

Guest editorial

Geographies of neoliberalism in Latin America

Introduction

On the evening of 17 October 2003 people throughout Bolivia crowded around television sets in bars, restaurants, and homes to witness a curious event. President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, the architect of Bolivian neoliberalism, was fleeing the country, headed for Miami aboard a commercial flight. Goni, as he is commonly known, had reluctantly resigned amid massive countrywide protests that left over fifty people dead, the vast majority of them demonstrators shot by the military (Arze and Kruse, 2004; Hilton, 2003; *The Economist* 2004). This widespread public unrest targeted a key portion of Goni's neoliberal policies, which sought to allow transnational firms to export natural gas to California and Mexico through a Chilean port. As a jubilant public looked on, the split screens on the national news showed the ex-president's plane taxiing down the runway at the very moment that his vice-president, Carlos Mesa, was being sworn into office as his replacement. In the aftermath of the protests, Mesa promised to revisit pieces of the market-oriented policies promulgated by Goni during the previous years, especially the Law of Hydrocarbons, the focus of attention during the October protests.

As Goni boarded the plane for Miami, he joined a peculiar club of individuals, becoming one of several Latin American former presidents currently (or recently) living in exile. Others include Alberto Fujimori of Peru, now living in Japan, Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico, who fled to Ireland, and Carlos Menem of Argentina, who took refuge in Chile. That these leaders were the primary architects of neoliberalism in their respective countries throughout the 1980s and 1990s is not sheer coincidence. Rather, they share similar histories of continued economic crisis, political scandal, and mobilized popular opposition. These leaders-in-exile remain, furthermore, a clear and living indictment of the failure of neoliberal policies in Latin America. Yet, although particular leaders may be on the run in Latin America, neoliberalism as a whole certainly is not. On the contrary, neoliberal policies continue to be rolled forward throughout the region as indicated by the recently signed Central American Free Trade Agreement, the expansion of targeted World Bank antipoverty programs, continued rounds of privatization, and ever-increasing transnational corporate influence (witness Wal-Mart's expansion in Mexico). Nonetheless, the tenor of contemporary neoliberalisms in Latin America is distinct from the macroeconomic 'shock therapy' and 'structural adjustment' policies of the 1980s and 1990s. As the papers in this theme issue indicate, for example, the environment, culture, and identity have emerged as key neoliberal frontiers. These new frontiers are linked, furthermore, to a shifting set of multiscale state practices organized through emergent discourses of citizenship and rights. Taken together these political, economic, and cultural processes are producing new geographies of neoliberalism. Through the construction of new frontiers and externalization of its own failures, neoliberalism remains a mobile project in Latin America (Huber and Solt, 2004; Weyland, 2004).

Bolivia's recent political volatility demonstrates, nonetheless, that neoliberalism continues to be challenged in a variety of ways. Such challenges have occurred not only on the streets, but in the electoral arena as well. The victories of Luís Inácio 'Lula' da Silva in Brazil, Néstor Kirchner in Argentina, and Hugo Chávez in Venezuela

demonstrate that electoral victories are no longer the sole purview of neoliberal technocratic elites. These elections are significant because they also recover historical terrain, building links with Latin American leftist electoral successes in the past, most notably that of Salvador Allende in Chile (Petras, 1997). These new leaders, nonetheless, are far from the radical threats to neoliberal hegemony that they have been portrayed in US media and some sectors of the political right.⁽¹⁾ Rather, they signal the successful emergence of left-leaning pragmatists willing to negotiate for softer versions of neoliberalism.

Political-economic restructuring in Latin America and the emergence of neoliberalism at the global scale are intimately intertwined. The region has provided a key arena of radical political-economic experimentation over the last twenty years. Tracking such transformations in Latin America is of importance both for extending our understanding of the region, and for analyzing neoliberalism more broadly. The detailed case studies of actually existing neoliberalisms in Latin America presented in this theme issue provide the foundation for such an examination and respond, therefore, to Weyland's (2004) call for critical assessments of Latin American neoliberalism. These papers offer rigorous theoretical and empirical analyses, paying attention to both the underlying ideologies and assumptions of neoliberal policies, as well as their locally contingent forms. To provide a framework for such analyses, this essay begins by introducing ideologies of neoliberalism and processes of neoliberalization. It then turns to an overview of neoliberalism's historical geography in Latin America in order to situate the individual papers, drawing attention to the key themes that they address.⁽²⁾

