

## 9. Neoliberal Hegemony and the Organization of Consent \*

William K. Carroll and Matthew Greeno

In December of 1972, three astronauts were locked in a capsule barreling toward the moon. The crew captured a picture of Earth in its full illumination, which came to be known as “The Blue Marble.” It was not the first picture of our planet, but it is the most significant, showing Earth in full view contrasted against the vast darkness of space. Released during a period of widespread environmental protests, the image provided significant meaning to a social movement that, at its boldest, called for radical departures from the status quo of the era. By the 1980s, the discourse had shifted substantially to ‘sustainable development’ as the mainstream environmental movement embraced the free market. Today’s carbon taxes and carbon trading schemes are the legacy of the notion of sustainable development and an explicitly capitalist environmentalism.

Environmentalism has been co-opted; indeed, mainstream corporate environmentalism helps disable more radical ideas. But it is by no means the only movement that has suffered this fate; another is the labour movement. A major force for social transformation in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, labour (specifically in the global North) traded its radicalism for membership in the consumer-capitalist ‘affluent society’ of the second half of the 20th century, and has been hobbled in recent decades by the internationalization of labour markets, among other factors. Each of these movements have largely accepted capitalist

---

\* This article is based on a previous article by William K. Carroll: W. K. Carroll, ‘Hegemony, counter-hegemony, anti-hegemony’, *Socialist Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 2, (2006), pp. 9-42.

growth as an imperative and presumed that progressive politics could be added 'on top' of the basic structure. These movements underestimated, or have been relatively powerless to oppose, the totalizing dynamic of capitalism: its capacity to mute dissent by incorporating into its circuitry the immediate concerns of oppositional movements - as in the 'green economy' or, earlier, high-wage Fordism.

Today the ongoing global economic crisis, coupled with deteriorating ecological conditions across the globe, demands a coherent and organised radical alternative. Yet despite signs of impending ecological catastrophe and the deepening inequalities that consign billions to lives of permanent privation, the solution offered from on high is fiscal austerity, more free trade and an increase in economic globalization while environmental protections are scaled back. Governments and corporations increasingly act to create short-term economic growth, to the benefit of a tiny minority - the investors and executives who comprise the ruling class.

To struggle effectively for a better world, we need to seek to understand how co-optation occurs, and how consent is managed. This article offers an analysis of how, despite its deepening crisis, contemporary capitalism co-opts its potential opposition and organizes consent to an unjust, unsustainable way of life. We will use the concept of hegemony, which Antonio Gramsci described as a state in which "spontaneous consent [is] given by [civil society]... to the general direction imposed on social life,"<sup>1</sup> as a method to understand co-optation. Consent is established historically through the continued prestige of intellectual concepts, the free market being the case in point. It is actively reinforced through institutions that support and expand these concepts as the 'common sense' of an era. But hegemony is more than ideology; it is also closely linked to capital accumulation, the profit-seeking process at the heart of the world economy.

Capital accumulation is commonly called 'economic growth' but regardless of the terminology, it is capitalism's driving force. Without growth, capitalism spirals downward, in crisis. Companies reduce their workforces, and this in turn shrinks the overall demand for goods and services and the tax revenues that governments collect. If prospects for growth flag, capitalists hold back from investment, further amplifying the crisis. In 2008, it was this meltdown scenario of under-investment/under-consumption that led many of the world's governments to provide banks and corporations with billions in public money to erase bad debt and encourage further investment. Having bailed out corporate capital in its moment of global crisis, the same governments now insist on austerity for the masses as a means of paying

the bail-out bill.

The various programs that institutions create to support the continued capital accumulation embody neoliberal capitalist hegemony, which is based around the norm of an unfettered free market. In this deeper, structural sense, hegemony has to do with “the cohesion of the social system. It secures the reproduction of the mode of production and other basic structural processes.”<sup>2</sup> In short, capitalist hegemony creates a material basis for its own reproduction while securing a manner of cohesion around the market. (See also Whyte, Chapter 3.)

