

# Political geography: political geographies of globalization (2) – governance

Matthew Sparke

Department of Geography, Box 353550, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98105, USA

## I Introduction

In my first report on the political geographies of globalization my focus was on dominance, and, in particular, on forms of dominance linking global, regional and personal spaces of coercion and *neocolonialism* (Sparke, 2004). In this report, as the focus turns to the relations between globalization and governance, it is instead the political geographies of control and *neoliberalism* that form the central concern. As I emphasized before, this does not mean that the coercive violence of neocolonial dominance is unrelated to the more consensual-cum-socialized forms of political control that comprise governance. There is tremendous ongoing work being published by geographers which highlights these interconnections especially as they relate to the ties between global capitalism, dispossession and the US 'War on Terror' (eg, Harvey, 2003; Hart, 2005; *Retort*, 2005). There is even work being written by other critics that seeks to describe neoliberalism itself as a form of terror (Brennan, 2003; Giroux, 2004). However, in attempting to come to terms with the diverse reterritorializations of contemporary governance there is also a great deal that can be gleaned from the abundant research and writing on the less directly coercive aspects of neoliberalism.

Across the social sciences the big 'N' of Neoliberalism has become an increasingly omnipresent umbrella term for the diverse ideologies, policies and practices associated with liberalizing global markets and expanding entrepreneurial practices and capitalist power relations into whole new areas of social, political and biophysical life. From free trade, privatization, and financial deregulation, to fiscal austerity, welfare reform, and punitive policing, to the enforcement of structural adjustment, to the expansion of entrepreneurial models of identity and action in institutions of scientific innovation, education and entertainment, writers are assigning neoliberalism an incredibly diverse and demanding set of descriptive duties. Indeed, it is put to work so commonly today that one finds it being applied to even more wide-ranging social, political and economic phenomena than even globalization itself. In geography there has been widespread attention paid to the spaces of neoliberalism (Peck and Tickell, 2002; Cox, 2005; Gilbert, 2005), the scales of neoliberalism (Kohl and Warner, 2004; Newstead, 2005), the urban regimes of neoliberalism (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Hackworth, 2004; L. Smith, 2004), the natures of neoliberalism (Budds, 2004; McCarthy, 2004; Mansfield, 2004; Robertson, 2004) and the

governmentalities of neoliberalism (Basu, 2004; Larner and Walters, 2004; Gökariksel and Mitchell, 2005). Meanwhile, outside of the discipline the so-called ‘culture of neoliberalism’ (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2001) continues to be connected to still more far-flung concerns, including everything from witch-finding in Kenya (J.H. Smith, 2005) to lesbian and gay organizing in Canada (M. Smith, 2005) to even the ‘invasion of neoliberal stereotypes’ into the fairytale world of Harry Potter (Yocaris, 2004; cf. Smadja, 2004). Inside geography, however, the expeditious application of neoliberalism to almost anything and everything has also led to warnings (eg, Larner, 2003), as well as a caution that the N-word is fast becoming a consolatory codeword that masks and thereby exacerbates the challenges of contemporary political engagement (Barnett, 2005).

Barnett’s critique is bold, but is limited by its liberalism and narrow focus on just the so-called ‘governmentality literature’. He argues that most accounts of neoliberal governmentality arrange a ‘marriage of convenience’ between Gramscian-turned-Regulation theories of neoliberal hegemony and state-centric instrumental readings of Foucault. He therefore complains that ‘between an overly economic derivation of political economy and an overly statist rendition of governmentality, stories about “neoliberalism” manage to reduce the understanding of social relations to a residual effect of hegemonic projects and/or governmental programs of rule’ (Barnett, 2005: 10). No doubt there is some truth in this when applied to the decontextualized and depoliticized accounts of ‘advanced liberalism’ offered by writers such as Rose (1999). However, in gesturing towards Larner as his own initial example, Barnett passes over her own earlier geographical argument that ‘without analyses of the “messy actualities” of particular neoliberal projects, those working within this analytic run the risk of precisely the problem they wish to avoid – that of producing generalized accounts of historical epochs’ (Larner, 2000: 14). Some summaries

of such messy governmentality can still at times seem problematically, albeit deliberately, superficial (eg, Larner and Walters, 2005). But the productive tensions between Foucault’s theses on governmentality (in Burchell *et al.*, 1991) and more materialist economic analysis are not always so consolingly ignored (eg, Larner, 2000; Mitchell, 2002; Fraser, 2003; Watts, 2003; 2004). Foucault’s 1979 lecture on the Chicago School may have been a little eccentric (focusing on the penal theses of Gary Becker rather than on the more influential market fundamentalism of Milton Friedman), but his basic point about state practices being refashioned by neoliberals as ‘une sorte de tribunal économique permanent; – a kind of permanent economic tribunal (quoted and translated in Lemke, 2001: 198) – still seems a provocative entry point for investigations of neoliberal state-making. Rather than enabling an instrumental, ageographical and statist reading of national ‘governmental rule’, such a Foucauldian approach makes it possible to examine how, for example, neoliberal free-trade agreements such as NAFTA are extending and entrenching the ‘tribunal économique permanent’ across the continental space of multiple nation states (see Sparke, 2005: Chapter 3). Furthermore, as I will detail in my next report, a Foucauldian focus on the circulatory and capillary networks of power relations can also operate in this way alongside feminist, anti-racist and Marxist critique to enable more adequate political geographic accounts of resistance to, resilience in and reworking of neoliberal globalization (see Katz, 2004, for the valuable distinctions between resistance, resilience and reworking). Bringing together an attention to market-mediated subjectivity formation with a more Marxian examination of economic transformation is not therefore necessarily doomed to creating politically paralyzing pictures of inevitable social shifts ensuing from inevitable economic shifts in regimes of accumulation.

Strangely Barnett's main example of a geographer who takes a consoling approach to theorizing neoliberal subjectivity formation is Nigel Thrift (2000). This seems strange not because Thrift resists gestures of consolation, but rather because the way in which his affect-orientated accounts *do* seem to console is precisely by divorcing theses about biopolitical assemblages from serious engagement with historical-materialist analysis. This sort of move has elsewhere enabled Foucault-fascinated anthropologists to recenter 'the figure of anthropos' and claim the global and the political as 'anthropological problems' (Rabinow, 2005: 41). But in this anthropological rush to move beyond the much-maligned meta-narratives of 'broad structural transformations' (Collier and Ong, 2005: 4), it would seem that too much geographical scholarship is ignored: scholarship that avoids teleology and economism not by disdaining political-economy and theories of hegemony, but rather by developing more grounded accounts of how political-economic transformations are embodied in, mediated by and productive of widely varied political, cultural and economic geographies (eg, Peck, 2001; Nagar *et al.*, 2002; Mitchell, 2004). This is not to suggest some simple disciplinary dichotomy. Even though he is a geographer, Thrift (2004) still abstracts away from such geographical mediations through the anthropos of affect. Meanwhile, there are anthropologists who are deeply concerned with embodied geographies of political-economic transformation (eg, Tsing, 2000; 2005) and who, like Donald Moore with his brilliant account of the racial biopolitics of dispossession in Zimbabwe, are therefore extraordinarily sensitive to the context-contingency of reterritorialization (Moore, 2005). Such geographical sensitivity – whether inside or outside the discipline – to how biopolitical transformations and political-economic transformations come together in different context-contingent ways offers a powerful way of nuancing narratives of neoliberalization and going beyond economic analyses

of networks (eg, Ramamurthy, 2003, on commodity chains). Rather than an analytical marriage of convenience, the tensions between such approaches may be better conceptualized therefore as a generative problematic: a problematic that can help us develop the better accounts demanded by Barnett of 'the pro-active role of socio-cultural processes in provoking changes in modes of governance' (Barnett, 2005: 10). Certainly we need such accounts, not least of all because ageographical invocations of generic categories such as 'the multitude' (Hardt and Negri, 2004) remain just as inadequate as ageographical appeals to 'intensities of feeling'. But the point remains that Barnett himself generalizes too quickly from these concerns to his sweeping claims about consolation. The multiple stories being told about neoliberalism are too many and too varied to be so quickly summarized and dismissed.

