Peter Hall and Michèle Lamont describe these trends as a constitution of the “neoliberal imaginary” that marks “a period that has authorized self-interested market behavior in settings where it might not once have been legitimate” (2013, 4). They illustrate the ways in which this imaginary has reconfigured social relationships and transformed the terms of social recognition in comparative contexts. Such changes, as some scholars have argued, have produced new forms of subjectivity that have been shaped in complex ways by the market-oriented logics of rationality, entrepreneurship, and selfhood (Brown 2005; Greenhouse 2009).

While such scholarship has produced critical insights into new modes of power and subjectivity, the primary emphasis of such work has been on the curtailment or displacement of the state by neoliberal modes of governance and identity. An effect of these very real processes of restructuring is a danger of presuming that the state has retreated or vanished in the post-liberalization period or that the neoliberal state is marked by a clear historical break from earlier forms of modern state power.³ In this context, neoliberalism risks taking on a deterministic and ghostly character—acting as a primary agent that reshapes socio-economic and cultural practices and permeates all forms of cultural, social, and political life. Critics of the paradigm of neoliberalism in effect may run the danger of reproducing the all-pervasive power of the neoliberal imaginary that they seek to contest by reproducing recursive narratives of a vanishing state in the face of the all-encompassing force of neoliberalism.

Although the “neoliberal imaginary” is commonly associated with privatization and market-led growth, the varying perspectives that exist on this paradigm are, in fact, paradoxically, implicitly, or explicitly grappling with the role of the state. The “state” often lurks at the edges of both popular and academic discourses on the neoliberal economic order of the twenty-first century. For instance, consider the strongest case for theories that presume a state in retreat. Policies of economic restructuring have led, rightly, to a great deal of research and analysis of state cutbacks in social spending (such as welfare benefits), of processes of privatization that have led to the decline of public sector employment, and of the naturalization of the ideological tenets of neoliberalism. Yet as recent research has shown, the state has, in fact, not retreated in the post-liberalization period. Gambetti and Godoy-Anatvia, for instance, provide an important cautionary reminder that “state power is the paradoxical instrument of the dismantling of the welfare state” (2013, 5).

Processes of privatization are indeed a key dimension both of policies of economic liberalization that have been implemented in comparative contexts and of certain forms of political subjectivity that emerge in particular contexts. However, the premise that the logic of markets (usually coded as “privatization”) is the driving impetus of neoliberalism also risks skewing knowledge production in ways that may inadvertently reproduce the logic of neoliberal ideology that such work seeks to

disrupt. An adequate understanding of the post-liberalization period in the twenty-first century requires more sustained analyses that also foreground questions of how conceptions of “publicness” are reconstituted and deployed (in relation to privatized conceptions of self and subjectivity), how states shape economic policy and contribute to the reproduction of inequality, and how political and social consent to structures of exclusion are produced and disrupted.⁴ Dag MacLeod, for instance, has shown that Mexico’s sweeping program of privatization from 1983 to 2000 cannot be understood adequately without addressing the role of the state in carrying this program forward (2004). As MacLeod notes, in the Mexican case, “the real challenge of implementing reform had to do with gaining control over the unwieldy apparatus of the state in order to transfer public assets to private actors” (2004, 26). Thus, for MacLeod, the question of the autonomy of the state can only be understood *relationally* where “the state’s ability to act ‘autonomously’ from one social group simply means that it is acting in the interest of some other social group” (26).

Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State seeks to understand the post-liberalization period through a redefinition of conceptions of “public” and “private” interests rather than an easy shift from public interests to the interests of private capital. This analysis disrupts the analytical drive to understand neoliberalism through a self-evident market-led logic of privatization. On the contrary, such an approach points to a need to think more deeply about how the state is implicated in and actively shapes policies and processes of economic liberalization. An analytical lens that mirrors a neoliberal logic of a market-dominated world misses the ways in which the restructuring of the state sets in motion a set of state practices and interventions that are not reducible to market actors. The state in effect does not retreat but both redeploys in complex ways (Brenner 2004; Collier 2011; Sassen, 1996) *and* continues to exercise power through long-standing practices, institutions and ideologies that have been historically salient features of the modern state. In this vein, the theoretical framework of the volume disrupts naturalized market-centered conceptions of the post-liberalization period.

The essays in this volume provide an in-depth analysis of the boundaries, practices, and nature of the post-liberalization state. The volume examines the nature of the restructuring of the state and argues for an

understanding of the state that moves beyond conceptions of a state in retreat on the one hand and a state that simply mirrors the needs of capital on the other. The book intervenes in this body of knowledge through a distinctive emphasis on the state from both a comparative and transnational perspective. Transnational processes (whether in terms of movements of capital, people, or ideational forms across national borders) are critical to understanding the post-liberalization period. However, transnationalism too often becomes an abstract or overdetermined frame of analysis (Fernandes 2013) when it is dislocated from situated understandings of such processes. Narrow conceptions of transnationalism can also severely underestimate both the sustained power of nationalism (such as the nationalist framings of certain modes of populism) and the significance of state power. This volume seeks to understand how such transnational processes shape and are shaped by the economic, political, and historical contexts of specific nation-states. Drawing on original field research in comparative contexts both globally and within the United States, the essays present a rich set of perspectives on the varied and often contradictory nature of state practices, structures, and ideologies in the post-liberalization era. The essays address four central questions: (1) How has the state been restructured? (2) How is state power exercised? (3) How is the state shaped by the needs of capital? (4) How does the state interact with institutions and organizational forms within the realm of civil society in the post-liberalization era of the twenty-first century?

As the essays in *Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State* illustrate, the nature of state formation affects processes of economic restructuring in complex ways. New state spaces and new state activities that emerge as the state seeks to direct economic liberalization or manage the political and social conflicts that arise from economic crisis and inequality intersect with and are shaped by historically specific trajectories of state formation in particular places. For instance, as recent research has shown, postcolonial state practices in the post-liberalization period often reflect a continuation of older regimes of state-led development (Fernandes 2006; Gupta 2012; Sharma 2008). Consider, for instance, one of the quintessential hegemonic discursive signifiers of liberalization—the growth of the middle classes in contemporary India. The potential for expanding upward mobility and access to middle-class status has

become the embodiment of the benefits of economic liberalization (Fernandes 2006). Public discourses and postcolonial scholarship have tended to emphasize the “newness” of these middle classes—often linking claims about a new middle-class identity to middle-class consumption and India’s policies of liberalization (Mazzarella 2003; Rajagopal 2001). What is missing in such analyses are both the ways in which these “new” middle classes are able to access upper-tier, new economy jobs because of historical state developmental patterns that support urban middle-class formation (by focusing, for instance, on higher education rather than primary education) and the ways in which these new middle classes continue to seek and receive substantial state resources (Fernandes 2006, 2015). Middle-class formation is thus still primarily a product of state developmental policies rather than of market liberalization. Such dynamics highlight the need to untangle the ways in which the neoliberal state coexists with older models of the developmental state and more closely investigate the interaction between these two sets of state activities.

