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This chapter provides an overview of the various issues related to neoliberalism and development. We will see that thinking about what development is and how it can be achieved has gone through tremendous shifts in the post–World War II era. Indeed, while a neoliberal orthodoxy now predominates in how mainstream development institutions think about economic policies in many countries of the global South, this has not always been the case, nor have the contours of what neoliberal policy meant always been consistent or discursively stable. In fact, in the years immediately after World War II, development was synonymous with economic policy led and directed by the state and those who adhered to an economic philosophy that emphasized the need to rely upon the market to allocate resources for development purposes were marginalized. However, just as neoliberalism began to assume ascendancy in the latter part of the twentieth century in the global North, so too did the ‘retreat of the state’ and associated policy prescriptions become the norm for countries of the global South after the debt crisis of the 1970s.

Thus, as we will see, from the 1980s onwards, neoliberalism became the orthodoxy for countries aligned to the Western powers, particularly through the imposition of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs). The ‘new world order’ envisioned by neoconservative think tanks and implemented through the Washington Consensus included a dual shift, one towards political liberalization and democracy, and another towards neoliberal macroeconomic policy. The emerging neoliberal state had to be (at least nominally) democratic, open for foreign investment and trade, and withdrawn from the provision of welfare (Petras and Veltmeyer 2011). Although the exact requirements of this neoliberal economic policy package varied from one country to another, there was undoubtedly a commonality in terms of what was usually prescribed by major donors such as the World Bank and the IMF, and this came to be known as the Washington Consensus. Significantly, at the same time that this neoliberal political-economic model rolled back the state and removed existing subsidies and social programmes, it also created a space for civil society to re-emerge and expand, in some countries after decades of military rule and civil wars.

While the contours of neoliberalism in the so-called developing world are a significant theme of this chapter, it also explores the way that the imposition of this doctrine has been challenged in different kinds of ways. Indeed, the implementation and outcomes of SAP according to the Washington Consensus in different parts of the world have been a subject of much debate and commentary. So, after outlining the role of SAPs in intensifying the neoliberalization of different
parts of the globe in the early part of the chapter, the next section examines how the consensus came to be challenged in various ways in the early 1990s and beyond. Indeed, there was significant opposition arising against the imposition of these neoliberal policies in countries of the global South, and there have been a variety of shifts in development policy orthodoxy as a consequence.

The chapter focuses on three major challenges to the neoliberalization of development. First, from the 1990s onwards there was increased attention on those East Asian countries that appeared to have done very well economically despite following policies which had a more active role for the state than that prescribed under the Washington Consensus. Second, it examines how it is in this milieu that various kinds of social movements and manifestations of civil society have begun operating in an emergent political space. La Vía Campesina (The Peasant Way – LVC), one of the world’s largest networks of NGOs and people’s movements, is highlighted here as an example of the challenges to neoliberalism that can be engendered by the opening of this emergent political space. What comes out clearly from this section is that, as a consequence of these various popular and discursive challenges to neoliberalism, development orthodoxy in the 2000s has again shifted. The third of these challenges comes from the growing embrace of what has come to be known as a ‘post-development critique’, which has arisen from within the academy as a consequence of the utilization of post-colonial and post-structuralist approaches to development.

The final section of the chapter explores how neoliberalism has shaped the attitude of people in the global North to development issues in the global South. In so doing, it will investigate the notion of neoliberal subjectivities through volunteer tourism, which is a relatively recent but growing phenomena whereby growing numbers of people, particularly young people from the global North, are volunteering to undertake development-related activities in the global South for short- and medium-term periods. To some people, this represents a welcome democratization of the ethics of care and demonstrates new forms of solidarity being forged across old divides between the ‘West’ and ‘the rest’. Others, however, are more sceptical of this movement and suggest that its emphasis on the individual as having the capacity to significantly alter global injustices is naive and simply reinforces old imaginaries that resonate with ideas about the white man’s burden. To those critics, the reproduction of celebrity humanitarianism that has become so widespread in the contemporary era has the effect of eliding the deeper structural issues of global injustice.

**Defining development**

‘Development’ is a notoriously difficult term to define, carrying with it what some people believe is an undue emphasis upon replicating the lifestyles, values and economic systems of the Western world (Haynes 2008). The early thinkers on development in the post-World War II era, most famously Rostow, believed that it was self-evident that countries that were previously colonies of the Western powers needed to imitate the countries of the West in these matters if they were to have any hope of catching up with the more advanced states. Over time, this view has come to be contested in a variety of different ways, with many people arguing that this Eurocentric perspective overlooks the tremendous diversity found throughout the globe in terms of people’s way of understanding themselves, their relationship to nature, and their priorities for what constitutes a good life (Escobar 2000).

