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THE VIOLENCE OF NEOLIBERALISM

Simon Springer

The ascent of neoliberalism can be understood as a particular form of anxiety, a disquiet born in the wake of the Second World War when the atrocities of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the Soviet Union fostered a belief that government intervention trampled personal freedoms and thereby unleashed indescribable slaughter (Mirowski and Plehwe 2009). There is some truth to be found in this concern, but the response that followed has exhibited its own violent tendencies. The Mont Pelerin Society, the originary neoliberal think tank, responded by resurrecting classical liberalism’s three basic tenets. First, a concentrated focus on the individual, who was viewed as the most qualified to communicate his or her desires, whereby society should be reoriented towards removing obstacles that hinder this goal. Second, free markets were considered the most proficient means for advancing self-reliance, whereby individuals could pursue their needs through the mechanism of price. Finally, a faith in a non-interventionist state that would emphasize and maintain competitive markets and guarantee individual rights shaped around a property regime (Hackworth 2007; Plehwe and Walpen 2006). From the geopolitical context of the war’s aftermath, the origins of neoliberalism as a political ideology can be understood as reactionary to violence. In short, neoliberals conceived that violence could be curbed by a return to Enlightenment thinking and its explicit basis in advancing the merits of individualism.

This historical context is ironic insofar as structural adjustment, fiscal austerity, and free trade, the basic principles of neoliberalism, are now ‘augmented by the direct use of military force’ (Roberts et al. 2003), where the ‘invisible hand’ of the global free market is increasingly clenched into the ‘visible fist’ of the US military. The relationship between capital accumulation and war is of course longstanding (Harvey 1985), and the peaceful division that early neoliberals pursued for their economic agenda demonstrated a certain naivety. While not all wars are decidedly capitalist, it is difficult to envisage conditions wherein an economic ideology like neoliberalism could not come attendant to violence insofar as it seeks a global domain, supports universal assumptions, and suppresses heterogeneity as individuals are remade according to the normative image of ‘neoliberal proper personhood’ (Kingfisher 2007). Either the lessons of colonialism were entirely overlooked by the Mont Pelerin Society, or they uncritically embraced its narrative appeal to the supposed higher purpose of the ‘white man’s burden’. Just as colonialism paved a road to hell with ostensibly good intentions, the neoliberal imagination of an eventual harmonious global village now demonstrates much the same. Embedded within such promises
of utopia are the dystopian realities that exist in a number of countries, where neoliberalization has not produced greater peace, but a profound and often ruinous encounter with violence.

The historical record indicates that the years under neoliberalism have been characterized by recurrent crises and deepening divisions between and within the world’s nations on ethno-religious grounds. Although in some instances poverty has arguably been alleviated, or at least not got any worse under neoliberalism, in many more contexts poverty remains painfully acute, while inequality has undeniably increased both within and between cities, states, and regions (Wade 2003; Harvey 2005). There is a nascent literature that is quickly gathering momentum, which attempts to make these connections between neoliberalism and violence more explicit (Auyero 2000; Borras and Ross 2007; Chatterjee 2009; Coleman 2007; Collier 2008; Goldstein 2005; Marchand 2004). From this growing concern comes increasing recognition for the idea that the imposition of neoliberal austerity measures may actually promote conditions of increased impoverishment that subsequently provide multiple opportunities for violent conflict (Bourdieu 1998; Bourgois 2001; Farmer 2004; Uvin 2003; Wacquant 2009). Within my own work I have attempted to demonstrate an urgent need to build linkages between the violence occurring in various sites undergoing neoliberalization, and to identify threads of commonality within these diverse spaces so that an emancipatory agenda of transnational scope may potentially begin to emerge (Springer 2015).

Although acknowledgement for the violence of neoliberalism continues to grow, it is important to recognize how simplistic and problematic it is to assume uniformity across the various constellations of violent geographies that are occurring in neoliberalizing contexts. Such an approach serves to reinforce the authority of neoliberal discourse by continuing to circulate the idea that neoliberalism as a particular model of statecraft is unavoidable, a criticism Gibson-Graham (1996) make more generally with regard to capitalism. Likewise, to treat the material expression of violence only through its directly observable manifestation is a reductionist appraisal. This view disregards the complexity of the endless entanglements of social relations, and further ignores the future possibilities of violence (Nordstrom 2004). When we bear witness to violence, what we are seeing is not a ‘thing’, but a moment with a past, present, and future that is determined by its elaborate relations with other moments of social process (Springer 2011). The material ‘act’ of violence itself is merely a confluence in the flows of oppressive social relations, and one that is persistently marked with absolutist accounts of space and time, when instead violence should be recognized as being temporally dispersed through a whole series of ‘troubling geographies’ (Gregory 2006). Nonetheless, understanding the resonances of violence within the now orthodox political economic model of neoliberalism – however disparate, protean, and variegated – is of critical importance to social justice. Only through a conceptualization of fluidity and process can we begin to recognize how violence and neoliberalism might actually converge.