Meanwhile, in specific national contexts, the retreat of the state is often due to state failures rather than to conscious policies of privatization. Thus, an analysis of the neoliberal model needs to guard against a conflation between processes of privatization and state regulatory failure. The failure of the state to provide services and to develop effective regulatory frameworks of governance—or what Stuart Corbridge calls “the scarcity of the state” (2005)—has often provided a space that has subsequently been occupied by private actors and privatized practices. This “scarcity of the state” often paradoxically coexists with an intensified set of state practices of policing, surveillance, and containment that marks expanding capacities of state power as exercised within civil society and the public sphere. *Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State* unpacks such contradictions and examines when and how the modern state contracts, expands, and is reconstituted in the historically specific conditions of late capitalism that are now associated with the ideology and policies of neoliberal economics.

Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State addresses the systemic and transnational effects of economic liberalization but does not presume a single model of neoliberalism with uniform effects. Research in comparative contexts provides a complex picture of the nature and causes

of inequality. States, although restructured in varying ways, continue to play a central role in shaping the causes and responses to inequality (Ewig 2010; Lind 2005; MacLeod 2004). Social movements that respond to various forms of inequality are immersed in complicated political dynamics with both the state and transnational and national capitalist actors. The political dynamics and economic effects of such processes also vary greatly depending on the specific national context being discussed. This volume delves into these questions with the objective of providing an in-depth comparative understanding of the nature and practices of the post-liberalization state. For instance, comparative social science research on economic liberalization shows that policies of economic liberalization are one of the biggest sources of new state activities (Levy 2006). Such research points to the importance of unpacking the normative model of neoliberalism and distinguishing this singular model from the varied economic policies that states have implemented in historically specific contexts.⁵

What Is Neoliberal about the Contemporary State? Historical Continuities and Discontinuities and the Question of State Power

The task of understanding the nature of the state in the twenty-first century requires a careful examination of the term “neoliberal.” The term itself is overladen with ideological and discursive meanings in both academic and public discourses. “Neoliberalism” in its overdetermined form often becomes a “master” concept that serves as an explanatory device for economic inequality, poverty, political quietism, alienation, and social exclusion. Complex questions regarding economic policy and ideology are conflated with broad processes of globalization as well as with long-standing historical processes that have shaped capitalist development and political and theoretical conceptions of liberalism. The risk in deploying the term “neoliberal” lies in the ways these overladen meanings that are invested in the term render it devoid of any analytical use. If “neoliberalism” becomes an ahistorical concept that is read back into time even as it becomes a default explanation for the plight of the present, the term itself becomes a symptom of its own conditions. In other words, if the drive of policies and ideologies of neoliberalism is to absorb

political, economic, and sociocultural life into an all-encompassing logic of market rationality, taking this all-encompassing logic as an unquestioned analytical assumption inadvertently mirrors the very rationality that critics seek to contest. As Gambetti and Godoy-Anativia note, the challenge is to “avoid constructing neoliberalism as a kind of ‘empty signifier’ that explains everything and anything” (2013, 4). Any analysis that seeks to demarcate the theoretical usefulness of the concept thus needs to delineate the specificity of the term and to consider where “neoliberalism” is simply an extension of long-standing historical processes and where it serves as a useful analytical marker of discontinuity.

The most well-known understanding of neoliberalism is linked to what is popularly known as the “Washington consensus,” which emerged in the late 1980s around a specific set of economic policies designed to restructure economies in comparative contexts. Such policies have broadly included a set of prescriptions that include programs of privatization (and the systematic dismantling of public sector industries), the promotion of free trade through regional and global agreements, and financial deregulation. Such policy frameworks, that have come to be known as structural adjustment, have also been linked to the power of global institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to recommend and enforce such changes through various forms of aid conditionalities. The political implications of these policies have led to conceptions of the neoliberal state as a state in retreat—one that has either lost its power to intervene or regulate or that has been recast as an entity designed to serve the needs of transnational capital. For instance, interdisciplinary feminist scholarship that emerged contemporaneously with the spread of structural adjustment policies in the 1980s focused on particular sites, such as export processing zones, that embodied these trends (Fernandez-Kelly 1984; Ong 1987). The intensity and scale of implementation (and the corresponding ideological support) of this particular set of policies indeed constitute a distinctive moment that requires specific empirical and theoretical attention.

However, the prescriptive and ideological dimension of such policies must be contextualized both in relation to long-standing historical precedents that they build on and the significant variations in the implementation of such policies (including the varying forms of political consent and opposition that accompany these policies). Peter Evans and William

Sewell caution against a conflation of ideas and policies of neoliberalism on the one hand and deep-rooted historical formations of classical liberalism and capitalism on the other. As they argue, “Hence, political and intellectual movements making prominent use of terms such as ‘individualism,’ ‘freedom,’ ‘human rights,’ and ‘democracy,’ should not automatically be tarred with the brush of neoliberalism because they are at least as likely to be derived from a broad liberal heritage as from neoliberalism per se. Second, we must resist attributing all the distinctive socio-economic trends of contemporary global capitalism to neoliberalism” (2013, 38). This conceptual reminder is of particular significance in understanding the causes and reproduction of inequality. Contemporary political and socioeconomic phenomena, such as the proliferation of public discourses, that center on norms of individualism, patterns of state violence against marginalized communities, and the systematic reproduction of socioeconomic exclusion are *reconstituted* through but not wholly invented by policies of neoliberalism.