In the immediate era of decolonization that took place after World War II and beyond, there was a belief that the state had an important role to play as the engine of economic development. The source for this belief was twofold: in the Western world, the experience of Keynesianism
and planning had demonstrated to many people that the state was important in creating an appropriate allocation of resources while also ensuring the social welfare of its citizens. In the Soviet bloc, centrally planned economies were ostensibly producing high growth rates and enabling industrialization in countries that historically had been based around agriculture. At the Bretton Woods conference in 1944 an international institutional architecture was put in place that was to become incredibly important in how development was understood and enacted in the post–World War II era. Indeed the World Bank and the IMF, as well as regional banks such as the Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Bank, became the primary conduits for finance and expertise to flow between the global North and the global South in the name of development.

It is certainly the case that during this period there are examples in the global South where the state accomplished a great deal to increase economic growth, although it is also the case that much violence, displacement and disruption of livelihoods was carried out in the name of the national interest in many places as well. A great deal of money was lent by Western powers to the leaders of some countries in the global South because they were important allies in a geopolitical sense rather than because they always had the best interests of their citizens in mind. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, by the 1970s many countries found themselves deeply in debt and, with the 1973 oil crisis and the rise of OPEC, many countries in the global South were functionally bankrupt (Martinussen 1997; McMichael 2012).

It was at this stage that neoliberalism began to become the standard orthodoxy in the policy prescriptions meted out by multilateral donors such as the World Bank and the IMF through SAPs. The election of Reagan and Thatcher in the USA and UK respectively added tremendous impetus to the growth of neoliberal orthodoxy in the global South, aided by now influential think tanks which provided the intellectual backing for their political agendas (George 1999; Harvey 2005). In the case of development economics, which has always provided the discursive framework by which development policies discussed and enacted, this meant that hitherto marginalized figures such as P.T. Bauer and Bella Balassa became central to debates that emphasized the importance of the market in most efficiently allocating resources and the necessity to reduce the role of the state, which was seen as inevitably compromised by rent-seeking behaviour.

There are essentially two phases to SAPs: a short-term adjustment period that brings the economy back under control, reduces its levels of inflation and appreciates its currency. This is followed by a longer-term recovery period when the fundamentals of the economy are changed, with the idea that this will eventually lead to the economy of the country being able to grow in a more sustainable manner (Mohan et al. 2000). These changes were more often than not incredibly controversial in the countries where they were enacted because they often withdrew subsidies and the provision of public goods that were disproportionately aimed towards helping the poor. Opposition to these policies took the form of food riots in some parts of South America for example, where people protested about the withdrawal of state-subsidized food grain programmes.

One of the most common ways to understand the form of neoliberalization that took place during this period is the term ‘the Washington Consensus’ that was coined to describe the set of measures prescribed by the World Bank and the IMF to countries of Latin America in the wake of their economic and financial crisis during the 1980s. These measures consisted of ten specific policy recommendations outlined below:

1. Fiscal policy discipline
2. Removal of public subsidies, particularly those viewed as politically motivated and indiscriminate
3. Tax reform
4. Introduction of market-based interest rates
5. Competitive exchange rates
6. Trade liberalization
7. Liberalization of foreign direct investment
8. Privatization of state-owned enterprises and a move away from import substitution
9. Deregulation
10. Introduction of private property rights.

(Williamson 2004)

With the implosion of the Soviet bloc after 1991, the neoliberal policy orthodoxy began to spread to many countries that had previously been classified as belonging to the so-called ‘second world’, including, for example, countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia. However, as we shall see in the next two sections, the hegemony of the Washington Consensus was subsequently challenged from a range of different sources.

The East Asian miracle and its challenge to neoliberalism

Beyond the significant opposition and protest in both the global North and the global South against neoliberalism in development policy, another significant intellectual battle against this form began to arise from a closer examination of the experience of the so-called Asian Tigers – that is, countries such as Japan, South Korea and Taiwan that, during the post-World War II period, had managed to successfully industrialize, develop a significant export economy and create a standard of living for their citizens that was broadly comparable with that experienced by people in the Western world. Initially, writers advocating for neoliberalism claimed that the success of these countries vindicated the prescriptions of the Washington Consensus and proved that by following these kinds of policies it was, indeed, possible for countries to grow rapidly and compete in the global economy. This perspective became solidified with the publication of a World Bank report in 1993 called The East Asian Miracle, which argued that the success of the Tiger economies ‘proved’ the case for neoliberalism.