One last criticism that might be made about Barnett's counternarrative is that it is clearly consolatory itself. It allows him to avoid discussing how, among other things, our world really does continue to be shaped by business class projects of state-making both nationally and transnationally (see Sklair, 2001; 2002; Gill, 2003; Harvey, 2005; N. Smith, 2005; for an especially witty commentary, see also Lapham, 1998). Such processes are of course overdetermined themselves by all kinds of racialized and gendered power hierarchies too (see Abu-Laban and Gabriel, 2002; Willis and Yeoh, 2002; Willis *et al.*, 2002; Mitchell, 2004). Thus, as Lisa Duggan (2003) has argued so powerfully *vis-à-vis* the American experience, we therefore need to examine the multiple ways in which neoliberal class projects of 'upward redistribution' are underpinned by projects of racial and sexual coding and control. But Barnett blocks off opportunities for this kind of analysis himself because of his own ageographical appeal to 'the moral sovereignty to the individual' in liberal philosophy (Barnett, 2005: 8): a normative appeal that not only ignores post-colonial

critiques of liberalism's imperial geographies (eg, Mehta, 1999; Slater, 2002), but also appears unengaged with the empirical challenges of work by geographers on the ties and tensions between liberalism and neoliberalism on the ground (eg, Mitchell, 2004). Elsewhere, writing with Murray Low, he has pointed to such spectral spaces of liberal democracy (Barnett and Low, 2004). But in his consolation article Barnett is unable to offer any kind of grounded geohistorical account of his own that might explain the conundrum with which he begins: namely, why 'liberal' is used in the USA to castigate and homogenize the left while simultaneously being used in France to castigate and homogenize the right. No doubt this flux does have something to do with the tension between individual freedom and collective obligation running through the main traditions of liberal constitutionalism – although I think poststructuralist problematizations of the (im)possible space between liberty and equality have more to offer than traditional liberal philosophy on this score (eg, Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: Chapter 4; Tully, 1995). But such philosophical accounts still miss the complex political and economic connections *and* disconnections that have led from the laissez-faire economic liberalism of the nineteenth century to the welfare-statist Keynesian liberalism of the mid-twentieth century, to the globalist neoliberalism of today. The disjunctive denunciations of liberalism and neoliberalism only begin to make sense in the context of these fractured geohistorical trajectories, and it is precisely the fracturings of such trajectories on the ground – in different ways in different places – that political geographical accounts of the emergence and entrenchment of neoliberal governance make manifest. In the rest of this paper I seek to show this by highlighting work that has mapped the political geography of neoliberalization at and across a whole variety of scales from the global to the personal. This is a personal, it needs noting, which, in the world's wealthiest universities where articles like this one are

read, is increasingly being constituted as a new global-personal: not Kant's cosmopolitan peacemaker (Malcomson, 1998), nor the cosmopolitan communist conjured by Marx and Engels, nor one of the global hybrids that emerged out of anti-colonial independence movements (Cheah, 1998), nor yet the global villager imagined by McLuhan (Spivak, 1998), and not even a national-citizen subject with global ambition – although in Euro-American educational institutions there is a long legacy of this (Heyman, 2001) – but rather an idealized neoliberal subject, a 'soft-cosmopolitan' (Calhoun, 2003) trained to be an adaptable, transnationally mobile, lifelong learner with global vision, entrepreneurial *savoir-faire*, and, of course, a track record of excellence (Readings, 1996; Hillis *et al.*, 2002; Roberts, 2004). Aware of how most of us are teaching as well as researching in educational environments that are being remade to cultivate and console such subjects (Castree and Sparke, 2000; Heyman, 2000; Castree, 2002; Larner and Le Heron, 2003a), I also want to point in what follows to particularly useful pedagogical resources that can help us offer critique instead of consolation in the course of remapping neoliberalism (eg, Rotherberg, 2006).

## II Geohistories of neoliberalism

'A congeries of ideas and theories associated with the rise of the New Right in the North Atlantic economies during the 1980s and with the desirability of the market as a central plank for the organization of social, economic and political life' (Watts, 2000). This is how Michael Watts begins his definition of neoliberalism in the fourth edition of the *Dictionary of human geography*. It is a useful entry, not least because it traces the lineage of neoliberalism back to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century economic liberals while nevertheless reminding readers of the enormous differences that the intervening centuries have made to the basic arguments about governance through the hidden hand of the free market. Also useful in this respect, the historical chronologies, online videos and

biographical portraits that are packaged together on the US Public Broadcasting Service website *Commanding Heights* provide a freely accessible teaching resource that is packed with insight into the eclipse of liberal Keynesian and socialist 'Command Economies' by the neoliberal reforms of the last three decades (PBS, 2005). While the program's producers advance predictably sanguine clichés about the outcomes of implementing neoliberal ideas, the actual genealogy of the ideas themselves, their early development by von Hayek and other Europeans in the hotel at Mont Pélérin, their scientization by Friedman and other Americans in the classrooms at Chicago, and their transformation into policy through the governments of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, is all charted in a way that usefully internationalizes and colors in the sketch of the New Right 'North Atlantic economies' offered by Watts. Indeed, a colorful interactive time-map on the PBS website provides a captivating geohistorical learning tool through which students can explore the country-by-country eclipse of central planning by the entrenchment of neoliberal ideas as policy. Unfortunately, though, three things get lost in such an ideas-driven account of neoliberalism. First, by overemphasizing the force of neoliberal ideas there is a clear danger of ignoring the more complex forces unleashed by economic developments themselves: both those relating to the overaccumulation crises of the early 1970s that created the context in which neoliberal ideas blossomed (Brenner, 2002; Harvey, 2005); and those relating to the ways in which the ensuing neoliberal orthodoxies actually 'informed development theory and practice' (Watts, 2000) thereby shaping further economic developments around the world. Second, an overfocus on the ideas of neoliberalism also risks obscuring the situationally varied articulation of neoliberal thinking in practices that have everywhere been mediated by geographically specific power relations – even if the basic common sense among neoliberal

believers at the IMF, World Bank and WTO is that the policies of free trade, privatization, fiscal austerity, the deregulation of finance are a one-size-fits-all recipe for success everywhere (Peet *et al.*, 2003). Third, and most ironically, overfocusing on the ideas alone risks reproducing (as the PBS materials do) the idealism of neoliberalism itself, a form of idealism that gains its political force precisely because it is a utopianism that masquerades as a form of practical, 'we're telling you the truth about the markets and globalization', realism (Harvey, 2000; Comaroff and Comaroff, 2001).