The significance of historical continuities also provides an important caution against the temptation to treat the contemporary state as an after-effect of the logic of neoliberalism. While significant dimensions of state power may be restructured through the implementation of policies of structural adjustment, state structures also endure and adapt in ways that disrupt strong claims about declining state power in the context of such policies. The question of what is neoliberal about the neoliberal state is thus more than a rhetorical question—it marks the need to identify more precisely the ways in which contemporary states have been changed in distinctive ways in light of changing state-capital relations and the ways in which the modern state has not changed. Such a shift allows us to move away from the presumption of a retreating state and the corresponding question of *whether* state power is exercised to the question of *how* state power is exercised. This kind of analytical shift moves us away from polarizing debates that reinscribe binary oppositions of the strong/weak state or the interventionist/retreating state.⁶

Let us consider first the distinctive dimensions of state power that are currently associated with the neoliberal state. Contemporary research has focused on three central aspects that distinguish neoliberal state power: (1) transformations associated with changes in the role of global capital (and finance capital in particular), (2) the significance of

the security state in the post-liberalization period, and (3) changes in the boundaries between “state” and “civil society.” Scholars writing about neoliberalism have focused on the complex and changing relationship between the state and capital. The distinctiveness of the neoliberal state in this context lies in its shift to a set of practices and structures that are specifically focused on producing ideal conditions for capital investment and mobility. While the complex connections between the state and capital are not new (Aronowitz and Bratsis 2002; Jessop 1982, 2002), what distinguishes the neoliberal state from older forms of the modern state is both an intensification of this relationship and the specific characteristics of contemporary capitalism. As Evans and Sewell note, one of the significant differences between theorists of classical liberalism and neoliberalism is that in contrast to classical liberalism’s concerns about cartels and monopolies, “neoliberalism was not concerned about great concentrations of private wealth and power” (2013, 43). State power plays out in a paradoxical fashion in the context of neoliberalism. The state actively promotes the conditions that enable the concentration of wealth and the growth of massive corporations and monopolies. This concentration of economic power in turn increases the dependent nature of the state within the state-capital relationship of the twenty-first century. The particular features of finance capitalism underline the specificities of this relationship. As David Harvey argues, state policy now relies on monetarism. This intensifies the paradoxical nature of contemporary state power where “neoliberal states typically facilitate the diffusion of influence of financial institutions through deregulation, but then they also all too often guarantee the integrity and solvency of financial institutions at no matter what cost. . . . The state has to step in and replace ‘bad’ money with ‘good’ money—which explains the pressure on central bankers to maintain confidence in the soundness of state money” (Harvey 2005, 73). While Harvey notes that states rely on monetarism, his analysis also implicitly illustrates the point that the financial dimensions of neoliberalism rest on the soundness and strength of the state. Thus, although the state in effect actively promotes policies that may weaken its own autonomy vis-à-vis capital, it is in fact an active interventionist partner within the distinctive state-capital relationship of contemporary neoliberalism.

The paradoxical nature of the role of the state in the twenty-first century is played out through a second feature—the reworking of security

and risk. One of the most self-evident arenas for the expansion of state power has been in the realm of security. The security state has expanded through a multitude of activities and institutions that have ranged from policing to surveillance to militarization. Any analysis of the state in the twenty-first century thus has to disentangle and analyze the points of connection, interaction, and divergence between the security state on the one hand and the post-liberalization state on the other. Contemporary scholarship tends to yoke these dimensions of state power together. For instance, Gambetti and Godoy-Anativia argue, “security is a neoliberal technique of power” (2013, 9) that has transformed both state-civil society relations and discourses of “security.” Languages of “terrorism,” they note, often provide useful tools that allow for an expansion of state power and can consequently strengthen the ability of states to implement policies associated with neoliberalism (15). Meanwhile, even as discourses of security proliferate in both national and global contexts, states increasingly promote policies and ideologies that require their citizens to bear responsibility for their own socioeconomic security. As Lisa Brush illustrates through her analysis of the U.S. state, discourses of personal responsibility (that obscure the structural causes of poverty) cut across both the penal security state and the social security state in the United States (2013). In the twenty-first century, the exercise of state power within civil society is expressed through the rhetoric of security even as it seeks to privatize risk (Lamont, Welburn, and Fleming 2013; Sharone 2013). This privatization of risk displaces state and public accountability for the structural forms of socioeconomic inequality and exclusion that have been intensified through neoliberal policies even as state regulation of poor and socioeconomically marginalized communities expands. As Soss, Fording, and Schram argue, while the state drains resources away from welfare programs in the United States, poverty governance has expanded; processes of “privatization and sanctioning” of the poor complement each other. As they argue, low wage work for welfare recipients is promoted “through affirmative uses of welfare programs as sites where state power is deployed to service markets” (2011, 7). This includes the use of long-standing tools of labor regulation in labor markets that are shaped or produced by welfare policies. The expanding insecurity of marginalized communities and individuals is accompanied by expanding forms of state discipline and control. State

power is thus exercised within civil society through both long-standing means of surveillance and control as well as through new regimes of power associated with neoliberal practices.

This body of scholarship provides important insights into the ways in which the economic and security agendas of states intertwine and reinforce each other. While essays in this volume will illustrate this enmeshing of these forms of state power, they also seek to delineate ways in which state security agendas are not reducible to the neoliberal economic agendas that are adopted by the state. Such agendas—whether they pertain to the carceral state within the United States or the historical legacies of the military regimes in Bangladesh—predate the economic agendas associated with neoliberalism. The volume contributes to a deeper understanding of where and when security and neoliberal frameworks intersect without reducing them to a singular monolithic framework of state power. Instead, the volume also seeks to ask the deeper question of how state power is exercised in complex, varied, and often contradictory ways within the realm of civil society.

Rethinking the Boundaries between State and Civil Society in the Era of Neoliberalism

The question of how the economic policies and ideologies of neoliberalism have transformed the boundaries and relationship between the state and civil society represents one of the most analyzed realms in existing scholarly work. A significant approach in this scholarship lies in the analysis of various modes of neoliberal governmentality. From such perspectives, the political technologies of neoliberalism do not require a demarcated state that operates above or in opposition to civil society. Rather, individual subjectivities and modes of being are, in effect, in a mutually constitutive relationship with market-oriented rationalities (Brown 2014; Greenhouse 2009; Ong 2006). The distinctive marker here lies in the fuzziness of the state; the state/civil society nexus is conceptualized through a Foucaultian conception of biopower. Technologies of governance cut across varied spaces and practices that range from non-governmental organizations (Bernal and Grewal 2014) to communities of experts (Laurie and Bondi 2005) to complex sets of cultural practices

that cut across the realms of media, cultural production, and consumption (Chen 2013; Gill and Scharff 2011).

It is at this analytical juncture where the power of the neoliberal project appears close to achieving omnipotence in its ability to soak through and refashion every facet of social and cultural life that the historical distinctiveness of neoliberalism risks overstatement. Hall and Lamont note that such perspectives often underestimate both the social resilience of marginalized communities and the persistence of cultural and institutional frameworks that are not defined by market rationalities (2013). However, the problem of reverting to an overdetermined master narrative of neoliberalism extends far beyond the persistence of alternative frameworks for subjectivity and social and cultural activity. Such a master narrative risks distorting our understandings of how inequality is reproduced and how state power operates. In this process, the distinctive features of neoliberal policies and ideologies are over-read as a sharp form of historical discontinuity from the past so that a murky form of neoliberalism becomes a generalized explanation of inequality, hierarchy, and violence in the twenty-first century.