Neoliberalism and neoliberalization

Though neoliberalism as a set of ideologies, policies, and practices has been with us in various forms for almost three decades, it has become in recent years a privileged theme of inquiry among critical geographers, spawning something of a cottage industry in critical analyses of neoliberal transitions and their implications (Larner, 2003; see also Peck, 2004). Neoliberalism has origins in the 1960s and 1970s as an economic theory formulated in the USA, most closely associated with the University of Chicago, and later emerging in the 1980s as political and economic policy under Reagan and Thatcher. With its acceptance as economic orthodoxy promoted by formerly Keynesian institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, neoliberalism has become, as Peck and Tickell (2002, page 381) point out, "a common-sense of the times". Yet, because of its seemingly omnipresent character—in part a product of triumphalist neoliberal discourses—neoliberalism in practice eludes simple identification.

Neoliberalism is perhaps most commonly thought of as an economic and political project that seeks to liberalize trade (particularly international trade), privatize state-controlled industries and services, and introduce market-oriented management practices to the reduced public sector (Jessop, 2002). Politically, neoliberalism seeks to 'roll back' selectively certain state functions, particularly the provision of social services and regulatory restraints on corporate practices. Williamson (1990) famously summarized these objectives with regard to the structural reforms demanded of Latin American governments by the World Bank and the IMF in the context of debt crisis of the 1980s.

⁽¹⁾ For example, in an astonishingly irresponsible letter to President Bush (dated 24 October 2002), Congressman Henry Hyde of Illinois, Chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, declared these three to constitute a new "Axis of Evil" in Latin America (reprinted at <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/781110/posts>).

⁽²⁾ These papers emerged out of four paper sessions on Neoliberalism in Latin America at the 2003 conference of the Association of American Geographers in New Orleans.

Williamson's list of ten policy recommendations, which included trade and financial liberalization, deregulation, privatization of industry, fiscal discipline, the encouragement of foreign direct investment, and the guarantee of private property, became widely known as the 'Washington Consensus'.

Although the central tenets of neoliberalism remain clear, tracing the processes through which places, economies, and societies become *neoliberalized* remains more complicated (Peck, 2004). Yet examining neoliberalization-in-practice helps to underscore the inherent contradictions within the neoliberal project. For example, contrary to antistate rhetoric the implementation of neoliberal policies often mobilizes an activist role for the state in promoting the privatization of goods and services and in opening up 'market opportunities'. State actions can range from the relatively subtle, such as the activities of national trade representatives negotiating agreements that favor particular policies, to the extremely blunt, such as the privatization of whole economies through debt restructuring or the use of military force to quell dissident activity. As such, despite discursive representations to the contrary, neoliberalism does *not* involve a necessary decrease in the state's functions or size, but rather its reconfiguration and reinstitutionalization (Peck, 2004).

Although typically considered a political-economic project, neoliberalism also profoundly shapes cultural realms in the production and affirmation of diversity through the commodification of difference (Laurie et al, 2002; Swyngedouw, 2000). As Comaroff and Comaroff (2001, page 9) argue, in contemporary 'millennial' capitalism, "consumption" has replaced "production" as "the privileged site of self and society". The practices of consumption strongly influence, in other words, the production of social identities. As a result, questions of group difference have been separated from issues of social equality in this 'postsocialist moment', despite increasing economic inequalities throughout the world (Fraser, 1997). Therefore, the cultures of neoliberalism intersect and rework in complex ways the experience, perception, and expression of difference constructed through historical and ongoing patterns of oppression (based on, for example, gender, class, race, and ethnicity). Official neoliberal development programs tend, moreover, to fold social difference into mainstream economic and development policy, and in so doing depoliticize difference and its contestation. Such 'mainstreaming' serves to reduce histories of oppression and marginalization to a technological fix. As demonstrated in the papers by Valdivia and Cupples (this issue), these intersections create particularly complex terrain for social and political contestation in Latin America.