There are many more critical teaching resources that puncture the faux realism of neoliberalism with *de facto* political geographies of neoliberal ideas as a locatable and hence also *dislocatable* idealism. *No Logo*, for example, a film based on Naomi Klein's inspiring book of the same title (Klein, 2000; Jhally and Alper, 2003), connects the economic geography of commodity chains with the political geography of protest against neoliberalism to fashion an extremely accessible examination of unexamined everyday neoliberal common sense in the global North (for another educative unpacking of commodity fetishism, see Cohen, 1997). Equally compelling in this respect are the excellent entries on topics such as 'Gouvernance' and 'Libéralisme' in a recent French 'altermondialiste' dictionary 'partiel et partiel de la mondialisation' (Ramonet *et al.*, 2003). Still more accessible and powerful as a pedagogic decoding device, Rafael Barajas's *How to succeed at globalization* with its subversive subtitle *A primer for the roadside vendor*, also breaks new political geographical ground by providing a polemical cartoon geohistory of capitalism that underlines the importance of tracing neoliberal governance out of the North Atlantic and back further than the 1980s to the longer *duree* of imperialism and developmentalism in the Global South (El Fisgón, 2004). From the perspective of Latin America, Barajas reminds us, not very much about neoliberalism is especially 'neo': the

continuities with colonial coercion being especially obvious in countries such as Chile where the murder of Allende and other socialists after the 9/11 coup revealed the ways in which Friedman's Chicago boys depended on hidden fists ahead of introducing neoliberal governance through marketized hidden hands (cf. Petras, 2004).

An antipodean historical-geography of neoliberalism attuned to its cutting edge in the periphery and semi-periphery chimes to some extent with arguments in the governmentality literature (see Dezalay and Garth, 2002). Larner's work, for example, points up the importance of exploring how certain sorts of entrepreneurial micropractices such as benchmarking need to be traced back to more peripheral parts of the global economy – such as New Zealand – where a long history of dependency on global staples markets has created a long history of experimentation with market-orientated development models (Larner, 2004; see also Agnew and Corbridge, 1995, on Canada's early embrace of monetarism). Likewise, Barry Hindess ends his exploration of neoliberal citizenship by noting that at 'least with regard to the social rights of citizenship ... the development of neo-liberal citizenship has advanced further in other parts of the world than it has in the West itself' (Hindess, 2002: 140). This should come as no surprise to scholars of colonialism who have long pointed to how the disciplinary architecture of liberal modernity – including the paradigmatic Panopticon – was itself often field-tested in the colonies (Mitchell, 1988). However, it does raise a big question about the political geography of neoliberalism (a question also suggested by Larner and Le Heron, 2003b): namely, how has neoliberalism's expansion and entrenchment as a system of market-mediated regulation in more macrospace of *governance* (such as free trade areas, world cities, cross-border regions and countries subject to structural adjustment rules) been connected to its development as a series of calculative practices in microspaces of

*governmentality* (corporations, finance centers, think-tanks, universities, schools, and border checkpoints, for example)? To ask such a question clearly means avoiding the assumptions of the Davos crowd who tend to reduce governance to top-town forms of rule-making by economic elites. But it also means eschewing the economy-obscuring assumptions of the Foucault followers who tend to redefine governance only in terms of the subjectivity formation practices of governmentality.

### III The TINA-touts in space

One approach to answering this question is to focus on the globalist ideologies that suture together ideas about institutional and individual entrepreneurialism with grand vistas of free market led development. In the writings of self-described neoliberal promoters, for instance, the micro-and macroscales of neoliberal rule are thus usually explained as fitting together naturally as some sort of synergistic adaptation of both personal imagination and social regulation brought on by a global struggle for political-economic survival: a naturally selected, heteronormative, coupling, it would seem, as well as very convenient for business. Martin Wolf (2004), Jagdish Bhagwati (2004), and Thomas Friedman (2005) can all be interpreted in this way as uncritical convenors of the arranged marriage feared by Barnett. While they belittle both individuals and regions who refuse to attend the neoliberal wedding, they celebrate freedom of individual choice (Wolf), they shower readers with the economic confetti (Bhagwati), and they offer a magical fantasy world – a flat world, no less – to explore on the honeymoon (Friedman). As a group who persistently proffer good seats at the There Is No Alternative festivities we might therefore usefully label them the TINA-touts. But, more than this, following calls to interrogate the enunciation and performance of market-fundamentalist inevitability arguments (Gibson-Graham, 1996; Massey, 2005), it is also possible to explore the force of such TINA-tout ideology in action: charting its

emergence and marketing as a form of 'Globaloney' or globalist common sense (Veseth, 1998; 2005; Steger, 2005); tracing how it has been re-engineered and spread internationally by 'World Bank Literature' (Williams, 1999; Kumar, 2003), global business schooling (Roberts, 2004; Olds and Thrift, 2005), and business-funded think-tanks (Peck, 2001; 2002; 2004); examining its omnipresent appeal but extremely uneven implementation in the actual economic geography of business practices themselves (Dicken, 2003; Ho, 2005); addressing its impact on ideological innovations in both national and transnational state power (Jones and Jones, 2004; Hay, 2004; Gilbert, 2005); and charting its deployment in this way as a form of geoeconomics, a way of scripting territory which operates like geopolitical discourse with huge impacts on policy-making, but which is distinct in being consistently mediated by neoliberal nostrums about the human freedoms and free space freed up by free markets (A. Smith, 2002; Roberts *et al.*, 2003; Sparke and Lawson, 2003; Coleman, 2005; Sparke, 2005; cf. Lerner and Walters, 2004: 11). Such examinations of the performance of market-fundamentalist ideology on the ground can in a sense bring it down to size and allow students to see it 'stutter', to use a phrase from Lerner and Walters (2005: 20). They also open up opportunities for imagining markets themselves more *care*-fully as potential sites for building non-neoliberal futures (S. Smith, 2005). However, in terms of theorizing how neoliberal governance and governmentality are mutually constitutive, there remains a danger of idealism if ideology and discourse alone are privileged as the media through which the micro- and macropactices of neoliberal rule are seen as being cobbled together. There are other mediations that are equally worthy of examination, and the fact that the planar world view of geoeconomic discourse reflects a distinctively American imaginative geography (originally the ever-expanding west) points directly to one: namely the central mediating role of the

USA as the incubator and exporter of the 'Washington Consensus'.