Consider two examples that would appear to mark the distinctive ascendancy of the neoliberal project—the question of professional expertise and the corresponding proliferation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in non-Western contexts and the retrenchment of state welfare support. In the first case, professional expertise circulates through complex webs of organizational and institutional networks that range from dominant institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to a plethora of nongovernmental organizations in comparative contexts (Bernal and Grewal 2014). Such networks indeed often comprise the everyday practices through which entrepreneurial models socioeconomic mobility and inclusion are dispersed (Karim 2011), sometimes in conjunction with and sometimes in lieu of the explicit exercise of state power. However, such modes of power stem from much longer historical processes that have unfolded through legacies of colonialism and the consolidation of capitalist development in the postcolonial world. Timothy Mitchell, for instance, demonstrates the way the idea of “economy” as an autonomous ontological entity is an outcome of such historical processes; expertise in this context was

abstracted from messy, contradictory processes that often belied the sanitized maps and models that were read back onto emerging forms of “capitalist development” in colonial contexts (2002). The circuits of expertise that are now commonly associated with the neoliberal moment (and the complex relationship between the state and capital that they embody or manage) in fact emerged out of the historical legacies of colonial and postcolonial capitalist economic development. In fact, in comparative non-Western contexts, paradigms of the developmental state either coexist with or are aligned with newer objectives of contemporary models of neoliberalism. What are termed “neoliberal policies” are often various configurations of policies of reform and liberalization that are carried out by interventionist developmentalist states (Harvey 2005; MacLeod 2004). Meanwhile, the implementation of policies of liberalization does not necessarily mark a shift from away from the modes of power associated with the interventionist developmental state (Gupta 2012).

The continued power of this form of interventionist state points to a second example of how a presumption of the newness of the neoliberal project can shortchange our understandings of both the state and the intensification of socioeconomic inequality and exclusion. One of the most vivid public markers of the neoliberal project is in the political imperative of dismantling the welfare state. This has unfolded in Western contexts that have had a specific model of the welfare state and that have recently witnessed acute versions of such cutbacks through austerity-based agendas (see Nancy A. Naples’s essay in this volume). Non-Western contexts have had different conceptions of such welfare programs. As Akhil Gupta notes, drawing on his research on a welfare program for children in India, “What a welfare program means in a Third World context has to be qualified by the knowledge that the state that runs such a program is not a welfare state. The logic of the program was never one of providing a security blanket for the poorest segments of the population. Rather, the justification for the program arose from the need to invest in human capital for the development of the nation-state” (2012, 248). This is an important reminder that developmental states continue to operate with a distinctive logic that is not reducible to the neoliberal moment of the present. This has led some cultural critics to postulate that neoliberalism has foreclosed on the possible emergence

of welfare policies in non-Western contexts. For instance, Gayatri Spivak posits, “In the South, welfare structures cannot emerge as a result of the priorities of the transnational agencies” (1996, 249). Yet this popular assumption regarding the turn away from welfare is riddled with empirical inaccuracies that permeate critical popular and academic discourses. In fact, non-Western states that have pursued policies of economic liberalization have varied in their policies regarding state supports of subsidies or welfare. This variation exists across nations as well as across different historical periods within particular nations.

A reconsideration of the question of state welfare provisions and the persistence of the logic of the developmental state has more at stake than a criticism of the presentist or empirically distorted nature of critical conceptions of neoliberalism that circulate within the academy. What is at stake are the ways in which states in non-Western contexts often strategically deploy welfare provisions and, in effect, depart from the ideal, typical model of the neoliberal project in order to persist with the very economic policies of liberalization that intensify inequality and exclusion. Consider, for instance, the case of Chile, one of the earliest countries to implement extensive policies associated with neoliberalism. Ashley Davis-Hamal demonstrates that Chile shifted from a model of orthodox neoliberalism (implemented by Pinochet from 1973 to 1982) to a form of “pragmatic neoliberalism” that advocated a project of “growth with equity” (2012). Davis-Hamal illustrates that successive Chilean governments have continued with neoliberal policies but have increased targeted spending through social programs. Evans and Sewell further note that countries such as France, Sweden, and Germany have in the past maintained welfare states while adopting many policies that were associated with neoliberalism (2013, 37). For Singapore, Youyenn Teo shows how the state has combined a highly interventionist mode of developmentalism in both the economic and social realms while incorporating ideologies and policies associated with neoliberalism (2011). Meanwhile, in India, one of the latecomers to this model (with the systematic implementation of economic policies of liberalization taking root in the 1990s), successive governments have embraced such policies but have also sought to temper some of the deleterious impacts (Kohli 2012) of such policies through state-run social programs and subsidies. If one assumes that the project of neoliberalism is marked by simple

signifiers of welfare cutbacks, one misses the way in which states may in fact strategically deploy welfare provisions or state subsidies either to ameliorate some aspects of socioeconomic inequality or to manage political resistance while in fact continuing to implement economic policies that intensify or produce inequality and exclusion.⁷

The challenge at hand for scholars concerned with the deleterious effects of policies associated with neoliberalism is to keep in tension the normative ideal model of neoliberalism, which has had significant power in both global and comparative contexts, on the one hand, with the complex, varied sets of policies and practices that have unfolded in historically and politically contextual ways, on the other. With this tension in mind, I distinguish the notion of neoliberalism and the ideal-typical understanding of the neoliberal state from the post-liberalization state. My conception of the post-liberalization state signals the array of policies of economic reform and paths of liberalization and also provides the space for an understanding of alternative trajectories that are emerging in the aftermath of the neoliberal turn. The essays in this volume, both individually and as a collective enterprise, seek to deepen our understanding of such varied complexities of the state in the post-liberalization period. Through situated research they examine the spaces where the logic of neoliberalism has sharply transformed state practices and the boundaries between the “state” and “civil society.” They also seek to disrupt a mimetic understanding of neoliberalism in which inequality, exclusion, and violence are self-evident reflections of present-day neoliberalism. This conceptual understanding of the state is in line with scholarship that has focused on the shifting line between state and civil society (Gramsci 1971; Migdal, 2001). Joel Migdal’s “state in society approach” is particularly effective in grasping the Janus-faced nature of the state. As Migdal argues, “the state is a field of power marked by the use and threat of violence and shaped by (1) the image of a coherent, controlling organization in a territory, which is a representation of the people bounded by that territory, and (2) the actual practices of its multiple parts” (2001, 16–17). The contradictory nature of the modern state allows it to act as a coherent, interventionist, and often seemingly autonomous actor even as it simultaneously permeates and builds on networks and institutions within the realm of “civil society.”