Similarly, neoliberalism holds a complex relationship to the processes of environmental transformations, environmental governance, and environmentally based social struggle. McCarthy and Prudham (2004, page 275) point toward three key points of connection in this regard: (1) neoliberalism not only generates very serious environmental transformations, but is constituted largely by changing relations between society and biophysical nature; (2) neoliberalism and environmentalism form the political basis of post-Fordist social regulation; and (3) environmental concerns and environmentally based social struggles represent a serious ideological challenge to neoliberal policies of deregulation and privatization. New forms of environmental governance have emerged, rooted in a reinstitutionalization of economic management, that have sought to increase both the depth and the breadth of the neoliberalization of nature. As Bakker (2002) argues, this involves both organizational transformation in the form of resource privatization, and institutional transformation in the form of resource commercialization. As neoliberal policies pursue the enclosure of environmental commons (privatization of water sources and services, patenting of genetic 'resources' through bioprospecting, the creation of 'markets' for environmental goods

and services), they simultaneously create opportunities for capital accumulation and generate the social conditions necessary for opposing such processes, a theme taken up by Perreault in this issue. Thus, as McCarthy and Prudham (2004) point out, Polanyi's thesis of the 'double movement' of capital has never been more apt.

How best to interrogate neoliberalism within such complex terrains? With Peck and Tickell (2002), we argue that attention must be maintained both on the general aspects and on the particular characteristics of neoliberalism. That is, as Larner (2003) points out, there is no single, unitary neoliberalism as such. Rather, there are multiple, often contradictory neoliberalisms, that emerge from a diversity of political contexts and generate a range of effects. Analytical focus should be trained on local class configurations, interests, ideologies, and practices, and their neoliberal outcomes. At the same time, however, we assert that localized analyses of neoliberalism can only be meaningful *as* analyses of neoliberalism to the extent that they are linked to more generalized neoliberal ideologies, policies, and practices. Neoliberalism is a multiple and locally experienced process to be sure. It is also, crucially, a broader phenomenon that connects as well as differentiates, that globalizes even as it localizes (see Martin, this issue).

The techniques and outcomes of neoliberalism are therefore multiple, varied, and often contradictory. Neoliberalism is best characterized not as a coherent end product, but rather as a complex and contested set of processes, comprised of diverse policies, practices, and discourses. Although neoliberal policies share an underlying logic and ideological foundation, they emerge from, and take hold in, distinct social, political, cultural, and environmental contexts. Neoliberalism as a regime of accumulation is rooted in entrenched social differentiation, and transnational class alliances (Glassman, 1999), sustained ideologically by legitimating discourses and materially by repressive force. Processes of neoliberalization both reflect and produce spatial and scalar differentiation, intensifying processes of uneven development (Harvey, 1990). Taking this spatial variation into account, the papers in this theme issue seek to interrogate particular geographies of neoliberalism in Latin America, throwing into sharp relief the production of neoliberal landscapes and livelihoods in a diversity of Latin American contexts. Of particular interest are the profound transformations neoliberalism has wrought in social relations, legal frameworks, and gendered and ethnic identities. These are transformations that have forged not only new economies and politics, but new subjectivities as well. These changes are, and will remain, embedded in the landscape and in the fabric of society. As such, the authors of these papers disavow any nostalgia for an idealized pre-neoliberal, Keynesian, Fordist era. Effective forms of resistance to neoliberal hegemony, and new paths forward toward more socially just, environmentally sustainable futures, must be identified from within the neoliberal present.

Neoliberalism in Latin America

Neoliberalism is often represented as a necessary and inevitable successor to the political-economic policies of import substitution industrialization (ISI) in Latin America. Such a narrative of transition tends to construct a historicized binary opposition between ISI and neoliberalism, closing down the process of transition as a terrain of inquiry (Smith and Pickles, 1998). We prefer to interpret this transition as a complex movement from one hegemonic political, economic, and cultural constellation to another. Here we offer a general overview of this transition, which, when placed in conversation with the individual papers of the theme issue, draws attention to the heterogeneity of transitions towards neoliberalism in Latin America.