I begin this chapter by identifying how processes of othering coincide and become a central component of neoliberal logic by providing it with the discursive tools to realize its heterogeneous ideals. In the following section I describe how attention to the relationality of space and time allows us to recognize neoliberalism and violence as mutually reinforcing moments of social process where it becomes very difficult to disentangle these two phenomena. I then turn my attention towards the exclusions of neoliberalism, where I consider how the exceptional violence of this process comes to form the rule. Here I identify neoliberalism as having produced a state of exception through its particular version of sovereign authority and the dire consequences this results in for the downtrodden and dispossessed. I then conclude on a hopeful note by insisting that collectively we are powerful actors who have the radical potential to resist, transform, and ultimately undo neoliberalism.
Neoliberal othering

Although mainstream examinations of conflict theory have a tendency to focus on ‘local’ origins by invoking the idea of ‘backward’ cultural practices as the most suitable explanations for violence (see Huntington 1996; Kaplan 2000), this reading problematically overlooks the influence of ideology and economics. The geographical imagination of violence vis-à-vis neoliberalism treats violence as an externality, a wrong-headed vision that engenders Orientalist ideas. Such othering discourses insidiously posit ‘local’ cultures as being wholly responsible for any ensuing bloodshed following neoliberalization, thus ignoring the mutability and relationality of the ‘global’ political economy of violence. Here we can look for guidance to the influence of Said (2003), who has made significant contributions to a broader interest in how geographical representations and practices produced notions of ‘us’ and ‘them’, or ‘Self’ and ‘Other’. In a contemporary sense, othering licenses further neoliberal reforms, as neoliberalization is positioned as a ‘civilizing’ enterprise in the face of any purported ‘savagery’ (Springer 2015). Neoliberalism is rarely interrogated and is typically either openly endorsed (see Fukuyama 1992) or tacitly accepted (see Sen 1999) as both the sine qua non of human development and the cure-all for violence. Such othering places neoliberalism ‘under erasure’, where we are encouraged to approach neoliberal ideas without a critical lens.

Popular geopolitics has repeatedly imagined ‘African’, ‘Asian’ and ‘Islamic’ cultures as being somehow ingrained with a supposedly ‘natural’ inclination towards violence, a tendency that has intensified in the context of the ongoing ‘war on terror’. The public performance of such ideas feeds into particular geostrategic aims, thus allowing them to gather momentum and develop a certain form of ‘commonsense’ validity. The imaginative geographies of such Orientalism are creations that meld difference and distance through a sequence of spatializations that not only assign particular people as ‘Other’, but also construct ‘our’ space of the familiar as distinct and separate from ‘their’ unfamiliar space that lies beyond (Gregory 2004; Said 2003). This is the exact discourse that colonialism rallied to erect its authority in the past, and in the current conjuncture, Orientalism can be considered as neoliberalism’s latitude insofar as othering enables a powerful discursive space for promoting the ideals of the free market. Such a connection between neoliberalism and Orientalism may appear counter-intuitive when neoliberalism is accepted at face value. After all, the neoliberal doctrine envisages itself as the champion of a liberal internationalism centred around the vision of a single human race peacefully united by a common code of conduct featuring deregulated markets, free trade, shared legal norms and states that feature civic liberties, electoral processes, and representative institutions (Gowen 2001). Nonetheless, an appreciation for neoliberalization’s capacity to promote inequality, exacerbate poverty, license authoritarianism, and advance a litany of other social ills is growing (Bourdieu 1998; Duménil and Lévy 2011; Giroux 2004; Goldberg 2009; MacEwan 1999; Springer 2008). Such recognition hints at the numerous ‘erasures’ neoliberal ideologues have attempted to engage through neoliberalism’s discursive concealment.