#### **IV The Washington Consensus in America**

In the leading texts addressing neoliberal governance as a standardized policy framework, the Washington Consensus generally serves as a synonym for neoliberalism and, as such, even sometimes operates as a linked entry 'Washington Consensus. *See* neoliberalism' in indexes (eg, Tabb, 2004: 519). Interestingly given Friedman's fantastically flat geoeconomic assertions, the original claim that there was a Consensus around the virtues of neoliberal policy was articulated as follows: 'The proof may not be quite as conclusive as the proof that the Earth is not flat, but it is sufficiently well established to give sensible people better things to do with their time than to challenge its veracity' (Williamson, 1993: 1330). Subsequently there has been considerable debate over whether there is global consensus on the Consensus (eg, Sheppard and Nagar, 2004), as well as critical discussion (eg, Hart, 2001) of the dissent illustrated by a former World Bank economist's much hyped discontent with the IMF (Stieglitz, 2002). However, with the exception of Ananya Roy's careful exploration of what she calls the 'Bangladesh Consensus' – a form of rival neoliberalism she associates with the microcredit governmentality organized by the Grameen Bank (Roy, 2005) – less is generally made of the fact that the Consensus was made in America in DC. The place specificity was, of course, a reflection of the far from flat political geography of economic authority in the world system that emerged out of the legacies of Bretton Woods. Among other things, the term therefore registered the unique power of the USA and specifically the linked roles of the IMF, World Bank and US Treasury Department – all based in Washington – in forcing recipients of their loans, credit guarantees and development assistance to implement neoliberal policies as a condition of new loans, loan

rescheduling and so-called advice. The life and death consequences of Consensus conditionalities are not always adequately fleshed out in dry tomes on global governance (eg, Väyrynen, 1999), but they are brilliantly critiqued in a film on the structural readjustment of Jamaica, *Life and debt* (Black, 2001): a film that is probably more powerful than a thousand powerpoint lectures as a way of teaching students about the direct relays between the neoliberal Consensus in DC and poverty, insecurity, and the straitjacketing of democratic government in the indebted world. Nonetheless, for students and teachers who want to read more about how this straitjacketing has developed under the auspices of the free world's self-appointed American leadership, work by geographers provides a wealth of simultaneously sophisticated and critical literature, thereby also addressing concerns about the discipline not contributing enough to the debates over globalization (eg, Dicken, 2004; Martin, 2004).

While there are some valuable examples from outside the discipline also (eg, Pieterse, 2004), recent political geographic scholarship informed by Marxian theory offers some of the best analysis around of the ways in which American influence has led to the expansion and entrenchment of neoliberalism both as a globally hegemonic regime of governance and as a system of governmentality predicated on congeries of calculative practices. Neil Smith's examination of what he calls *The endgame of globalization*, for example, provides an extremely accessible, lively, and, to use one of his favourite words, trenchant critique of the three rounds of efforts to establish liberal capitalist norms for global governance by the administrations of Wilson, F.D.R. and Bush-Clinton-Bush (N. Smith, 2005). The book's title might at first be read as an embrace of a traditional hegemonic decline thesis, but instead Smith offers a historically sensitive and far from 'broad structural transformations' picture of the politics that have led to the defeat of the liberal globalists in Washington itself. These are

politics, he argues, that have therefore led in each of the three historical phases to the ultimate victory of national chauvinists over the liberalizing capitalist game plan. Yet, by explaining the 'end' of (neo)liberal visions largely in terms of right-wing reaction internal to America, Smith ironically underplays the more globalized economic forces that other Marxist, World Systems and, increasingly also, investment guru accounts tend to privilege as an explanation of American decline (eg, Brenner, 2004, who himself sounds more and more like Morgan Stanley's bearish Stephen Roach). However, for a detailed picture of these, one only needs to turn to John Agnew's comprehensive examination of the changing political geography of global hegemony (Agnew, 2005). While less trenchant than Smith, Agnew nevertheless provides readers with an empirically rich and theoretically systematic rebuttal to the naïve geoeconomic orthodoxies uttered and stuttered by the TINA-touts (see also O'Loughlin *et al.*, 2004). His argument at base is that the form of 'marketplace society' incubated in America and exported around the world through the agencies of global governance based in Washington (*and* Wall Street) is now – via trade deficits, budget deficits, and American indebtedness – increasingly undercutting American influence while creating a globally hegemonic system over which no single government holds hegemonic control. Agnew prefers to describe this system in terms of the spread of the marketplace society rather than of neoliberalism *per se* (there is not even an entry for neoliberalism in his index), but even so it is clear that he thinks interpretations of global power that stress its neoliberal norms are preferable to others that speak of neocolonialism, neo-imperialism and empire. Despite this, Agnew's analysis chimes in interesting ways with David Harvey's account of *The new imperialism*. Harvey offers a more dialectical argument that draws out the contradictions between the ongoing military assertion of American might and its weakening economic underpinnings – an

account that also offers an enabling invitation to explore the overdetermination of the economic by the extra-economic through the category of 'accumulation by dispossession'. A key point that emerges from Harvey's argument is that the neoconservative turn to neocolonial military adventurism in Iraq has also to some extent unmasked the ways in which specifically American interests lie at the heart of neoliberal globalization (see also Thornton, 2004). This was a point that even an ex-assistant secretary of state under President Clinton could grasp when he reviewed the book in *The Guardian*. Of course, he felt obliged to start by calling Harvey 'neo-Marxist and extreme', but his subsequent outline of the text's basic thesis – about how the 'neoconservatives have now ripped away from globalization the veil under which neoliberals hid the new imperialism' – indicated a much less dismissive engagement with Harvey's argument (Rubin, 2004).

Whatever else it says about the disrespectful approach to Marxism that tends today to be rehearsed through rhetorics of respect and anti-extremism, the fact that Rubin was even reviewing *The new imperialism* stands as testimony to how geographers can still get noticed in the big public debates over globalization (see also Monbiot, 2003; Arrighi, 2005). Hopefully, other recent critical geographical work will similarly reach a wider audience. Certainly there are many contributions that deserve such attention, including the terrific introduction to global governance co-authored by Peet and 17 students from Clark university on the IMF, World Bank and WTO (Peet *et al.*, 2003). Entitled *Unholy trinity*, the book offers educative introductions to how each of the three institutions has developed in quite different ways through the second half of the twentieth century, thereby creating a polycentric and far from monolithic apparatus of global rule. While also attending to the unique role of American influence over and in each element of the trinity (including the contradictory challenges to the USA posed by WTO multilateralism),

another of the book's great merits is the way in which it explains how the governance capacity of the IMF, World Bank and WTO is not something developed internally (like a nation state's police force), but instead emerges out of each institution's ability to leverage the force of global financial and trade networks. In this respect, the arguments of *Unholy trinity* reflect a widespread sensitivity among geographers to the ways in which various forms of reterritorialization associated with neoliberal governance are underpinned, if only partially and context-contingently, by market-mediated calculative practices and networks (eg, Lawson, 2003; Wright, 2004; Taylor, 2005): ie, the practices and network relations of neoliberal governmentality.