The contemporary neoliberalization of Latin America rests on a deep history of colonial and neocolonial relationships, recalling the region's earlier position in the

world capitalist system as a supplier of raw materials and a consumer of finished goods (Gwynne and Kay, 1999). Although the contemporary period holds striking historical parallels with the 19th century, it is the more recent transitional phase with which we are concerned here. In order to understand the ways in which neoliberalism has taken hold in Latin America, one must appreciate what preceded it: the economic policies and crises, and the political configurations and regimes of state violence that shaped the conditions for political economic reform.

ISI emerged in piecemeal fashion in the wake of the global economic depression of 1929–33, which vividly demonstrated the vulnerability of Latin American states to fluctuations in the global economy (Bulmer-Thomas, 1994; Gwynne, 1999). ISI policies promoted inward-oriented economic growth and industrialization by limiting foreign trade and investment through protectionist policies such as tariffs, quotas, and subsidies for domestic industry (Green, 1999). A multiscaled set of ideologies offered legitimacy for the construction of a domestic production–consumption nexus, positioning the state as a central actor in economic and social development (Green, 2003; Peet and Hartwick, 1999). These Keynesian-style policies sought a middle ground between Marxist radicalism and popular demands for economic and social redistribution.

During the ISI period, Latin American economies, states, and societies were transformed, producing multiple Latin American modernities. Politically, populist and state corporatist practices, resting on a language of social justice, often accompanied ISI (Green, 2003; Molyneux, 2000). Institutionally organized sectoral groups, such as workers, *campesinos*, and urban dwellers, provided a vehicle for large-scale popular inclusion within the political arena. A surging sense of nationalism also accompanied these trends, and elaborated particular patriarchal and racialized orders (Molyneux, 2000). As the decades continued, nonetheless, power accrued to a national elite that became increasingly authoritarian.

ISI encouraged industrialization and brought periods of remarkable economic growth throughout Latin America. Brazil and Mexico were particular ‘success stories’, each producing over 90% of domestically consumed goods, and together contributing over 60% of the region’s industrial output (Green, 2003). Yet, industrialization rested on the importation of technology and capital goods, exacerbating trade deficits and contributing to structural contradictions within the model. To address deficit spending, governments printed money, leading to inflationary tendencies, while persistent and increasing economic inequality impeded the creation of consumer classes large enough to support national industries. Finally, ISI, with its focus on rapid industrialization, was particularly detrimental to rural areas and provoked mass migration to the urban centers which in some cases overwhelmed the ability of city governments adequately to provide basic services.

The economic instabilities contained in ISI policies remained masked through the 1970s. During that decade, international capital markets, flush with petrodollars, were eager to lend to Latin American states (Harvey, 1990), and Latin American leaders—mostly military and authoritarian at the time—were anxious to take advantage of easily available credit. Private capital in the form of commercial bank loans flowed into the region, leading to booms in industrialization, agricultural expansion, and, to a lesser extent, government investments in health care, education, and social welfare services. This boom came to an abrupt end in August 1982 when Mexico defaulted on its debt payments, leading to a crisis in investor confidence that quickly spread throughout Latin America. Years of high inflation led to extremely low rates of internal investment, which in turn meant that domestic banks were incapable of filling the gap left by fleeing international lenders. Multinational banks sought to reduce their

risk in Latin America, renegotiating the terms of loans and insisting that private debts be socialized—that is, that governments take on the private debts incurred within their countries (Congdon, 1988). The result was a debt crisis that affected nearly every country in the region. With commercial loans unavailable, governments were forced to turn to the IMF and World Bank for loans to keep their economies afloat. These new debts, however, were not so easily incurred as those from private lenders. IMF loan conditionality and Structural Adjustment Programs ushered in processes of neoliberal reform for most Latin American countries (Gwynne, 1999; Peet and Hartwick, 1999).