However, this position was quickly and effectively challenged by a number of influential scholars that asserted a close reading of the experience of these countries, including their institutional frameworks, their economic policies and the role that they gave to the state, pointed to exactly the opposite conclusions – that is, these East Asian countries had become successful precisely because they had not adopted Washington Consensus-style policies (Chang 2006; Wade 1996). Some important points to note here include that each of these countries had a significant role for what became known as the development state – that is, a state which was able to create the conditions for industrialization, including through the provision of highly targeted credit to specific economic entities which they wanted to foster; an initial period of import substitution during which time local business houses could become strong and able to compete globally; and, subsequently, a sympathetic trade environment that gave the products of these countries an entry into Western markets largely as a consequence of their geopolitical importance (Amsden 1989; Chang 2006).

Towards a post-neoliberal era of development? Or deepening the neoliberalization of everyday life?

Unsurprisingly, the combination of widespread popular opposition to the difficulties imposed upon everyday people by neoliberal development policies in the global South has meant that the
neoliberal orthodoxy as it came to be understood during the 1980s and early 1990s has increasingly been contested. Matched by empirical evidence, à la the East Asian miracle, the question was not whether the state should be involved but what the appropriate role of the state should be. It is certainly the case that the multilateral institutions have shifted away from such a narrowly focused policy agenda and argue that their prescriptions are no longer able to be characterized as market fundamentalism in the way that they were in the past. Certainly it is the case that the development community now places a much stronger and more central place for mechanisms that increase the inclusion of previously marginalized people. Decentralization, participation and increased attention to ways to increase the legitimacy of development among the community have become part of the policy packages of donors throughout the globe (Williams 2004; Wong 2003). However, there is a great deal of contention about the extent to which the so-called post-Washington Consensus, with its emphasis upon ‘getting the institutions right’, is a departure from neoliberal orthodoxy or is instead a deepening of this orthodoxy into realms that were previously untouched by development (Cammack 2004; Fine 2009; Ruckert 2006). Certainly we can say that the World Bank has shifted a considerable way from its early position in many respects, and has diverged in important ways from the IMF. The Bank now has poverty at the centre of its agenda; it places a great deal more emphasis upon the state and has funds available for programmes devoted to the removal of social inequalities, such as those around gender or micro-finance, that were not part of its thinking two or more decades before. In that respect, the IMF is much closer to the US Treasury in terms of the narrowness of its policy prescriptions.

An important question to ask at this juncture is whether or not the shifts in development policy that we have seen in the last decade reject many elements of neoliberalism (Jomo and Fine 2005). The case of social capital may be illustrative in that sense since it has become a prominent part of development thinking during this period and the promotion of social capital is an aim of many development policies around the world (Harriss 2001). To its advocates, the promotion of social capital is part of a long overdue recognition of the importance of social relations in fostering the conditions for development and as such demonstrates that development orthodoxy has moved beyond the narrow economism that characterized earlier neoliberal policy prescriptions. To its critics, in contrast, the focus upon social capital is an attempt to extend neoliberal categories of understanding the world into areas that are far more complex than such thinking would allow. Thus, for example, Ben Fine (1999) suggests that social capital – as it is promoted by the World Bank – is influenced by the thinking of scholars such as Robert Putnam and, as such, largely ignores issues of power at a variety of scales. Indeed, his broader critique is that these institutions believe that by promoting social capital ultimately market allocation will become more efficient as information asymmetries will be reduced. To Fine, then, the increasing emphasis upon the social aspects of development has not reduced the predominance of neoliberalism in the theory and practice of development, but is, rather, reflective of what advocates view as an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the conditions which need to be created in order for neoliberalism to flourish.

A further challenge to neoliberalism has arisen in the growing interest in and embrace of an approach to development called post-development. Rather than a single theory of development, post-development began as a critique of the epistemological and ontological closures of mainstream development, drawing extensively from post-structuralist and post-colonial work, particularly, at least initially, from Michel Foucault (Escobar 1995) and Edward Said (McEwan 2008). Post-development argues that development is inherently limited because of its teleological assumptions about progress drawn from Western categories of thought and historical experience, that privilege white, male heteronormative understandings of the world (Ziai 2004). To scholars working in this tradition, the imposition of neoliberal development delegitimizes the
experiences and knowledges of ‘others’ who do not conform to this worldview. To them, effectively, resistance to neoliberalism must necessarily include a question of the foundations of development thought and practice (McKinnon 2007).