## **V The permanent economic tribunal in reterritorialized space**

Rethinking what reterritorialization means at a global scale, Stuart Elden has recently made the point (inspired anachronistically it appears by Aristotle) that '[I]ate capitalism extends the mathematical, calculative understanding of territory to the entire globe' (Elden, 2005: 16). While this sort of claim risks representing capitalism in a much too disembodied way (see Massey, 2005), Elden's final suggestion about globalization and calculation – that the form of territorialization traditionally associated with the post-Westphalian, capitalist nation state has increasingly been transnationalized via transnational calculative practices – remains a useful entry point into more grounded accounts of reterritorialization. This, for example, is how free trade areas can be investigated as arenas of emergent state effects (Mitchell, 1991): effects of governance that are nevertheless predicated on everyday economic calculations and the legal codes and tribunals that enforce such calculative practices as a system of governmentality. Whether the arena is the NAFTA region (Sparke, 2005), the EU (Sweet, 2004) or the whole world of the WTO (Wallach and Woodall, 2004), we can

chart in this fashion how Foucault's 'permanent economic tribunal' is actually instantiated in transnational spaces of neoliberal regulation. As Gilbert (2005) cogently underlines *vis-à-vis* the NAFTA region, we further need to attend to the ways in which the associated reterritorialization is also informed ideologically by TINA-tout inevitability arguments. To an important degree, however, the quotidian calculations made necessary by the trade agreements do nonetheless generate new quasi-constitutional transnational regimes of neoliberal rule that straitjacket policy and make more democratic forms of governance harder to imagine and implement (Gill, 2003).

Another set of transnational spaces that can be addressed with a similar attention to their codetermination by both neoliberal ideology and the emergent effects of neoliberal governmentality are crossborder regions. In the 1980s and 90s, TINA-touts around the world began promoting the idea that such 'gateway' regions could internally embody all the 'end of the nation state' free market freedoms of the so-called 'borderless world' (eg, Ohmae, 1995). While most geohistories of neoliberalism remain North Atlantic origin stories, a case can be made that in terms of both the ideology and the promotional practices of crossborder regionalism it was in fact Ohmae's Asian examples – most famously, the Singapore Growth Triangle – that set the pattern for the paradigm (Sparke *et al.*, 2004; see also Sum, 2002). The calculative practices found in these examples have since become common denominators of neoliberal crossborder regionalism elsewhere too (see Scott, 2002b; Newstead *et al.*, 2003). As such they involve constant competitive comparisons with other 'gateway' regions and a place promotionism in international competitions for direct investment and consumption spending: calculative practices that together comprise a form of regionalist benchmarking. What makes this slightly different from the post-Fordist entrepreneurial governance and 'glocalization' dynamics that Harvey and

Swyngedouw have highlighted (Swyngedouw, 1997; 2004; Harvey, 1989), is that this benchmarking is yoked in the case of crossborder regions to a distinctive geoeconomic script of borderless opportunity (see Sparke, 2000; 2002a). Among the recent efflorescence of articles and edited volumes on borders and border regions (Eskelinen *et al.*, 1999; Perkmann and Sum, 2002; Nicol and Townsend-Gault, 2005; van Houtum *et al.*, 2005), certain pieces merely replay this place promotional geoeconomics as academic argument (eg, Artibise, 2005). However, the vast majority of this research tends instead to document with care and empirical detail what is actually happening on the ground, sometimes noting how neoliberal governance effects and geoeconomic discourses emerge as a result (eg, Jessop, 2002; Perkmann, 2002; Coleman, 2005; Nicol and Townsend-Gault, 2005). Border regions, though, remain overdetermined by multiple geopolitical complexities, and submit just as uneasily to official state discourse as they do to the opportunistic geoeconomic scripts of neoliberal boosters. Indeed, as Balibar notes, 'no border is ever the mere boundary between two states, but is always overdetermined, and, in that sense, sanctioned, reduplicated and relativized by other geopolitical divisions' (Balibar, 2002: 79). This heterogeneous 'other scene' of border regions (to use Balibar's Althusserian appropriation of Freud) is also well addressed in the recent outpouring of research on borders, and, whether it is an other scene of geopolitics (Scott, 2002a; 2004; 2005; Brunn *et al.*, 2005; Edwards, 2005), of nature (Fall, 2005), of postcolonial sovereignties (Mbembe, 2000; Kramsch, 2002; Sidaway, 2002; Sletto, 2002; Sparke, 2002b) or of legal identities and their others (Darian-Smith, 1999; Nevins, 2002; Lindquist, 2004; Price, 2004), it is clear that borders offer a usefully prismatic lens on to the changing shape of governance in the context of accelerating interdependency. Indeed, borders seem so resistant to singular readings that even just the metaphor of border-crossing

can help raise critically transgressive questions (eg, Mahtani, 2002).

Another argument already cited in this report (Castree, 2002) that usefully runs with the metaphorical meaning of borders provokes in turn more critical reflection on what activism means in the neoliberal academy. In conclusion, I would like to note that ongoing reports from this academic border zone provide us with a far from consolatory picture. There are depressing accounts, for example, about how academic publishing is becoming increasingly controlled by Anglo-American corporate capital (Hughes and Reimer, 2005; Paasi, 2005). There are the worrying trends towards the segmentation and attendant flexibilization of academic labor (Shelton *et al.*, 2001); and, while it represents more of a neoconservative adaptation of neoliberal norms – including a cynical instrumentalization of the language of ‘plurality’ – American universities are now experiencing a right-wing campaign to provide a legal framework for suing liberal and leftist teachers (AAUP, 2005). Against these trends, however, three responses seem vital. The first, which I have tried to highlight here, is to nuance rather than abandon our analyses of neoliberalism: a nuancing that can be developed in part through analysis of the context-contingent connections between neoliberal governance and neoliberal governmentality. The second is to draw on the excellent pedagogic resources that are increasingly easy to access and teach about these political geographies in our classrooms. The third response, as I shall seek to outline in my third report, is to remain responsible scholars of the burgeoning political geographies of resistance too.

#### *Acknowledgements*

Sincere thanks go to Gill Hart and Stephen Young for valuable feedback. In addition the author would like to acknowledge the support of NSF grant 9984250. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily

reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

#### **References**

- Abu-Laban, Y.** and **Gabriel, C.** 2002: *Selling diversity: immigration, multiculturalism, employment equity and globalization*. New York: Broadview Press.
- Agnew, J.** 2005: *Hegemony: the new shape of global power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Agnew, J.** and **Corbridge S.** 1995: *Mastering space: hegemony, territory and international political economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Arrighi, G.** 2005: Hegemony unravelling – I. *New Left Review* 32, 45–79.
- Artibise, A.** 2005: Cascadian adventures: shared visions, strategic alliances, and ingrained barriers in a transborder region. In Nicol, H. and Townsend-Gault, I., editors,  *Holding the line: borders in a global world*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 238–67.
- Association of American University Presses (AAUP)** 2005: The ‘Academic bill of rights’ campaign proposes government oversight of teaching and learning. Retrieved 5 December 2005, from <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/ABOR/aborintro2.htm>
- Balibar, E.** 2002: *Politics and the other scene*. New York: Verso.
- Barnett, C.** 2005: The consolations of ‘neoliberalism’. *Geoforum* 36, 7–12.
- Barnett, C.** and **Low, M.** 2004: Geography and democracy: an introduction. In Barnett, C. and Low, M., editors, *Spaces of democracy: geographical perspectives on citizenship, participation and representation*, London: Sage, 1–22.
- Basu, R.** 2004: The rationalization of neoliberalism in Ontario’s public education system, 1995–2000. *Geoforum* 35, 621–34.
- Bhagwati, J.** 2004: *In defense of globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Black, S.** 2001: *Life and debt*. New York: New Yorker Films.
- Brennan, T.** 2003: *Globalization and its terrors: daily life in the West*. New York: Routledge.
- Brenner, N.** and **Theodore, N.** 2002: Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’. *Antipode* 34, 349–79.
- Brenner, R.** 2002: *The boom and the bubble: the US in the global economy*. New York: Verso.
- 2004: New boom or new bubble: the trajectory of the US economy. *New Left Review* 25, 57–100.
- Brunn, S., Watkins, J.F., Fargo, T., Lepawsky, J.** and **Jones, J.A.** 2005: Towards a geopolitics of life and living: where boundaries still matter. In Nicol, H.N. and Townsend-Gault, I., editors,  *Holding the line: borders in a global world*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 381–99.
- Budds, J.** 2004: Power, nature and neoliberalism. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 25, 322–43.

- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P.** 1991: *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. University of Chicago Press.
- Calhoun, C.** 2003: The class consciousness of frequent travellers: towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. In Archibugi, D., editor, *Debating cosmopolitanism*, New York: Verso, 86–16.
- Castree, N.** 2002: Border geography. *Area* 34, 103–12.
- Castree, N. and Sparke, M.** 2000: Professional geography and the corporatization of the university: experiences, evaluations and engagements. *Antipode* 32, 222–29.
- Cheah, P.** 1998: Given culture: rethinking cosmopolitical freedom in transnationalism. In Cheah, P. and Robbins, B., editors, *Cosmopolitanism: thinking and feeling beyond the nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 290–28.
- Cohen, L.H.** 1997: *Glass, paper, beans: revelations on the nature and value of ordinary things*. New York: Doubleday.
- Coleman, M.** 2005: US statecraft and the US-Mexico border as security/economy nexus. *Political Geography* 24, 1–25.
- Collier, S. and Ong, A.** 2005: Global assemblages, anthropological problems. In Ong, A. and Collier, S., editors, *Global assemblages: technology, politics and ethics as anthropological problems*, Oxford: Blackwell, 3–21.
- Comaroff, J. and Comaroff, J.L.** 2001: *Millennial capitalism and the culture of neoliberalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Cox, K.R.** 2005: Spaces of neoliberalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23, 149–51.
- Darian-Smith, E.** 1999: *Bridging divides: the channel tunnel and English legal identity in the new Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dezalay, Y. and Garth, B.G.** 2002: *The internationalization of palace wars: lawyers, economists, and the contest to transform Latin American states*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dicken, P.** 2003: *Global shift: reshaping the global economic map in the 21st century* (fourth edition). New York: Guilford Press.
- 2004: Geographers and ‘globalization’: (yet) another missed boat? *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 29, 5–26.
- Duggan, L.** 2003: *The twilight of equality: neoliberalism, cultural politics and the attack on democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Edwards, T.** 2005: Information geopolitics: blurring the lines of sovereignty. In Nicol, H. and Townsend-Gault, I., editors, *Holding the line: borders in a global world*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 26–49.
- Elden, S.** 2005: Missing the point: globalization, deterritorialization and the space of the world. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 30, 8–19.
- El Fisgón,** 2004: *How to succeed at globalization: a primer for the roadside vendor*. Metropolitan Books.
- Eskelinen, H., Liikanen, I. and Oksa, J.** 1999: *Curtains of iron and gold: reconstructing borders and scales of interaction*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Fall, J.** 2005: Drawing the line: nature, hybridity and politics in transboundary spaces. Ashgate.
- Fraser, N.** 2003: From discipline to flexibilization? rereading Foucault in the shadow of globalization. *Constellations* 10, 160–71.
- Friedman, T.L.** 2005: *The world is flat: a brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K.** 1996. *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): a feminist critique of political economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gilbert, E.** 2005: The inevitability of integration? Neoliberal discourse and the proposals for a new North American economic space after September 11. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95, 202–22.
- Gill, S.** 2003: *Power and resistance in the new world order*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux, H.A.** 2004: *The terror of neoliberalism: authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gökariksel, B. and Mitchell, K.** 2005: Veiling, secularism, and the neoliberal subject: national narratives and the supranational desires in Turkey and France. *Global Networks* 5, 147–65.
- Hackworth, J.** 2004: Local autonomy, bond rating agencies and neoliberal urbanism in the United States. *International Journal of Urban and Regional research* 26, 707–25.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A.** 2004: *Multitude: war and democracy in the age of empire*. New York: Penguin.
- Hart, G.** 2001: Development critiques in the 1990s: cults de sac and promising paths. *Progress in Human Geography* 25, 649–58.
- 2005: Denaturalizing dispossession: critical ethnography in the age of resurgent imperialism. In *From local processes to global forces*, Centre for Civil Society, University of KwaZulu-Natal Research Reports volume 1.
- 2006: Beyond neoliberalism? Post-apartheid developments in historical and comparative perspective. In Padayachee, V., editor, *The development decade? Economic and social change in South Africa 1994–2004*, HSRC Press, in press.
- Harvey, D.** 1989: From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler* 71B, 3–17.
- 2000: *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 2003: *The new imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2005: *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hay, C.** 2004: The normalizing role of rationalist assumptions in the institutional embedding of neoliberalism. *Economy and Society* 33, 500–27.
- Heyman, R.** 2000: Research, pedagogy, and instrumental geography. *Antipode* 32, 292–307.
- 2001: Libraries as armouries: Daniel Coit Gilman, geography, and the uses of a university. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19, 295–316.
- Hillis, K., Petit, M. and Cravey, A.J.** 2002: Adventure travel for the mind®: analyzing the United States virtual trade mission's promotion of globalization through discourse and corporate media strategies. In Herod, A. and Wright, M., editors, *Geographies of power: placing scale*, Oxford: Blackwell, 154–70.
- Hindess, B.** 2002: Neo-liberal citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 6, 127–43.
- Ho, K.** 2005: Situating global capitalisms: a view from Wall Street investment banks. *Cultural Anthropology* 20, 68–96.
- Hughes, A. and Reimer, S.** 2005: Publishing commodity chains. *Geoforum* 36, 273–75.
- Jessop, B.** 2002: The political economy of scale. In Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L., editors, *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*, London: Palgrave.
- Jhally, S. and Alper, L.** 2003: *No logo [videorecording]: brands, globalization, resistance*. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.
- Jones, M. and Jones, R.** 2004: Nation states, ideological power and globalisation: can geographers catch the boat? *Geoforum* 35, 409–24.
- Katz, C.** 2004: *Growing up global: economic restructuring and children's everyday lives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Klein, N.** 2000: *No logo: taking aim at the brand bullies*. New York: Picador.
- Kohl, B. and Warner, M.** 2004: Scales of neoliberalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28, 855–58.
- Kramsch, O.** 2002: Re-imagining the scalar topologies of cross-border governance: euro regions in the postcolonial present. *Space and Polity* 6, 169–96.
- Kumar, A.**, editor 2003: *World Bank literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C.** 1985: *Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. New York: Verso.
- Lapham, L.** 1998: *The agony of mammon: the imperial global economy explains itself to the membership in Davos, Switzerland*. New York: Verso.
- Larner, W.** 2000: Neo-liberalism: policy, ideology, governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy* 62, 5–25.
- 2003: Neoliberalism? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 509–12.
- 2004: Global benchmarking: participating at a distance in the global economy. In Larner, W. and Walters, W., editors, *Global governmentality: new perspectives on international rule*, New York: Routledge, 89–106.
- Larner, W.J. and Le Heron, R.** 2003a: Neoliberalising universities?: spaces of policy, practice and performance. *New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 18, 102–14.
- 2003b: From economic globalisation to globalising economic processes: towards post-structuralist political economies. *Geoforum* 33, 415–19.
- Larner, W. and Walters, W.** 2004: Global governmentality: governing international spaces. In Larner, W. and Walters, W., editors, *Global governmentality: new perspectives on international rule*, New York: Routledge, 1–20.
- 2005: Globalization as governmentality. *Alternatives* 29, 1–24.
- Lawson, V.** 2003: Global governmentality and graduated sovereignty: national belonging among poor migrants in Ecuador. *Scottish Geographical Journal* 118, 235–55.
- Lemke, T.** 2001: The birth of bio-politics: Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society* 30, 190–207.
- Lindquist, J.** 2004: Veils and ecstasy: negotiating shame in the Indonesian borderlands. *Ethnos* 69, 487–508.
- Mahtani, M.** 2002: Tricking the border guards: performing race. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 425–40.
- Malcomson, S.** 1998: The varieties of cosmopolitan experience. In Cheah, P. and Robbins, B., editors, *Cosmopolitics: thinking and feeling beyond the nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 233–45.
- McCarthy, J.** 2004: Privatizing conditions of production: trade agreements as neoliberal environmental governance. *Geoforum* 35, 327–41.
- Mansfield, B.** 2004: Rules of privatization: contradictions in neoliberal regulation of north Pacific fisheries. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94, 565–85.
- Martin, R.** 2004: Geography: making a difference in a globalizing world. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 29, 147–50.
- Massey, D.** 2005: *For space*. London: Sage.
- Mbembe, A.** 2000: At the edge of the world: boundaries, territoriality, and sovereignty in Africa. *Public Culture* 12, 259–84.
- Mehta, U.** 1999: *Liberalism and empire: a study in nineteenth century British liberal thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchell, K.** 2004: *Crossing the neoliberal line: pacific rim migration and the metropolis*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Mitchell, T.** 1988: *Colonising Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1991: The limits of the state: beyond statist approaches and their critics. *American Political Science Review* 85, 77–96.