Yet, neoliberalism has origins in Latin America that predate the watershed year of 1982. Most notably, Chile was subject to a jarring liberalization beginning in the 1970s. Shortly after Pinochet seized power in 1973, the military regime, advised by US-trained economists known as the ‘Chicago Boys’, instituted a package of economic reforms that would become commonplace throughout Latin America a decade later (Fernández Jilberto, 2001).⁽³⁾ More subtly, the rise of bureaucratic–authoritarian regimes in Latin America signaled an incipient breakdown of the populist political order under ISI. As Reuschmeyer et al (1992, page 212) argue, bureaucratic authoritarian regimes organized new political–economic coalitions of “civilian technocrats, big internationalized bourgeoisie, exporting groups, and foreign capital”. This new constellation of forces undermined previous redistributive networks, influencing the terms of transition through the economic crisis of the 1980s. Moreover, in Chile, Brazil, Argentina, and elsewhere, their brutality considerably weakened the organization of oppositional forces that might have advocated a distinct path for moving through the debt crisis.

Although discursive linkages are commonly made between neoliberalism and political liberalism, in numerous Latin American states (neo)populism accompanied the rise of neoliberalism (Demmers et al, 2001). In several countries, neoliberal reform has been initiated or strongly supported by the populist parties and populist-style politics that had previously promoted ISI policies.⁽⁴⁾ These leaders often took advantage of new ‘citizenship discourses’ to appeal strategically to the growing informal sector (for example, de Soto, 1989; Vargas Llosa, 1989), and to target certain groups through strategic social spending (for example, Solidaridad in Mexico, or the various Bono Solidario programs across the continent). Moreover, neoliberal reform did not simply reflect class interest, but rather a negotiated outcome of contestation between elite class fractions. Reforms typically resulted from struggles between government technocrats, economic elites, social actors, and external lending institutions. Business elites were in most cases not natural allies of neoliberal technocrats, and in many cases stood to lose considerably with economic liberalization (Conaghan et al, 1990).

What, then, is the current condition of neoliberalism in Latin America? Peck and Tickell (2002) discuss the transition from ‘roll-back’ to ‘roll-out’ neoliberalism in the North Atlantic states. By this they mean that during the first phase of neoliberalism, in the 1980s, reforms centered on deregulation and the scaling back of state involvement in the economy. While over time the focus of neoliberal policies shifted to an “emergent phase of active state-building and regulatory reform” (Peck and Tickell, 2002, page 384). Parallel processes have occurred in Latin America as states have restructured many of their economic and social functions. These have produced

⁽³⁾ The Economics Department at the University of Chicago established institutional connections, dating back to the 1950s, with the Catholic University in Chile.

⁽⁴⁾ This was the case in Mexico with the Partido Revolucionario Institucional, in Bolivia with the Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario, and in Argentina with the Peronists. In Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s transformation from dependency theorist to neoliberal president provides, perhaps, the most striking example.

new spatialities of neoliberalism encompassing the rescaling of state administrative responsibilities. Frequently, this process of state reinstitutionalization has taken place under the tutelage of multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, IMF, or Inter-American Development Bank, or bilateral aid agencies such as the US Agency for International Development or the German technical assistance service GTZ. With the stated objectives of promoting ‘good governance’, ‘open markets’, and ‘public participation’—all potent buzzwords of the current neoliberal political economy—governments have outsourced services and functions to a diversity of public–private partnerships, privately funded ‘foundations’, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Regulatory functions for certain economic sectors have in some cases been turned over to newly formed agencies that are anything but democratic. These new forms of transnational governance call for a rethinking of taken-for-granted notions of state spatiality and scalar power relations, as well as the everyday practices that reproduce neoliberal governmentality (Ferguson and Gupta, 2002).

Neoliberal reforms in Latin America have also been aimed at the decentralization of administrative authority. Whereas such restructuring was justified on the grounds of increasing public participation and good governance, they also had the effect of exposing the scalar differentials of power and accountability (Kohl, 2002). As Peck and Tickell (2002, page 386) note, “in the asymmetrical scale politics of neoliberalism, local institutions and actors were being given responsibility without power, while international institutions and actors were gaining power without responsibility.” Although local governments have gained nominal control of local resources and policy agendas, they must operate within a context in which extralocal actors—frequently transnational corporations and multilateral lending institutions—wield vastly more influence. Thus, whereas local communities may have more opportunities to participate democratically in a narrow, formal sense, their range of options, and therefore their power to choose has been straightjacketed and predetermined to a considerable extent.