Drawing on such an approach, this volume contributes to contemporary understandings of the paradigm of neoliberalism and the nature

of the post-liberalization state through a focus on four central themes: First, the volume engages with the conceptualization of the state as a series of boundary projects that reconstitute conceptions of the “public” and “civil society.”⁸ Understanding the post-liberalization state in this context necessitates a shift from a sole preoccupation with processes of privatization to a deeper examination of shifting conceptions of the “public.” Second, the volume uses the state as an entry point into deepening our understanding of various forms of inequality and exclusion that have become almost naturalized markers of social, political, and economic life in the contemporary world. Essays in the volume provide analyses of the complex ways in which the realm of the “economic” is structured by social relations such as those marked by race, gender, and caste. Third, the volume delineates the new state structures, modes of governance, and forms of power that have specifically emerged with the implementation of policies of economic liberalization. The volume thus examines both what is distinctive about the post-liberalization state and what must be contextualized as long-standing features of modern state power. Finally, this volume engages with both the possibilities and limits of political and social change. Individual essays examine the ways in which collective responses seek to combat inequality and are often disciplined by the very terms of the cultural and ideological dimensions of the logic of neoliberalism that such responses seek to contest.

Feminist Conceptions of State Power and Structural Inequality

The essays in this volume develop analyses of the post-liberalization state that build on interdisciplinary scholarship that has interrogated the boundaries of the “state” and “economic” inequality (Bakker and Silvey 2008; Newman, 2013; Runyan and Peterson 2013). Interdisciplinary scholarship in fields such as feminist, queer, postcolonial, and critical race studies has called attention to the ways in which the state represents a gendered, racialized, and sexualized field of power, practices, and institutions (Canaday 2009; Cooper 1995; Omi and Winant 2014; Reddy, 2011; Tripp, Ferree, and Ewig 2013). Meanwhile, a vast field of scholarship has also sought to pry open the category of the “economic” in order to illustrate the ways in which both the nature and reproduction of economic inequality can only adequately be addressed

when inequalities such as race and gender in the United States and inequalities such as caste, ethnicity, gender, and religion in comparative contexts are conceptualized as constitutive of economic inequality. As this scholarship has illustrated in both interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary fields, such inequalities are historically produced structural forces and are not simply epiphenomenal consequences of economic processes. In other words, the terrain of the “economic” is made up of such inequalities even as such inequalities are intensified by specific economic policies.

Despite the existence of this now vast scholarship, major scholarly analyses of the neoliberal state often neglect the critical insights of feminist scholarship and rest on conceptions of both the state and the economy as race- and gender-neutral entities. Much of the existing scholarship that has sought to map the relationship between the state and neoliberalism (Gambetti and Godoy-Anativia 2013; Hall and Lamont 2013; Harvey 2005) through broad and comparative frames has missed the ways in which this relationship is in fact constituted by historically specific relationships between inequalities such as gender, race, caste, sexuality, and class. An adequate understanding of the post-liberalization state requires a framework that treats an understanding of these forms of inequality as integral to rather than as (after-) effects of the policies and ideologies associated with the neoliberal project.

Consider, for instance, one of the significant attempts at understanding the relationship between the U.S. carceral state and the project of neoliberalism. Loic Wacquant makes a powerful case for linking social welfare policies and penal policies in the United States in order to show how “the obsessive focus on crime, backed by ordinary and scholarly commonsense, has served well to hide from view the new politics and policy of poverty that is a core component in the forging of the neoliberal state” (2009, 287). Yet Wacquant is unable to fully grapple with the structural and political dimensions of race either in the organization of the U.S. economy or in terms of the nature of state power. For Wacquant, the mass incarceration of African Americans is an effect of the “remaking of the state” through “the retooling of public authority suited to fostering the advance of neoliberalism” (xviii). Neoliberalism in this context is the driving force for the expansion of the carceral state; incarceration becomes the political tool for the management of dislocations

produced by this set of economic policies. Neoliberalism becomes the de facto explanation for the expansion of the carceral state. Wacquant argues that the “penal categories, practices, and policies of the United States find their root and reason in the neoliberal revolution of which this country is the historical crucible and the planetary spearhead” (xv). On one level, race becomes a largely epiphenomenal element in this analysis (rather than an analytical category of analysis necessary for an understanding of the state and political economy in the United States). While Wacquant does address the use of prisons as a racialized response both to the challenge of social movements as well as to socioeconomic forms of segregation (206), the state remains a unitary, neutral entity that deploys such strategies. The deeper problem with such an approach lies in the way in which neoliberalism becomes a de facto ahistorical, functionalist explanation for changes in the state. Such an explanation begs the question as to why the United States has disproportionate rates of incarceration when compared to other states that have pursued neoliberal agendas? Or if incarceration remains a tool of neoliberalism, why have state prisons (as opposed to privatized prisons) remained the central mode of incarceration (Gilmore 2007)?

The example of the U.S. carceral state illustrates the analytical import of the feminist perspectives of the post-liberalization state presented in this volume. Feminist analyses that take the state (or the terrain of political economy) as fields that are structured by race, sexuality, and gender are not simply calling for a shift to “identity-based” dimensions (Fraser 2014) or to mechanistic intersectional effects of state policies or practices. Rather, such perspectives, by locating the paradigm of neoliberalism in relation to historically situated conceptions of race and gender, deepen our understanding of contemporary political and economic processes without reverting to an understanding of the “neoliberal project” as a totalizing explanation of contemporary inequality and state power. The “racial state” (Omi and Winant 2014) may indeed, as Wacquant (2009) argues, provide the political management necessary for the neoliberal revolution; but the racial state also operates as a distinctive historical and political formation. In other words, the racial state (much like the developmental state of many postcolonial contexts) may align with the objectives of neoliberal policies, but it is not produced by or reducible to the paradigm of neoliberalism.

Feminist theoretical perspectives are well situated to disentangle these formations in ways that address both the complexities of contemporary socioeconomic inequality and the conceptual intricacies of state power. While feminist (and related interdisciplinary) scholarship has engaged in extensive theorizations of neoliberalism (mostly centered around conceptions of neoliberal subjectivity and modes of governmentality), the body of scholarship that has engaged in systematic research on the state is much smaller. *Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State* builds on and contributes to this small but rich scholarship that has sought to situate understandings of the post-liberalization state through in-depth and grounded research on specific places and nations. Such scholarship has developed analyses of key dimensions of the state in the neoliberal era. First, it has shown how both state-led policies and national languages of development intersect with policies of liberalization through an expanding terrain of “women’s empowerment” programs (Sharma 2008). The category of “women” has in effect become a specific kind of technology of governance that must be understood as central to the operation of the post-liberalization state. Second, feminist scholarship has disaggregated the state through careful analyses of how economic restructuring unfolds in specific policy sectors (Ewig 2011). Such state-led processes of restructuring entrench and intensify inequalities of gender, class, and race in ways that are shaped by the political, economic, and historical context in question (Ewig 2011; Lind 2005; Sahle 2006). Finally, such research has also complicated our understandings of women’s movements and the ways in which feminism becomes enmeshed in the ideological and institutional investments of the neoliberal project (Prügl 2015; Rottenberg 2014). While, on the one hand, languages of women’s empowerment are integrated within state-led policies of liberalization in non-Western contexts, languages of feminism in the United States are also often integrated within state agendas in distinctive ways. Kristin Bumiller, for instance, argues that feminist agendas to combat sexual violence in the United States have become enmeshed in the neoliberal state regulatory practices that have expanded social control through both the welfare and the carceral dimensions of the state (2008).