- 2002: *The rule of experts: Egypt, techno-politics, modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Monbiot, G.** 2003: Too much of a good thing: underlying the US drive to war is a thirst to open up new opportunities for surplus capital. *The Guardian* 18 February. Retrieved 5 December 2004 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,897766,00.html>
- Moore, D.** 2005: *Suffering for territory*. Duke University Press.
- Nagar, R., Lawson, V., McDowell, L. and Hanson, S.** 2002: Locating globalization: feminist (re)readings of the subjects and spaces of globalization. *Economic Geography* 78, 257–84.
- Nevins, J.** 2002: *Operation gatekeeper: the rise of the 'illegal alien' and the making of the U.S. – Mexico border*. New York: Routledge.
- Newstead, C.** 2005: Scaling Caribbean (in)dependence. *Geoforum* 36, 45–58.
- Newstead, C., Reid, C. and Sparke, M.** 2003: The cultural geography of scale. In Anderson, K., Domosh, M. and Thrift, N., editors, *The handbook of cultural geography*, London: Sage, 485–97.
- Nicol, H.N. and Townsend-Gault, I.,** editors 2005: *Holding the line: borders in a global world*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Ohmae, K.** 1995: *The end of the nation-state: the rise of regional economies*. New York: Free Press.
- Olds, K. and Thrift, N.,** 2005: Cultures on the brink: reengineering the soul of capitalism – on a global scale. In Ong, A. and Collier, S., editors, *Global assemblages: technology, politics and ethics as anthropological problems*, Oxford: Blackwell, 270–90.
- O'Loughlin, J., Staeheli, L. and Greenberg, E.,** editors 2004: *Globalization and its outcomes*. New York: Guilford.
- Paasi, A.** 2005: Globalization, academic capitalism and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A* 37, 769–89.
- Peck, J.** 2001: *Workfare states*. New York: Guilford Press.
- 2002: Political economies of scale: fast policy, interscalar relations, and neoliberal workfare. *Economic Geography* 78, 331–60.
- 2004: Geography and public policy: constructions of neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography* 28, 392–405.
- Peck, J. and Tickell, A.** 2002: Neoliberalising space. *Antipode* 34, 380–404.
- Peet, R., Borne, B., Davis, M., Fehrer, K., Feinstein, M., Feldman, S., Khan, S.R., Labban, M., McArdle, K., Marcano, C., Meierotto, Niles, D., Ponniah, T., Schmidt, M.C., Schwarz, G., Shagwert, J., Staton, M.P. and Stratton, S.** 2003: *Unholy trinity: the IMF, World Bank and WTO*. London: Zed Books.
- Perkmann, M.** 2002: Euroregions: institutional entrepreneurship in the European Union. In Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L., editors, *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*, London: Palgrave, 103–24.
- Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L.,** editors 2002: *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*. London: Palgrave.
- Petras, J.** 2004: The politics of imperialism: neoliberalism and class politics in Latin America. Retrieved 8 March 2005 from <http://www.counterpunch.org/petras11132004.html>
- Pieterse, J.N.** 2004: *Globalization or empire?* New York: Routledge.
- Price, P.** 2004: *Dry place: landscapes of belonging and exclusion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Public Broadcasting Service (PBS)** 2005: *Commanding heights*. Retrieved 5 December 2005 from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/commandingheights/hi/index.html> 3/8/05
- Rabinow, P.** 2005: Midst anthropology's problems. In Ong, A. and Collier, S., editors, *Global assemblages: technology, politics and ethics as anthropological problems*, Oxford: Blackwell, 40–54.
- Ramamurthy, P.** 2003: Material consumers, fabricating subjects: perplexity, global connectivity discourses, and transnational feminist research. *Cultural Anthropology* 18, 524–50.
- Ramonet, I., Chao, R. and Wozniak, J.** 2003: *Abécédaire partiel, et partiel de la mondialisation*. Paris: Plon.
- Readings, B.** 1996: *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Retort,** 2005: Blood for oil. *London Review of Books* 27. Retrieved 5 December 2005 from <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v27/n08/reto01.html>
- Roberts, S.** 2004: Global strategic vision, managing the world. In Maurer, B. and Perry, R.W., editors, *Globalization under construction: governmentality law and identity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 176–97.
- Roberts, S., Secord, A. and Sparke, M.** 2003: Neoliberal geopolitics. *Antipode* 35, 886–97.
- Rose, N.** 1999: *Powers of freedom: reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, M.** 2004: The neoliberalization of ecosystem services: wetland mitigation banking and problems in environmental governance. *Geoforum* 35, 361–73.
- Rothenberg, P.** 2006: *Beyond borders: thinking critically about global issues*. Worth.
- Roy, A.** 2005: Counter-geographies: the battle for a new global order of poverty management. Invited presentation given at the university of Washington, Department of Geography, 13 May.
- Rubin, J.** 2004: Base motives. *The Guardian* 8 May Retrieved 4 October 2004 from <http://books.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4918315-110738,00.html>
- 2002a: A networked space of meaning? Spatial politics as geostrategies of European Integration. *Space and Polity* 6, 147–67.