Klein (2007) has persuasively argued that natural disasters have been used as opportunities to push through unpopular neoliberal reforms on peoples and societies too disoriented to protect their interests. In their absence, othering lays the necessary foundation for manufactured ‘shocks’ in procuring openings for neoliberalism. Similar to the originary state-level neoliberal trial run in Chile (Challies and Murray 2008), the current sequence of imperialism-cum-neoliberalization in the Middle East is exemplary of American geopolitical intervention and a variety of militarism rooted in the Orientalist idea of folding distance into difference. Would the mere presence of ISIS, as problematic as this organization is, have been enough to galvanize America’s authorization of air strikes had their fragmented activities and threats occurred on Canadian soil rather than in...
Iraq and Syria? We can only speculate, but, given the wholesale devastation that ensues, without a significant dose of Orientalism the idea of launching missiles and dropping bombs on a country in all probability would not get off the ground and a different strategy would be devised to ensure minimal civilian casualties. Similarly, it was ‘unknown/faraway’ Santiago and not ‘familiar/nearby’ Ottawa that played host to Washington’s subversions in the lead up to the ‘other 9/11’ in 1973, when the neoliberal experiment was first realized with the installation of Pinochet.

Attention to how particular geographies, including imaginative ones, are ‘produced by multiple, often unnoticed, space-making and space-changing processes’ is of critical importance (Sparke 2007: 338, 2005). Sparke (2007) argues that such appreciation is itself an ethical commitment to consider the exclusions – which can be read in the double sense of ‘under erasure’ and ‘othering’ – in the production of any given geographical truth claims. The geography of neoliberalism involves recognizing its variegated expressions (Peck and Tickell 2002), imperialist impulses (Escobar 2004; Hart 2006), and authoritarian responses (Canterbury 2005; Springer 2009), all of which dispel the theoretical tall-tales of a smooth-space, flat-earth where neoliberalism rolls-out across the globe without friction or resistance. To deal with the inconsistencies between these material interpretations and a doctrine allegedly premised on peace, othering practices are employed to indemnify ‘aberrant’, ‘violent’, and ‘local’ cultures in explaining away any failings of neoliberalism, thereby leaving its class project unscathed (Springer 2015). Orientalism is used to legitimize the doublespeak neoliberal proponents invoke in the global distribution of violence (Sparke 2007), to code the violence of anti-neoliberal resistance, and to geographically allocate and place the blame for violence by asserting that violence sits in particular, ‘Oriental’ places (Springer 2011). The responsibility of critical theory under this ‘new imperialism’ (Harvey 2003) is thus to illuminate such erasures so that the othering of neoliberalism is laid bare and therein may be refused.

**Momentous violence**

In my attempt to link neoliberalism to violence one might be inclined to ask if the former actually causes the latter and how that could be proven. My response is that the question itself is largely irrelevant. The empirical record reveals a noticeable upswing in inequality under neoliberalism (Wade 2003), which Harvey (2005) regards as neoliberalism’s principal substantive achievement. Inequality alone is about measuring disparity, however qualified, while the link between inequality and violence is typically considered as an appraisal of the ‘validity’ of a causal relationship, where the link may or may not be understood to take on multiple dimensions including temporally, spatially, economically, politically, culturally and so forth. The point is that violence and inequality are mutually constitutive. Inequality precipitates violence, and violence gives rise to further inequalities. Accordingly, if we wish to attenuate the devastating and disafflicting effects of either, we need to rid ourselves of a calculative model and instead consider violence and inequality as an integral system or particular moment. ‘Thinking in terms of moments’, Hartsock (2006: 176) argues, can allow scholars ‘to take account of discontinuities and incommensurabilities without losing sight of the presence of a social system within which these features are embedded’. Although the enduring phenomenon of violence is fragmented by variations, strains and aberrations as part of its processual nature, within the current moment of neoliberalism, violence is all too often a reflection of the chaotic landscapes of globalized capitalism.