The landscapes of Latin American neoliberalism also reflect the fact that reforms have exacerbated, rather than reduced, the uneven geographies of development. Massive urban migration attests to a countryside deemed nonviable by neoliberal development models (Bebbington, 2000) while remittances from foreign migrants prop up local economies. International migration in many cases accounts for over 10% (and in the case of El Salvador some 25%) of the national population. The gulf between the rich and poor has widened, and carries with it a spatial imprint more pronounced than ever before, with large areas of the countryside experiencing deepening immiseration, even as urban centers modernize and grow wealthy. Gated and guarded communities mark spatially the social inequalities that neoliberalism has exacerbated (Caldeira, 1999). Many rural areas have been transformed into spaces of neoliberal governmentality, as nonstate, or quasi-state actors—NGOs, transnational petroleum firms, multilateral aid agencies—administer projects and enact forms of governance at the fringes of state control (Watts, 2003). As the papers by Bury and Wolford (this issue) demonstrate, such processes have altered the ways in which economic development and state accountability are enacted, experienced and understood, and have led to new configurations in environmental governance, with profound implications for the resource rights and livelihoods of rural populations.

Papers and themes

The geographical unevenness of neoliberal reforms demands careful attention to the forms and effects of actually existing neoliberalisms in Latin America. Accordingly, the papers that follow highlight specific aspects of neoliberal reforms in different

countries throughout the region. Each author has carefully outlined the emergence of neoliberalism in the country of her or his case study, linking those national policies both to transnational processes of neoliberalization, and to more specific local, social, or sectoral effects. Through a diverse set of theoretically and empirically rich case studies, the papers in this special issue demonstrate well the multiple forms that neoliberalism has taken in Latin America. We wish here to highlight three cross-cutting themes that they address.

The diversity of cases discussed in these papers demonstrates well that *neoliberalism produces locally specific spatial and scalar expressions*. Processes of uneven development, state restructuring, and the production of neoliberal landscapes (both exclusionary and participatory) display a particular geography. These connections are demonstrated particularly well by Bury in his examination of the transnationalization of Peru's mining sector. Bury links scales of policies and processes by interrogating Peru's changing national policy framework, how this has influenced investment decisions by transnational firms, and how these decisions have in turn impacted local communities and environments. The result, Bury argues, is landscapes and livelihoods subject to the vagaries of neoliberal policies, enacted by foreign firms with little state oversight. Similarly, in her examination of the changing landscapes and politics in two Mexican localities, Martin highlights the local effects of national and transnational policies. Drawing on Katz (2001), Martin explores the 'topographies of neoliberalism' in Monterey and Oaxaca as a way to illuminate the multiscalar linkages between particular places and extralocal processes, and between local and global forms of resistance. Though these processes have taken on very different material and ideological forms in Oaxaca and Monterey, respectively, they have been conditioned by similar multiscalar processes of neoliberal economic reform and political restructuring. Her analysis offers, furthermore, a means for bringing disparate oppositional discourses to neoliberalism—calls for local autonomy on the one hand and the defense of global human rights on the other—into conversation with one another.

A second theme of this issue is the fact that *neoliberalism is a productive, as well as destructive force*. Neoliberalization produces new subjectivities and reconfigures social relations in ways that are not strictly destructive, but which may open up opportunities for renegotiating repressive or marginalizing social relations. Lest this sounds overly celebratory, we wish to underscore that new opportunities for social mobilization and the renegotiation of subject identities created by neoliberal transformations are always circumscribed by those same transformations (Hale, 2002). Valdivia takes up these new opportunities and their attendant limitations in her examination of what she terms the "cultural project of neoliberalism". Valdivia shows that indigenous identities are renegotiated through notions of neoliberal modernity, and associated ideologies of conservation and development. Through an empirically rich comparison of two indigenous groups in northeastern Ecuador, Valdivia details the different ways these groups engage with neoliberalism, and the ways that this encounter serves to rework understandings of indigeneity, tradition, modernity, and production. Neoliberal reforms in international development policies have created new opportunities for social organization and funding for indigenous groups, but simultaneously condition the types of claims and forms of mobilization deemed acceptable. Similar themes are explored by Cupples in her study of the renegotiation of gendered identities in the context of neoliberal reforms in Nicaragua. Cupples focuses on work as a site of identity formation and demonstrates how, in the aftermath of war and the subsequent neoliberalization of the Nicaraguan economy, women have been able to renegotiate traditional *machista* gender ideologies related to work and household reproduction. Cupples argues that, through their increased participation in the workplace, Nicaraguan

women have been able to create spaces for solidarity in order to counter some of the economic and social crises produced by neoliberal reforms.