- 2002b: On the political economy of cross-border regionalism: regional development and cooperation on the US-Mexican border. In Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L., editors, *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*, London: Palgrave, 191–211.
- 2004: The northern dimension: ‘multiscalar’ regionalism in an enlarging European Union? In Kramersch, O. and Hopper, B., editors, *Cross-border governance in the European Union*, London: Routledge, 135–56.
- 2005: Transnational regionalism, strategic geopolitics, and European integration: the case of the Baltic Sea region. In Nicol, H.N. and Townsend-Gault, I., editors, *Holding the line: borders in a global world*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 90–116.
- Shelton, N., Laoire, C., Fielding, S., Harvey, D.C., Pelling, M. and Duke-Williams, O.** 2001: Working at the coalface: Contract staff, academic initiation and the RAE. *Area* 33, 434–39.
- Sheppard, E. and Nagar, R.** 2004: From east west to north south. *Antipode* 36, 557–63.
- Sidaway, J.D.** 2002: *Imagined regional communities: integration and sovereignty in the global south*. New York: Routledge.
- Sklair, L.** 2001: *The transnational capitalist class*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 2002: *Globalization: capitalism and its alternatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slater, D.** 2002: Other domains of democratic theory: space, power and the politics of democratization. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 255–76.
- Sletto, B.** 2002, Boundary making and regional identities in a globalized environment: rebordering the Nariva Swamp, Trinidad. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 183–208.
- Smadja, I.** 2004: Who is Harry Potter, really? Retrieved 14 August 2005 from <http://gnosticalturpitude.org/archives/000233.html>
- Smith, A.** 2002: Imagining geographies of the ‘new Europe’: geo-economic power and the new European architecture of integration. *Political Geography* 21, 647–70.
- Smith, J.H.** 2005: Buying a better witch doctor: witch-finding, neoliberalism, and the development imagination in the Taita Hills, Kenya. *American Ethnologist* 32, 141–58.
- Smith, L.** 2004: The murky waters of the second wave of neoliberalism: corporatization as a service delivery model in Cape Town. *Geoforum* 35, 375–93.
- Smith, M.** 2005: Resisting and reinforcing neoliberalism: lesbian and gay organising at the federal and local levels in Canada. *Policy and Politics* 33, 75–93.
- Smith, N.** 2005: *The endgame of globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, S.** 2005: States, markets and an ethic of care. *Political Geography* 24, 1–20.
- Sparke, M.** 2000: Chunnel visions: unpacking the anticipatory geographies of an Anglo-European borderland. *Journal of Borderland Studies* 15, 2–34.
- 2002a: Not a state, but more than a state of mind: cascading Cascadias and the geoeconomics of cross-border regionalism. In Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L., editors, *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*, London: Palgrave, 212–40.
- 2002b: Between post-colonialism and cross-border regionalism. *Space and Polity* 6, 183–95.
- 2004: Political geography: political geographies of globalizations (I) – dominance. *Progress in Human Geography* 28, 777–76.
- 2005: *In the space of theory: postfoundational geographies of the nation-state*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sparke, M. and Lawson, V.** 2003: Entrepreneurial political geographies of the global-local nexus. In Agnew, J., Mitchell, K. and O Tuathail, G., editors, *A companion to political geography*, Oxford: Blackwell, 315–34.
- Sparke, M., Sidaway, J., Bunnell, T. and Grundy-Warr, C.** 2004: Triangulating the borderless world: geographies of power in the Indonesia-Malaysia-Singapore growth triangle. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 29, 485–98.
- Spivak, G.C.** 1998: Cultural talks in the hot peace: revisiting the ‘global village’. In Cheah, P. and Robbins, B., editors, *Cosmopolitics: thinking and feeling beyond the nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 329–48.
- Steger, M.** 2005: *Globalism: market ideology meets terrorism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Stieglitz, J.** 2002: *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: Norton.
- Sum, N.-L.** 2002: Globalization, regionalization and cross-border modes of growth in East Asia: the (re-)constitution of ‘time-space governance’. In Perkmann, M. and Sum, N.L., editors, *Globalization, regionalization and cross-border regions*, London: Palgrave, 50–76.
- Sweet, A.** 2004: *The judicial construction of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swyngedouw, E.** 1997: Neither local nor global: ‘glocalisation’ and the politics of scale. In Cox, K.R., editor, *Spaces of globalization: reasserting the power of the local*, New York: Guildford Press, 137–66.
- 2004: Globalisation or ‘glocalisation’? Networks, territories and re-scaling. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17, 25–48.
- Tabb, W.K.** 2004: *Economic governance in the age of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Taylor, P.J.** 2005: New political geographies: global civil society and global governance through world city networks. *GaWC Research Bulletin* 149. Retrieved 25 August 2005 from <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb149.html>

- Thornton, W.H.** 2004: Neoglobalism: the fourth way. *Antipode* 36, 564–74.
- Thrift, N.** 2000: Performing cultures in the new economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, 674–92.
- 2004: Intensities of feeling: towards a spatial politics of affect. *Geografiska Annaler* 86, 57–78.
- Tsing, A.** 2000: Inside the economy of appearances. *Public Culture* 12, 115–44.
- 2005: *Friction: an ethnography of global connection*. Princeton: University of Princeton Press.
- Tully, J.** 1995: *Strange multiplicity: constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Houtum, H., Kramsch, O. and Ziefhofer, W.**, editors 2005: *Bordering space*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Väyrynen, R.**, editor 1999: *Globalization and global governance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Veseth, M.** 1998: *Selling globalization: the myth of the global economy*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- 2005: *Globaloney: unraveling the myths of globalization*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wallach, L. and Woodall, P.** 2004: *Whose trade organization? A comprehensive guide to the WTO*. New York: The New Press.
- Watts, M.** 2000: Neo-liberalism. In Johnston, R.J., Gregory, D., Pratt, G. and Watts, M., editors, *The dictionary of human geography* (fourth edition) Oxford: Blackwell, 547–48.
- 2003: Development and governmentality. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 24, 96–125.
- 2004: Antinomies of community: some thoughts on geography, resources and empire. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 29, 195–216.
- Williams, D.G.** 1999: Constructing the economic space: the World Bank and the making of homo economicus. *Millennium* 28, 79–99.
- Williamson, J.** 1993: Democracy and the Washington consensus. *World Development* 21, 1329–36.
- Willis, K. and Yeoh, B.S.A.** 2002: Gendering transnational communities: a comparison of Singaporean and British migrants in China. *Geoforum* 33, 553–65.
- Willis, K., Yeoh, B.S.A. and Fakhri, S.M.A.K.** 2002: Transnational elites. *Geoforum* 33, 505–7.
- Wolf, M.** 2004: *Why globalization works*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wright, S.** 2004: Harvesting knowledge: the contested terrain of intellectual property rights in the Philippines. PhD dissertation, University of Washington.
- Yocaris, I.** 2004: Harry Potter, market wiz. *The New York Times* 18 July. Retrieved 5 January 2005 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/07/18/opinion/18YOCA.html?ex=1136610000&en=2a415c15b374eec2&ei=5070>