### Development civil society actors under neoliberalism

The effects of these neoliberal shifts on the agency of people in the global South is contentious for a variety of reasons. On the one hand, neoliberalism deprived the poor and marginalized from at least some state assistance, while, on the other hand, it created a political space for communities to get involved in decision-making over development directions (Jackson and Warren 2005). The development vacuum that was created and the space for civil society to mobilize and organize prompted a proliferation of NGOs and social movements. This proliferation, however, was not unintentional. In the 1980s, the World Bank and other international aid donors made a strategic decision to make NGOs prominent partners in development projects. NGOs were perceived by these bodies as more reliable than governments and as more in touch with and committed to those in need of assistance (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004). Donor agencies began to pursue a ‘New Policy Agenda’ which positioned civil society as a prominent force in development efforts. According to Edwards and Hulme (1996) the New Policy Agenda rested on two main pillars, one economic and the other political. The economic pillar rested on a foundational belief in the market and the private sector as the most efficient mechanisms for realizing economic growth and therefore poverty alleviation and development. The political pillar reflected a belief in a good democratic governance as being essential for creating and maintaining an efficient economy. Some development NGOs, therefore, enjoined substantial financial support from Western governments, private foundations and international institutions, and were seen as the new agents of decentralized and participatory development.

In general terms, NGOs were often seen as important players in strengthening liberal democracy by pluralizing the socio-political arena, by facilitating the activities of grassroots organizations of the poor and marginalized, and by scrutinizing state power and pressing for change. NGOs, therefore, were heralded by official agencies and the wider public as important catalysts of a positive democratic development and a ‘healthy’ and ‘vibrant’ civil society (Mercer 2002). NGOs have had a progressive promise and the ability to devise and implement innovative programmes (Klees 1998). NGOs were not, however, an invention of neoliberalism, as they already had a long history of providing health and social services in places where governments lacked the capacity to do so. But under this New Policy Agenda NGOs became the preferred agents for delivering social welfare, and that was a fundamental strategic shift (Edwards and Hulme 1996).

This reliance on civil society, and particularly on NGOs, has been widely questioned and critiqued. The neoliberal theoretical underpinning of the New Policy Agenda may have struck a chord with donors and members of the public, but the empirical evidence was very mixed. There was, and still is, a plethora of NGOs employing a myriad of measures and pursuing a great number of objectives. Not all of them, therefore, are progressive and ‘good’. While some were believed to have fulfilled their efficiency and other potentials, that was not always the case and the ‘poorest-of-the-poor’, for instance, were not always reached. However, as argued by Wallace (2004: 202), ‘Evidence-based research does not noticeably shape this analysis, which appears to be influenced more by changing macroeconomic ideologies’. In other words, the ‘NGOzation’ of development efforts rested more on a neoliberal ideology than on empirical evidence. This does not to imply that NGOs inherently have a neoliberal agenda, although that could sometimes be the case. Nevertheless, the system of pursuing and delivering development through civil society organizations created a high level of dependency, where NGOs need to compete for
funding, which in turn comes with conditionalities attached. This has arguably made NGOs propagators, even if reluctantly, of neoliberal agendas in different parts of the world (Hickey and Mohan 2005; Wallace 2004).

Notwithstanding the complex and contested role of development NGOs, it is also the case that they often form associations with progressive social movements, which constitute another element of civil society that is generally more dissenting and combative towards neoliberalism and its various economic, social and political effects. Like NGOs, social movements are not inherently progressive or transformative, but those who are deemed ‘progressive’ (promoting social justice, equitable wealth distribution, human rights, environmental sustainability and so forth) have been identified by development theorists as having the potential for realizing radical change. As noted by Escobar (1992: 29), ‘For many it is in relation to social movements that questions about daily life, democracy, the state, political practice, and the redefinition of development can be most fruitfully pursued’. Thus, while NGOs have often been criticized for depoliticizing development and promoting neoliberal ideas, progressive social movements have represented for many a hopeful political space where individuals and groups challenge and resist different forms of exclusion and exploitation, some historic and others resulting from processes of global neoliberal capitalism.