If such research points to the significance of feminist perspectives for an adequate understanding of the nature of state power and the effects of policies of liberalization, it also dispels any presumed political innocence

of either the category of “woman” or of the project of feminism. Particular models of feminism can certainly be compatible with the ideologies of neoliberalism, and the effects of policies of neoliberalism may vary greatly for women from elite and marginalized socioeconomic groups. The theoretical understanding of feminism that shapes this volume is thus one that is not rooted in an identity-based perspective on women’s lives. What the essays cohere around are a set of feminist analytical concerns with explaining and understanding state power, inequality, and resistance in the wake of the “neoliberal project” (see chapter 8, this volume). The essays thus do not seek to define themselves either purely through the analytical categories of “gender” or “woman” or through a formulaic implementation of a model of intersectionality. Instead, the analytical frames of each essay draw on the specific historically situated contexts of the countries in question and deploy, combine, and move between three central frames of analysis: (1) an analysis of context-specific intersecting and often mutually constitutive forms of socioeconomic inequality; (2) an analysis of the significance of the category of “women” in understanding the post-liberalization state; and (3) an analysis of policies, politics, and practices that are not specifically focused on women or gender but are critical to any feminist project concerned with the reproduction of inequalities and exclusions that disproportionately affect socioeconomically marginalized women in comparative contexts. In this endeavor, these essays seek to present a set of interdisciplinary, empirically grounded studies, all shaped by feminist theoretical work that seeks to pry open and understand categories such as the “state,” “civil society,” and “the economy” in the post-liberalization world.

Comparative Perspectives on the Practices, Spaces, and Trajectories of the Post-Liberalization State

Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State provides a comparative perspective on the nature of the post-liberalization state and the limits and possibilities of challenges to both the state and the neoliberal project in Western and non-Western contexts. Throughout this essay, I have presented an analysis of the project of neoliberalism while framing the approach of the volume through this conceptual lens of the post-liberalization state. I have deployed these two conceptual tools to highlight two significant

dimensions that make up the contradictory nature of the project of neoliberalism. On the one hand, the dominant ideologies associated with neoliberal policies explicitly delineated by the “Washington consensus” have played a central role in shaping economic, social, and political life in the twenty-first century. Dominant ideologies and discourses matter—they shape policies, institutions, and everyday life in material ways. However, neoliberalism does not exist as a totalizing approach to organizing societies or economies (Peck and Tickell 2002). Policies of economic liberalization vary across national contexts and coexist and interact with historically specific political practices, institutions, and policies that long predate the current era of neoliberalism; they also face challenges from movements and nation-states seeking alternative paths. My framing of this volume in terms of the post-liberalization state thus seeks to simultaneously capture the hegemonic power of the project of neoliberalism and unsettle the singular language of neoliberalism. In this endeavor, *Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State* brings together essays that show how states structure and are reconstituted by complex and varying amalgams of the ideologies, economic compulsions, institutional norms, and political interests that constitute the paradigm of neoliberalism.

Essays in the volume each draw on a range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives and present original research and theoretical perspectives on various aspects of the state in comparative contexts. The essays draw on original field research in a range of countries and deploy analytical approaches that move between and connect the local, national, and transnational realms. They are shaped by a commitment to the development of analytical and theoretical frames that emerge from the careful study of places, contexts, and nations. In this endeavor, the volume does not rest on area-based claims of geographic coverage of the world. Rather, these essays seek to spark intellectual debates and open up both research agendas and theoretical conceptions that deepen our understanding of the shifting nature of the state and the implications for both the reproduction of inequality and the possibilities of change.

Nancy A. Naples’s essay, “What’s in a Word?,” opens the volume with a comparative materialist feminist examination of the public and political discourses associated with neoliberal ideologies and policies. The development of such a feminist materialistic understanding of the post-

liberalization state is central to the feminist analytic that undergirds the volume (see chapter 8). Naples's essay specifically analyzes how government policies of "austerity" seem to circulate as autonomous discourses in a "post-neoliberal epoch" in ways that conceal their deeper links to longstanding policies of economic neoliberalism. Discourses of austerity in Naples's analysis "render invisible the larger scaffolding of neoliberalism." Naples approaches the state as a set of "relations of ruling" (Smith 1999) that shapes the everyday lives of diverse individuals, families, communities, and nations during and following the Great Recession of 2008–9. She specifically focuses on the intersection of the media, state actors, and economic analysts in post-liberal state governance in producing austerity discourses. This construction of "austerity" redraws the conception of "the public" in distinctive ways. The complex relationship between the economic and discursive realms produces differential effects for different social groups and nations and intensifies the precarity of economically vulnerable populations made disposable by late capitalism in the twenty-first century. Naples's essay provides a rich and systematic analysis of the effects of austerity discourses on socioeconomic inequalities of class, gender, and race through a comparative focus on the United States and the European Union.

Ujju Aggarwal's essay, "After Rights," elaborates on the complex connections between public and political discourses, institutional practices, social and economic exclusion, and inequality through an analysis of the relationship between narratives of choice, racial inequality, and state-produced segregation in the United States. The essay draws on extended ethnographic research in New York City and on a fine-grained historical analysis of the judicial dimensions of the state. Aggarwal argues that while *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) signified a moment when universal rights to education were won (thus indicating a different structure of citizenship than Jim Crow segregation), *how* universal rights were structured becomes critical to understanding why public education is the most universally accessible yet also most unequal institution in the United States. The essay provides an analysis of policies and legislation in the post-*Brown* period that examines how choice becomes an amendment to (rather than a break from) Jim Crow-style segregation. She uses her genealogy of the framework of "choice" to track the realignment that took place in the post-civil rights social structure and shows that

the result was a continued production of a tiered citizenship. This tiered citizenship, organized through race and embedded within the public, was assured when universal rights were organized as individual private choices. Narratives of choice, as Aggarwal illustrates, have reinvigorated the story of American exceptionalism and been central to the creation of the “achievement gap.” Such narratives have formed a core part of an ideological infrastructure that has become central to the rationalization of the inequality that stems from the socioeconomic exclusion of marginalized African American communities from access to education.