A third theme of this special issue is that *neoliberalism restructures the rights regimes and moral economies of resource use and livelihoods*. Neoliberal political and economic restructuring has led to the reinstitutionalization of the state, and a concomitant transformation of legal and administrative frameworks. This has profoundly influenced both resource rights and the moral economies that people construct around those rights. These transformations are clearly demonstrated in Wolford's discussion of Brazil's Landless Workers' Movement (O Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem-Terra, MST), and the discourses produced by those opposed to the MST's land claims in order to justify the existing inequitable distribution of land and wealth. Wolford argues that these discourses constitute a "moral economy of neoliberalism", based in individualism, hard work, and a reliance on supposedly apolitical 'market forces'—as opposed to the state—for distribution of rights to land and resources. Similar processes are at work in Bolivia, as Perreault demonstrates. In his examination of the restructuring of the Bolivian state and the implications of this process for the management of small-scale irrigation systems, Perreault finds that, under neoliberalism, water rights in Bolivia are guaranteed more through participation in the market than through state-conferred entitlements or traditional uses. The legal and administrative void created by this situation has put the customary water rights of small-scale farmers at risk, while private (and privatized) firms in the mining, hydroelectricity, and industrial sectors, as well as municipalities, are guaranteed more secure access to water. As with Brazil's landless movement, Bolivian irrigators are contesting the rights regimes and understandings of citizenship conditioned by neoliberalism, thereby complicating the efforts of the state, the World Bank, the IMF, and others to implement reform.

Individually, these papers present empirically and theoretically rich case studies of neoliberal processes in six different countries. As a whole, they advance understanding of the neoliberal project as it has taken hold, and is negotiated and contested, in Latin America. We believe that these papers represent an important contribution to the literature on the global characteristics of neoliberalism, as well as its local manifestations.

Thomas Perreault, Patricia Martin

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Jamie Peck and Ros Whitehead for their guidance through this project, and the authors of the papers, Jeffrey Bury, Julie Cupples, Sarah Radcliffe, Gabriela Valdivia, and Wendy Wolford, for their hard work and patience.

References

- Arze C, Kruse T, 2004, "The consequences of neoliberal reform" *NACLA Report on the Americas* **38**(3) 23–28
- Bakker K, 2002, "From state to market?: water *mercantilización* in Spain" *Environment and Planning A* **34** 767–790
- Bebbington T, 2000, "Re-encountering development: livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **90** 495–520
- Bulmer-Thomas V, 1994 *The Economic History of Latin America Since Independence* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
- Caldeira T, 1999, "Fortified enclaves: the new urban segregation", in *Cities and Citizenship* Ed. J Holston (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) pp 114–138
- Comaroff J, Comaroff J, 2001, "Millennial capitalism: first thoughts on a second coming", in *Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism* Eds J Comaroff, J Comaroff (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) pp 1–56
- Conaghan C, Malloy J, Abugattus L A, 1990, "Business and the 'boys': the politics of neoliberalism in the Central Andes" *Latin American Research Review* **25**(2) 3–30