At different moments capitalism creates particular kinds of agents who become capable of certain kinds of violence dependent upon both their distinctive geohistorical milieu and their situation within its hierarchy. It is in this distinction of moments that we can come to understand the correlations between violence and neoliberalism. By exploring the particular histories and
distinctive geographies that define individual neoliberalizations, scholars can begin to shed light on the phantasmagoria of violence that is projected within neoliberalism’s wider rationality of power. In other words, it is important to recognize and start working through how the moment of neoliberalism and the moment of violence converge. The intention here is not to produce a Cartesian map, wherein the same interpretation is replicated in each and every context of neoliberalization. Neoliberalism should not be read as an all-powerful and self-reproducing logic. Lending such an infallible appearance serves to empower the idea that neoliberalism is beyond reproach. It is imperative to contest the neoliberalism-as-monolithism argument for failing to recognize space and time as open and always becoming (Springer 2014). In focusing solely on an externally constructed neoliberalism we neglect the local geographies of existing political economic circumstances and institutional frameworks, wherein the vagaries of societal influences and individual agency play a key role in the circulation and (re)production of neoliberalism. In short, to focus exclusively on external forces is to risk producing over-generalized accounts of a singular and omnipresent neoliberalism.

While acknowledging the problematics of a monolithic reading of neoliberalism it is also critically important to acknowledge that an intensive focus on internal phenomena is also limiting. Without attention to the relational connections of neoliberalism across space we cannot adequately addresses the essential features and important connections of neoliberalism as a global project (Peck and Tickell 2002). This ‘larger conversation’ of neoliberalism is considered important in relating similar constellations of experiences across various locations as a potential basis for emancipation (Brand and Wissen 2005; Featherstone 2005; Routledge 2003; Springer 2008; Willis et al. 2008). Retaining the abstraction of a ‘global’ neoliberalism allows phenomena like inequality and poverty, which are experienced across multiple sites, to find a point of similarity, a moment. In contrast, a refusal of the global scope of neoliberalism hinders attempts at developing and maintaining solidarity beyond the micro-politics of the ‘local’. For that reason, conceptualizing neoliberalism requires awareness for the complex connections between local and extralocal forces functioning within the global political economy (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Peck 2001). To understand the violence of neoliberalism then, we must be willing to sift through and account for the traction of violence in the contexts of its particular hybridized and modified instances of neoliberalization, while at the same time preserving the notion of neoliberalism as a ‘radical theoretical slogan’ (Peck 2004: 403). The latter can be employed as a reference point in opposing violence and bringing together distinct struggles against the controlling, abusive, and punishing structures of capitalism.

It was only over the course of a succession of setbacks, interruptions, and false starts that neoliberalism as a marginal utopian idea began to emerge as an established doctrine that has congealed as a diverse yet related series of neoliberalizations (Peck 2010; England and Ward 2007). Part of the ‘success’ of neoliberalism as the common language of global discourse is that it is based on a series of nostrums that, once employed, foretell that free market forces will lead to a thriving future, where all of the world’s peoples will be unified in an equitable and harmonious ‘global village’. Put differently, the neoliberal apostles are false prophets of emancipation, proselytizing peace as they wage war. So while I want to argue that understanding neoliberal violence requires attention to particular specificities that are conditional and context dependent, the violence of neoliberalism also has a relational character that extends across multiple sites, having been entwined within particular discourses and (re)productions of space (Lefebvre 1991). Acknowledgement of this dialectic moment brings a broader significance to neoliberalism’s encounter with violence, where contextually specific patterns of violence that are associated with unique social events, political circumstances, cultural processes, and spatial transformations can also be read more broadly across an array of sites undertaking neoliberalizing processes all
across the globe. While the inflections, cadences, and pulses of neoliberalism will always have some measure of idiosyncrasy in different contexts, from moment to moment the funeral march remains the same. Concealed beneath the allure of sirens, neoliberalism is actually a cacophony of violence and conflict, where there is profound dissonance between what it promises and what it ultimately delivers.

The neoliberal state of exception

The continuing exclusions of neoliberalism should motivate us to get involved and galvanize our collective strength to stand in opposition. But beyond the desire for compassion, an affinity that never takes for granted our shared humanity (Day 2005), lurks the threat of complacency, the shadow of indifference, and the menace of detachment among those of us who have not yet been subjected to our homes being forcibly taken by armed bandits known as police, to our children’s curiosity languishing because a basic education is an expense we cannot shoulder, or to our spouses dying in our arms having been denied adequate healthcare. The examples are not mere abstractions. Each of these scenarios has been revealed to me with disturbing regularity during the course of my ongoing research in Cambodia (Springer 2010, 2013, 2015). What those of us still on the winning side of neoliberalism do not anticipate or account for – and let there be no mistake that this is a system that unquestionably produces winners and losers – is that in this abandonment of our ‘Others’, we produce a state of exception (Ong 2006). The relation of the ban is nothing if not ambiguous, and to abandon someone is not simply to ignore or forsake them. As Agamben (1998: 72) explains, ‘What has been banned is delivered over to its own separateness and, at the same time, consigned to the mercy of the one who abandons it – at once excluded and included, removed and at the same time captured’. In other words, to ban is to create a state of exception, wherein the ‘exception does not subtract itself from the rule; rather, the rule, suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and, maintaining itself in relation to the exception, first constitutes itself as a rule’ (Ibid.: 14). Consequently, it is through the construction of a new neoliberal normative frame – wherein malice and malevolence become the rule – that the exceptional violence of neoliberalism is transformed into exemplary violence.