One of the most notable and celebrated social movements of this kind is the transnational peasant movement La Vía Campesina (The Peasant Way – LVC). This movement has positioned itself in direct and radical opposition to the neoliberal model of global capitalism, with a particular emphasis on food politics. LVC is a worldwide coalition of 164 organizations from 73 countries that brings together some 200 million producers from a range of rural groups, including peasants, small to medium-size farmers, rural indigenous communities, landless workers, rural women and more. The movement was officially established in 1993 as a response to neoliberal restructuring of agricultural policies that favoured large-scale agribusiness corporations and marginalized small-scale family producers. LVC was thus created out of a common vision that family farmers and peasants from the North and South are being threatened by similar processes of neoliberal globalization, albeit facing different local realities and challenges. LVC promotes a grassroots participatory model of agriculture and rural development which aims to generate an encompassing social, political and economic change through the democratic control of communities over productive resources. As the movement grew and consolidated internally, it also reached out and formed alliances with other social movements and NGOs with common interests and visions (Desmarais 2008; Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2010).

In comparison to some other notable global social movements such as the alter-globalization movement or the environmental movement, LVC has a much clearer structure and mechanisms for decision-making. And while democracy has been of rhetorical importance to neoliberal ideology, LVC practices and promotes a far more radical model of a direct democratic participation, where decisions require deliberation and consensus. This horizontal organizational structure, although not without challenges, seeks to promote equality, transparency and solidarity within the movement and among its member organizations and communities. This structure also facilitates the integration of and dialogue between groups of different socio-cultural backgrounds and ideological inclinations (Martínez-Torres and Rosset 2014).

LVC is particularly known for developing and popularizing the concept of food sovereignty. First discussed by LVC in 1996, food sovereignty represents an alternative framework of food production and consumption that is based on:

- the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food
and agriculture systems... [and that] puts those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations.

(Nyéléni 2007: 9)

This concept, therefore, is positioned in direct opposition to the ‘corporate food regime’, which is governed by and organized according to neoliberal policies that idealize the market economy (McMichael 2009). This concept has received substantial academic attention in recent years, some more critical and some more sympathetic, but it is worth noting the collaborative and participatory way in which the conceptualization of food sovereignty has evolved over time. And while some aspects may be less clear, such as international trade and the role of the state, food sovereignty remains an important anti-neoliberal framework that engages with one of the most sensitive issues even within neoliberal free trade agreements – agriculture.

LVC and its key framework of food sovereignty are not, therefore, merely a critique of a global neoliberal political economy of agriculture and food production, but a much broader political project. This project explicitly rejects the neoliberal model of rural development and aims to bring about social, economic and political change by opening up democratic spaces and empowering people to actively participate in them and influence political and development processes. In short, LVC ‘believes that this kind of change can occur only when local communities gain greater access to and control over local productive resources, and gain more social and political power’ (La Vía Campesina 2009: 41).

Individual subjectivities within neoliberalism

Along with the rise of new political actors to resist global injustice, the increased dominance of neoliberalism has also changed the subjectivities of individuals, including those residing in the global North. A significant manifestation of this is an increasing acceptance and embrace of popular humanitarianism with young people becoming particularly mobilized behind humanitarian causes. Celebrity humanitarianism and the iconography of aid present so-called ‘developing’ nations as places devoid of carers or individuals working towards development (Conradson 2011) and promote a view that Westerners are needed to fill this void. Such acts are heralded for their virtue, with Bornstein (2012) arguing that what makes liberal humanitarian acts heroic is precisely because they are for the ‘distant other’ rather than for a family member, which is simply expected behaviour. Therefore, although we may feel responsible for providing support and care to these nations, our complicity in their suffering is ignored. Humanitarianism towards people they have no previous connection with is predicated upon ‘liberal assumptions about how to perform moral “good”’ (ibid.: 151). Yet this ignores the structural violence within the neoliberal capitalist system, with the consequence that people fail to consider how such band-aid solutions dissuade guilt while failing to enact real change (Daley 2013; Vrasti 2013; Vrasti and Montsion 2014).