If the rhetoric of choice operates in tandem with specific state policies and legal regimes in the United States, postcolonial contexts reveal new and complex configurations between narratives of microcredit-based entrepreneurship, NGOs within civil society, and the state. Lamia Karim’s essay, “The Production of Silence,” examines the distinctive nature of neoliberalism in Bangladesh that began under military rule, and she analyzes the discursive silences that neoliberal development policies have produced within the NGO sector. Her essay shows how policies of market liberalization were historically promoted by successive military and democratic governments since independence—prior to the Washington consensus commonly associated with neoliberalism. Her essay specifically examines the impact of market liberalization on the state, NGOs, and the framing of feminist/women’s agendas. As she illustrates, policies and ideologies of neoliberalism discursively shape public discourses about NGOs, women, and development. She argues that feminist and women’s agendas are themselves often shaped by liberal ideas of empowerment that have been reworked through neoliberal models of economic empowerment and that have silenced more critical discourses questioning free-market policies and their deleterious effects on women’s labor and lives. As with Aggarwal’s analysis, Karim illustrates that such policies must be contextualized within long-standing, historically specific legacies of state policies that become imbricated in agendas associated with neoliberal economic policies and ideologies.

Dolly Daftary’s essay, “An Improvising State,” takes up the question of the state-NGO nexus in the context of postcolonial nations through an in-depth examination of the restructuring of rural bureaucracies in India. In contrast to Karim’s analysis, Daftary examines the micro-credit model through an analysis of NGOs that are funded by the state. The

essay draws on ethnographic research on watershed development, India's largest development intervention for its drylands, and its delivery of state-sponsored micro-credit in Gujarat (a state that has been publicly depicted as an idealized national embodiment of the success of India's economic reforms). Daftary examines the state's devolution of policy implementation to local political actors and argues that the deployment of ideologies and practices of self-governance have transformed the state into an improvising formation—constantly departing from precedent and certainty, and provisionally administering social life. Various forms of socioeconomic vulnerability produced by policies of liberalization are intensified by a state in transition—one that has distinctive gendered implications for women from marginalized castes who are employed at the lower rungs of rural bureaucracies.

The question of vulnerability is foregrounded in Christina Heatherton's essay, "The Broken Windows of Rosa Ramos." Heatherton's analysis takes us to the heart of precarious communities of color in the urban United States and expands the focus on vulnerability to include the political and physical dimensions of life for such communities. Heatherton provides a careful analysis of the intersections and divergences of dimensions of state power that are concerned with security on the one hand and with neoliberal models of urban development on the other. As she illustrates, "broken windows" policing as both philosophy and practice emerged alongside and also facilitated major transformations of the neoliberal political economy. Drawing on an analysis of patterns of policing in Skidmore, Los Angeles, and Ferguson, Missouri, Heatherton argues that the "securitized urbanism" of the model of broken windows policing has become a central form of political expression of neoliberalism in urban U.S. communities. The broken windows philosophy has provided the underpinning for an expansion of police capacities directed primarily at small-scale "crimes of poverty." In the process, deindustrialized cities are constructed as places of disease and disorder so that racialized poverty appears to have no origin in ways that echo Naples' feminist materialist analysis of public and political discourses. However, as Heatherton notes, such processes are not invented by the Washington consensus—they extend and rework historical formations of the racial state (Omi and Winant 2014) and intensify racialized and class-based inequalities produced by processes of deindustrialization

that preceded the ascendancy of neoliberal policies. Heatherton argues that the vulnerability of communities of color within these racial and gendered spatial dimensions of neoliberalism must be understood through a feminist analytic of *imminent violability*.

The essays by Karim and Aggarwal point to ways in which liberal feminist ideals of empowerment and choice become complicit with neoliberal ideologies. Their perspectives point to ways in which the rhetoric of neoliberalism can discipline political responses to inequality. The question of the limits of political opposition within the constraints of neoliberal contexts raises the question of alternative trajectories that try to break from the project of neoliberalism. Amy Lind's essay, "After Neoliberalism?," makes a critical shift to an analysis of the apparent move away from neoliberalism in Latin America. Drawing on an in-depth study of Ecuador, Lind analyzes both the possibilities opened up by regional challenges to the global hegemony of the neoliberal model as well as the contradictions that continue to exist within the Ecuadorian nation and within the state apparatus. The essay analyzes post-neoliberal Ecuador's Citizen Revolution and asks whether and how it has fostered more just, "postcapitalist" forms of political, economic, and social life? Lind's research provides a complex set of answers to this question. The chapter highlights the centrality of heteronormativity in understanding post-neoliberal states, including governance and development frameworks that privilege the patriarchal heterosexual family above all others and view it as the foundation of the country's modernization goals. It argues that Ecuador's shift away from neoliberalism is fraught with contradictions and is best understood as signifying only a partial rupture with the neoliberal legacy. Despite progressive legal changes to the definition of family, nation, and economy in Ecuador's 2008 Constitution, a symbol of the country's move away from neoliberalism, it argues that the state nonetheless maintains a heteronormative, colonialist understanding of governance and development, thereby rendering the potentially radical project of reimagining life "after" neoliberalism incomplete and paradoxical at best.

Conclusion

Feminists Rethink the Neoliberal State provides a distinctive comparative perspective on the post-liberalization state through a series of

theoretically informed essays on a range of national contexts and transnational processes. The final chapter of the volume, “Toward a Feminist Analytic of the Post-Liberalization State,” outlines the theoretical terrain of the feminist materialist approach of the volume. Taken together the essays seek to enlarge, rethink, and challenge some of the conventional assumptions about the project of neoliberalism that are rooted in interdisciplinary scholarship. Such an approach provides a distinctive understanding of the nature of inequality, exclusion, and disenfranchisement in the twenty-first century. The goal of this volume is to open up an intellectual conversation about the nature of inequality, exclusion, and change. Such a conversation is premised as much on what is not changing (how inequality and exclusion are reproduced over time) as it is on what is new and distinctive about contemporary neoliberalism. With this undertaking in mind, the authors of this volume hope to foreground the role of the post-liberalization state.