Exceptional violence always runs the risk of becoming exemplary, or so routinized, quotidian, ordinary, and banal that we no longer feel an emotional response to its appearance precisely because it is the norm. We may recognize it as violence, but we remain indifferent. Exemplary violence is most effective when it is no longer recognized as violence at all, a destructive form of unconsciousness that Bourdieu (2001) referred to as ‘symbolic violence’. It is in this mundanity of the everyday that we find meaning in Arendt’s (1963) ‘banality of evil’. History’s profoundest moments of iniquity are not performed by extremists or psychopaths, but by ordinary people – potentially you and me – as we come to accept the premises of the existing order. The banality of evil is thus an erasure that deprives us of our ability to recognize violence as a moment that is at once both exceptional and exemplary. As Agamben (1998: 14) explains, an exception,

does not limit itself to distinguishing what is inside from what is outside but instead traces a threshold (the state of exception) between the two, on the basis of which outside and inside, the normal situation and chaos, enter into those complex topological relations.

The exception and the example accordingly always exist in a dialectic relationship, and it is for this reason that the ongoing abandonment of the ‘Other’ under neoliberalism comes to define the sovereign authority of neoliberalism as a political economic order.
The violence of neoliberalism

As our political capacities knowingly and unknowingly embrace the social disarticulation and anomie of neoliberalism’s dystopia of individualism, the violence of this process deepens. Within neoliberalism’s imaginative geographies of an affluent global village, what is not spoken is the desire for a certain and particular homogeneity, an impulse to remake the ‘Other’ in ‘our’ image, whereby the space of ‘the peculiar’, ‘the exotic’, ‘the bizarre’ is continually (re)produced through the relation of the ban. But this is a relation that Agamben (ibid.: 21) knows well to be one where ‘outside and inside, become indistinguishable’, and thus, as with all fantasies and desires, at the heart of neoliberalism’s chimera of strength and confidence lurks a profound sense of anxiety (Gregory 1995). This is not a disquiet without consequence, but one that licenses particular violent geographies in ensuring that the ‘tableau of queerness’ (Said 2003) never disrupts the neoliberal vision of global sovereignty. The ominous specter of the banality of evil is signalled by the juxtaposition between a panacean fantasy of a ‘new world order’ and the sheer magnitude of violence that permeates our contemporary world. This is a routinized, clichéd, hackneyed, and mundane force, an evil whose potential resides within each and every one of us, and whose hostility is nurtured, accumulated, and consumed through the othering of neoliberalism.

Fantasy and reality collide under neoliberalization, and our involvement in this process allows for the normative entrenchment of violence against the marginalized, the dispossessed, the poor, the downtrodden, the homeless, the unemployed, the disaffected, and the ‘Other’. Yet this necropolitics of violence is not the conclusion of neoliberalism’s violent fantasy; rather, it is its genesis. The violence of neoliberalism is continuing to unravel the world. In this grave realization, and in echoing Marx, critical scholarship must not merely seek to interpret the world; it must seek to change it by aligning its theory and practice on all occasions and in all instances to the service of social justice. By seeking to shine a light on the variety of ways in which the processes of neoliberalization are saturated with both exceptional and exemplary violence, we open our geographical imaginations to the possibility of (re)producing space in ways that make possible a transformative and emancipatory politics. This moment of ‘Empire’ (Hardt and Negri 2000) demands such courage of our scholarship. As members of the assemblage we call humanity, we each have a moral obligation to stand up and speak out as an act of solidarity with those whom the violence of neoliberalism has targeted, and those who have been silenced by the complacency of a stifled collective imagination wherein neoliberalism is considered an inexorable force.