It has been widely noted that with the roll-back of the state under neoliberalism, volunteering has become increasingly popular as a response to the increased individualization of previously state services and a cultural shift towards moral consumption (Baillie Smith and Laurie 2011; Kapoor 2012; Vrasti 2013; Vrasti and Montsion 2014). Individualized forms of development have become prolific in the neoliberal present with volunteer tourism at the forefront of tourism development agendas (Brown and Morrison 2003; Harlow and Pomfret 2007; McIntosh and Zahra 2007; Mostafanezhad 2014b). Such individualized responses to global inequality are generally by unskilled, young volunteers and for a short-term duration,
rather than by traditional development actors trained in specific fields (Chouliaraki 2012; Daley 2013; Kapoor 2012; Mostafanezhad 2013; Wilson and Brown 2009). To Guiney (2015), the growing popularity of these kinds of activities for those from the global North is also indicative of larger processes surrounding the responsibility that Western nations feel towards the global South and the neoliberalization of aid and volunteering. As Vrasti (2013: 2) puts it:

Phrases like ‘giving back to the community’ and ‘making a difference in the world’ that litter the brochure discourse are meant to tickle the post-materialist and anti-modernist sensibilities of the Western ethical consumer looking to demonstrate their superior social capital by ‘travelling with a purpose’.

From this perspective, it becomes clear that volunteer tourism is not a spontaneous trend, but rather one steeped in moral and cultural notions of what it means to be an active and moral global citizen and illustrates the importance of an individualized neoliberal subjectivity within the international system (Vrasti 2013; Vrasti and Montsion 2014).

Although initial examinations of volunteer tourism were overwhelmingly positive (Stoddart and Rogerson 2004; Wearing 2001, 2004; Wearing and Neil 2000; Zahra and McIntosh 2007), negative critiques are becoming pronounced (Guttentag 2009, 2011; McGehee and Andereck 2009). Increasingly, these critiques are focused upon the ironic juxtaposition of neoliberal actors seeking to address inequality in the neoliberal system by ignoring these structural conditions. Thus, many commentators have argued that the consumer demand for volunteer experiences has emerged partly as a consequence of the rise of celebrity humanitarianism, which celebrates the capacity of the individual to ‘make a difference’ while simultaneously not seeking to alter the dynamics of the capitalist system (Daley 2013; Guiney 2015; Mostafanezhad 2014a). Biccum (2011) directly links celebrity advocacy with youth mobilization and global citizenship – neoliberalism’s solution to inequality and injustice. As Brown and Hall (2008: 845) argue:

it reduces development to individual acts of charity which seek to work round rather than transform the relationship of poor, rural societies to the natural world. The use of volunteers, who often have little knowledge or experience of the work they are undertaking (an attraction for the volunteers), also calls into question their effectiveness and raises the spectre of neo-colonialism in the tacit assumption that even ignorant Westerners can improve the lot of people in the South.

Such tourism development forms are predicated upon notions of making a difference through travel; however, the impact of these experiences may not actually address poverty and inequality at an adequate or systemic level. Volunteer tourism could ironically be distracting volunteers and visitors from wider social issues, issues that are responsible for inequality within the global system. Such examples alert us to the reality of contemporary neoliberalization of development; namely, that the advancement of these discourses serves to discursively delimit what is discussed and how it is discussed. On the one hand, the processes of global capitalism continue to be responsible for significant social, environmental and ecological injustice. On the other hand, the promotion of neoliberal subjectivities, through tropes such as celebrity humanitarianism, has the effect of enabling those from more privileged parts of the globe to absolve themselves of complicity in the perpetuation of these injustices through the performance of volunteer acts in the global South.
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Conclusion

The chapter has outlined the contours of the shifts in development policy and practice over time, so that the reader is placed to assess the position of neoliberalism in the contemporary era of development. Are we now entering an era of a post-Washington Consensus that has seen a lessening of neoliberalism in development policy and practice? Certainly, there is a greater acceptance among some institutions that there is a role for the state in creating the conditions for development to occur, albeit the kind of development linked to the flourishing of markets. It also seems that there is a greater emphasis now put upon issues such as decentralization, participation, gender and the generation of social capital that are much more focused on mechanisms of inclusion than the previously very narrowly focused era of structural adjustment.

However, as this chapter has demonstrated, opinion is starkly divided about the extent to which these shifts in development orthodoxy represent a significant departure from the neoliberal policies or whether they are instead a deepening of neoliberalism in the global South.

The latter part of the chapter has utilized examples of challenges to neoliberalism within development. For those in the global North, the increasing neoliberal subjectivities demonstrated in the rise of celebrity humanitarianism and volunteer tourism illustrate an elision of the ongoing structural biases of global capitalism. However, the rise of global justice movements demonstrates the range of alternatives beyond neoliberal development; while the success of alternative worldviews and practices is always contingent and subject to co-option, it is clear that development will remain a vital battleground in policy and practice for the ongoing spread of neoliberalism throughout the globe.
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