NOTES

- 1 Agence France-Presse, “Global Income Inequality Now Back at 1820s Levels: OECD,” *Rappler.com*, October 3, 2014, www.rappler.com.
- 2 The report also produced an immediate critical backlash from mainstream business media outlets. See, for example, Tim Worstall, “OECD: Global Inequality Is Now as Bad as in 1820,” October 31, 2014, Forbes.com.
- 3 My focus here is on dominant trends. Such approaches generally focus on how the state must now be understood through conceptions of governmentality. See, e.g., Brown 2015. For work that has sought to address the restructuring of the state in nuanced ways, see Brenner 2004 and Collier 2011.
- 4 The theoretical framework of this volume draws in large part on work that I have been conducting on the post-liberalization state in India for my current book, *India's Liberalizing State: Urbanization, Inequality, and the Politics of Water in India*.
- 5 Such historical processes, of course, have always been encompassed by transnational processes. Structures of political economy in the global south, for instance, have been fundamentally shaped by histories of colonialism. For a critical discussion of more abstract conceptions of transnationalism, see Fernandes 2013.
- 6 For an example of work that argues that globalization has been accompanied by a decline in state sovereignty, see Brown 2014.
- 7 As Chandan Reddy argues, such simplified views of neoliberalism also miss the ways in which welfare provisions are reconstituted through exclusionary conceptions of citizenship (2011).
- 8 There has already been a rich body of scholarship that has sought to unsettle the boundaries between the state and civil society and illustrate how the state

is always enmeshed in the terrain of civil society. Such work has explicitly or implicitly drawn on Foucaultian and Gramscian conceptions of how state power permeates civil society, See, e.g., Migdal 2001; Mitchell 1991.

REFERENCES

- Aronowitz, Stanley, and Peter Bratsis, eds. 2002. *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakker, Isabella, and Rachel Silvey, eds. 2008. *Beyond States and Markets: The Challenges of Social Reproduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Bernal, Victoria, and Inderpal Grewal. 2014. *Theorizing NGOS: States, Feminisms and Neoliberalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish N. 2004. *In Defense of Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brenner, Neil. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2005. *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2014. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. New York: Zone Books.
- . 2015. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. Cambridge: Zone Books.
- Brush, Lisa. 2013. "Work and Love in the Gendered Insecurity State." In Tripp et al., *Gender Violence and Human Security*, 109–31.
- Bumiller, Kristin. 2008. *In an Abusive State: How Neoliberalism Appropriated the Feminist Movement against Sexual Violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Canaday, Margot. 2009. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chen, Eva. 2013. "Neoliberalism and Popular Women's Culture: Rethinking Choice, Freedom and Agency." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 16, no. 4: 440–52.
- Collier, Stephen J. 2011. *Post-Soviet Social: Neoliberalism, Social Modernity, BioPolitics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, Davina. 1995. *Power in Struggle: Feminism, Sexuality and the State*. New York: New York University Press.
- Corbridge, Stuart. 2005. *Seeing the State: Governance and Governmentality in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis-Hamel, Ashley. 2012. "Successful Neoliberalism? State Policy, Poverty, and Income Inequality in Chile." *International Social Science Review* 87, no. 3–4: 79–101.
- Evans, Peter, and William Sewell. 2013. "Neoliberalism." In Hall and Lamont, *Social Resilience*, 35–68.
- Ewig, Christina. 2011. *Second-Wave Neoliberalism: Gender, Race, and Health Sector Reform in Peru*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fernandes, Leela. 2006. *India's New Middle Class: Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2013. *Transnational Feminism in the United States: Knowledge, Ethics, Power*. New York: New York University Press.

- . 2015. "The Paradox of India's Middle Class." In *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary India*, ed. Knut Axel Jacobsen, 232–42. London: Routledge.
- Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia. 1984. *For We Are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2014. *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.
- Gambetti, Zeynep, and Marcial Godoy-Anativia. 2013. *Rhetorics of Insecurity: Belonging and Violence in the Neoliberal Era*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gill, Rosalind, and Christina Scharff. 2011. *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2007. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and edited by Quintin Hoare and G. N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Greenhouse, Carole J. 2009. *Ethnographies of Neoliberalism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gupta, Akhil. 2012. *Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hall, Peter A., and Michèle Lamont. 2013. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1982. *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*. New York: New York University Press.
- . 2002. "Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective." *Antipode* 34, no. 3: 452–72.
- Karim, Lamia. 2011. *Microfinance and Its Discontents: Women in Debt in Bangladesh*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kohli, Atul. 2012. *Poverty Amid Plenty in the New India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle, Jessica Welburn, and Crystal Fleming. 2013. "Responses to Discrimination and Social Resilience under Neoliberalism." In Hall and Lamont, *Social Resilience*, 129–57.
- Laurie, Nina, and Liz Bondi. 2005. *Working the Spaces of Neoliberalism: Activism, Professionalisation and Incorporation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Levy, Jonah D. 2006. *The State after Statism: New State Activities in the Age of Liberalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lind, Amy. 2005. *Gendered Paradoxes: Women's Movements, State Restructuring, and Global Development in Ecuador*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- MacLeod, Dag. 2004. *Downsizing the State: Privatization and the Limits of Neoliberal Reform in Mexico*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Mazzarella, William. 2003. *Shovelling Smoke: Advertising and Globalization in Contemporary India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Migdal, Joel. 2001. *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics." *American Political Science Review* 85, no. 1 (March 1991): 77–96.
- . 2002. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Newman, Janet. 2013. "Spaces of Power: Feminism, Neoliberalism and Gendered Labor." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 20, no. 2: 200–221.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Peck, Jamie, and Adam Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalising Space." *Antipode* 34, no. 3: 380–404.
- Piketty, Thomas. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Prügl, Elisabeth. 2015. "Neoliberalising Feminism." *New Political Economy* 20, no. 4: 614–31.
- Rajagopal, Arvind. 2001. "Thinking about the New Middle Class: Gender, Advertising and Politics in an Age of Globalisation." In *Signposts: Gender Issues in Post-Independence India*, ed. Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, 57–99. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Reddy, Chandan. 2011. *Freedom with Violence: Race, Sexuality, and the U.S. State*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rottenberg, Catherine. 2014. "The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism." *Cultural Studies* 28, no. 3: 418–37.
- Runyon, Anne Sisson, and Spike V. Peterson. 2013. *Global Gender Issues in the New Millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sahle, Eunice. 2006. "Gender, States and Markets in Africa." *Studies in Political Economy* 77: 9–32.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1996. *Losing Control?: Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sharma, Aradhana. 2008. *Logics of Empowerment: Development, Gender, and Governance in Neoliberal India*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sharone, Ofer. 2013. *Unemployment Experiences: Job Searching, Interpersonal Chemistry and Self-Blame*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Soss, Joe, Richard C. Fording, and Sanford Schram. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1999. *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1996. "Diasporas Old and New: Women in the Transnational World." *Textual Practice* 10, no. 2: 245–69.
- Teo, Youyenn. 2010. "Shaping the Singapore Family: Producing the State and Society." *Economy and Society* 39, no. 3: 337–59.
- . 2011. *Neoliberal Morality in Singapore: How Family Policies Make State and Society*. London: Routledge Press.
- Tripp, Aili Mari, Myra Marx Ferree, and Christina Ewig, eds. 2013. *Gender, Violence, and Human Security: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.