Conclusion

The rolling-back of the state is a rationale of neoliberal governance, not an informed choice of the autonomous agents that comprise the nation. Thus, resistance to neoliberalism often provokes a more despotic outlook as states move to ensure that reforms are pushed through, particularly if the changes are rapid and a legitimizing discourse for neoliberalization has not already become widely circulated. This is why effective subjectification to neoliberal ideals and the production of ‘othering’ discourses become a hallmark of neoliberalization. Yet complete acquiescence to neoliberalism is improbable for two reasons. First, every single member of a given society is never going to completely accept or agree with the dominant discourses. Thus, we so often find that those marginalized by neoliberal reforms are actively engaged in continuous struggles to have their voices heard, which is unfortunately just as frequently met with state violence in response. Second, social processes have an essential temporality, meaning that they continue to unfold. While notions of temporal stasis and spatial uniformity pervade popular accounts of a fully integrated ‘global village’ (see Friedman 1999), these ideas are fundamentally reliant upon a problematic assignment of monolithism and inevitability to neoliberalism, as
though space–time has only one possible trajectory (Massey 2005). In the popular imagination, there is little acknowledgement of the discursive work that goes into the (re)production and distribution of neoliberal ideas in a diverse range of contexts (Plehwe and Walpen 2006). As the utopian discourse of neoliberalism rubs up against empirical realities—such as heightened inequality and ongoing poverty—citizens are more likely to express discontent with particular characteristics of neoliberalization, most obviously the reduction of essential social provisions such as healthcare and education. Resorting to violence accordingly becomes one of the few disciplinary options available to governments transformed by neoliberalization as they attempt to retain legitimacy, where ‘othering’ becomes a primary mechanism in the articulation of power. In short, those who don’t fit the mould of a proper neoliberal subject are treated as enemies.

The rising tide against neoliberalism and the geographically dispersed protests that signify and support such a movement necessarily occur in terrains that always exceed neoliberalism (Hart 2008; Leitner et al. 2007). Consequently, we can never attribute neoliberalism to a direct calculable expression. Although the idea of a distinct singular form of neoliberalism is prominent in the popular imagination, such a formulaic interpretation of a pure neoliberalism is an untenable idea that has been altogether dismissed by geographers (Peck and Tickell 2002). Neoliberalism is a theoretical abstraction that rubs up against geographical limits, and consequently its ‘actually existing’ circumstances are never paradigmatic. Yet it is nonetheless enormously important to recognize how the evolving geographies of protest, resistance, and contestation can be interpreted as a shared sense of betrayal with what can be broadly defined as ‘neoliberal policy goals’. The implication of this reading is a growing recognition for transnational solidarity as being inseparable from ‘local’ movements, which prompts a relational understanding of both resistance to and the violence of neoliberalism (Featherstone 2005; Wainwright and Kim 2008). Some of the most noticeable outcomes of neoliberalization are increased class tensions, intensified policing, expanded surveillance, and heightened security measures, which inevitably arise from strained relations. So while there are variegations and mutations to account for in neoliberalism’s travels, there is also a need to appreciate the similar deleterious outcomes that all too frequently arise.

The relationship between neoliberalism and violence is directly related to the system of rule that neoliberalism constructs, justifies, and defends in advancing its hegemonies of ideology, of policy and programme, of state form, of governmentality, and, ultimately, of discourse (Springer 2012). Neoliberalism is a context in which the establishment, maintenance, and extension of hierarchical orderings of social relations are re-created, sustained, and intensified, where processes of ‘othering’ loom large. Accordingly, neoliberalization should be regarded as integral to violence inasmuch as it generates social divisions within and across space. Yet the world as we see it today where the violence of neoliberalism proceeds with a careless lack of restraint is neither necessary nor inevitable. By increasing our shared understanding for the cruelty that neoliberalism engenders we set in motion a process of awakening from the allure of market logic, a process that shatters the influence of anomie and sounds a death knell for neoliberal ideas. As exceptional violence comes to form the rule, people around the world are becoming more acutely aware that something is not right, and consequently we are becoming more willing to stand up for our communities, for ourselves, and for ‘Others’. Every time we refuse to sit idle before would-be evictors speculating on land, have the courage to protest exclusion from democratic process, strike against an exploitative employer who denies a fair wage, or resist being framed as violent savages incapable of agency, the rhizomes of emancipation grow stronger. There is a world to be won, and as long as we can come to recognize the reflection of ‘Others’ within ourselves, we will prevail.
The violence of neoliberalism
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