- Congdon T, 1988 *The Debt Threat* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Demmers J, Fernández Jilberto A E, Hogenboom B, 2001, "The transformation of Latin American populism: regional and global dimensions", in *Miraculous Metamorphoses: The Neoliberalization of Latin American Populism* Eds J Demmers, A E Fernández Jilberto, B Hogenboom (Zed Books, London) pp 1–21
- de Soto H, 1989 *The Other Path: The Invisible Revolution in the Third World* (Harper and Row, New York)
- Ferguson J, Gupta A, 2002, "Spatializing states: toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality" *American Ethnologist* **29** 981–1002
- Fernández Jilberto A E, 2001, "The neoliberal transformation of Chilean populism: the case of the socialist party", in *Miraculous Metamorphoses: the Neoliberalization of Latin American Populism* Eds J Demmers, A E Fernández Jilberto, B Hogenboom (Zed Books, London) pp 60–88
- Fraser N, 1997 *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition* (Routledge, London)
- Glassman J, 1999, "State power beyond the 'territorial trap': the internationalization of the state" *Political Geography* **18** 669–696
- Green D, 1999, "A trip to the market: the impact of neoliberalism in Latin America", in *Developments in Latin American Political Economy: States, Markets and Actors* Eds J Buxton, N Philips (Manchester University Press, Manchester) pp 13–32
- Green D, 2003 *The Silent Revolution: The Rise of Market Economics in Latin America* (Latin American Bureau and Cassell, London)
- Gwynne R N, 1999, "Globalization, neoliberalism and economic change in South America and Mexico", in *Latin America Transformed: Globalization and Modernity* Eds R N Gwynne, C Kay (Arnold, London) pp 68–97
- Gwynne R N, Kay C, 1999, "Latin America transformed: changing paradigms, debates and alternatives", in *Latin America Transformed: Globalization and Modernity* Eds RN Gwynne, C Kay (Arnold, London) pp 2–30
- Hale C R, 2002, "Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala" *Journal of Latin American Studies* **34** 485–524
- Harvey D, 1990 *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Blackwell, Cambridge, MA)
- Hilton I, 2003, "Justice takes to the streets: the ousting of Bolivia's president is a warning" *Guardian Weekly* 30 October–5 November, page 14
- Huber E, Solt F, 2004, "Successes and failures of neoliberalism" *Latin American Research Review* **39**(3) 150–164
- Jessop B, 2002, "Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: a state-theoretical perspective" *Antipode* **34** 452–472
- Katz C, 2001, "On the grounds of globalization: a topography for feminist political engagement" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* **26** 1213–1234
- Kohl B, 2002, "Stabilizing neoliberalism in Bolivia: popular participation and privatization" *Political Geography* **21** 449–472
- Larner W, 2003, "Neoliberalism?" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **21** 509–512
- Laurie N, Andolina R, Radcliffe S, 2002, "The excluded 'indigenous'? The implications of multi-ethnic policies for water reform in Bolivia", in *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy* Ed. R Sieder (Palgrave Macmillan, New York) pp 252–276
- McCarthy J, Prudham S, 2004, "Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism" *Geoforum* **35** 275–283
- Molyneux M, 2000, "Twentieth-century state formations in Latin America", in *Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in Latin America* Eds E Dore, M Molyneux (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) pp 33–81
- Peck J, 2004, "Geography and public policy: constructions of neoliberalism" *Progress in Human Geography* **28** 392–405
- Peck J, Tickell A, 2002, "Neoliberalizing space" *Antipode* **34** 380–404
- Peet R, Hartwick E, 1999 *Theories of Development* (Guilford Press, New York)
- Petras J, 1997, "Alternatives to Neoliberalism in Latin America" *Latin American Perspectives* **24**(1) 80–91
- Reuschmeyer D, Stephens E, Stephens J, 1992 *Capitalist Development and Democracy* (University of Chicago, Chicago, IL)
- Smith A, Pickles J, 1998, "Introduction: theorising transition and the political economy of transformation", in *Theorising Transition: The Political Economy of Post-communist Transformations* Eds J Pickles, A Smith (Routledge, London) pp 1–24

-
- Swyngedouw E, 2000, "Authoritarian governance, power, and the politics of rescaling" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **18** 63–76
- The Economist* 2004, "A political awakening", 19 February, http://www.economist.com/world/la/displaystory.cfm?story_id=2446861
- Vargas Llosa M, 1989, forward to *The Other Path: The Invisible Revolution in the Third World* H de Soto (Harper and Row, New York) pp xiii–xxii
- Watts M, 2003, "Development and governmentality" *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* **24**(1) 6–34
- Weyland K, 2004, "Assessing Latin American neoliberalism: introduction to a debate" *Latin American Research Review* **39**(3) 143–149
- Williamson J (Ed), 1990 *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* (Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC)