Amid an ongoing global economic and ecological crisis, the question of hegemony looms larger than perhaps at any time since the Great Depression of the 1930s, yet the challenges of constructing a political alternative to the rule of capital seem more daunting than ever. We will focus on the three ‘mechanisms’ that underlie neoliberal hegemony: cultural fragmentation; market insulation and dispossession; and globalization from above. In combination, these mechanisms disorganize, disable and defang movements. However, if we are to move beyond our deeply flawed contemporary world order we must build stronger forms of organisation that can repel co-optation. (See also, *The Free Association*, Chapter 13.) To do this we must examine the processes of co-optation.

### **Cultural Fragmentation:**

Hegemony is often conceptualized as a condition of cultural and political consensus, yet today one of its most important bases is the *cultural fragmentation* that issues from advanced consumer capitalism as a way of life, particularly in the global North. The full flowering of consumer capitalism has brought the commodification of everyday life, including culture. Beginning in the 1970s, aided by information technologies, corporations in the global North began to produce not only for mass consumer markets but for niche markets. This meant more than a shift in business strategy. Over time, it fragmented culture into many pieces, each of which can be cultivated and exploited for its commercial value. Each subculture and identity group offers a niche market to corporate capital. As market principles invade culture they absorb and commodify the voices of subjugated groups within the chain of production and consumption. As David Teztlaff explains, “The genius of capitalism is its simplicity of motive. As long as profit can be accumulated and maximized, other considerations are secondary. This

gives capital great flexibility, allowing it to form alliances of convenience with other centers of power.”<sup>3</sup> To manage consent, any combination of ideologies that instills compliance in the workforce while discouraging challenges to the system is acceptable. Forces of capitalism organize society explicitly with that motive, in a governance strategy of “divide and conquer.”<sup>4</sup>

Take for example the actions of Dove Cosmetics starting in 2004 when it established its “Self-esteem Fund” and its “Campaign for Real Beauty.”<sup>5</sup> Dove’s campaign claimed to work towards a diversification of beauty and spawned commercials with the slogan “let’s make peace with beauty.” Dove reported constructing this campaign because a study they commissioned showed that the vast majority of women were feeling alienated by the media and its idealization of women’s bodies. Their rationale suggests that this campaign was about a company’s growing awareness of a social problem. However, grassroots activists and academics have been analyzing the negative social effects of the media’s idealization of women’s bodies at least since the early 1990s. Dove picked up on this social movement and saw an opportunity to capitalize; Dove was attempting, through this marketing campaign, to sell a version of women’s diversity and then fuse the Dove brand to the idea. The intended effect was for Dove to appear socially responsible, but the end goal was always capital accumulation. To that end, the marketing campaign succeeded: according to one account, “the campaign returned \$3 for every \$1 spent.”<sup>6</sup>

The result of corporations seeking to appear socially responsible and agreeable to the progressive goals of various social movements is the commodification of those movements and division within these movements. In the example above, Dove commodified the alienation of women by the media and made the purchase of their products seem politically motivated. This organizes people around a product as opposed to a collectively transformative project. Dove’s campaign is sharply contrasted by groups like Pretty, Porky, and Pissed Off from Toronto, who are critical of consumer culture and involved in grassroots activism about women’s body image.<sup>7</sup> The radical viewpoints of such a group, which are less compliant with the chain of production and consumption, are alienated from mainstream culture.

The Dove example serves to show how marketing creates culture, but a divided culture. Dove made great efforts to differentiate itself within a broad category of beauty products by marketing a social mission. This marketing effort blurred the line between the actual products Dove sells and consumers’ sense of identity. This is generally true about marketing. Marketing attempts to define experience by associating a brand with

symbols that people recognize about that experience, but through this process, as corporations continue to jostle for competitive position, marketing helps produce a culture that is fragmented. Products are created for increasingly esoteric markets and take increasingly divergent forms. Today our culture produces markets for cable channels designed for classic movie fans, smart phones designed for being dropped in the mud, and board games designed for miniature train collectors. Niche markets are created first by marketers as they try to differentiate their product and then are adopted by the masses. As Apple Computer former CEO, Steve Jobs, advocated, “people don’t know what they want until you show it to them.”<sup>8</sup>

From this perspective, the hegemonic significance of cultural fragmentation lies in a *consent without consensus* that is sustained by two mechanisms:

- *ideological diversification*: the proliferation of many distinct style cultures and subcultures - divided by age, gender, ethnic and other differences - that prevent subjugated groups from understanding one another and undertaking the difficult work of constructing solidarities; for example, there is a conflict between younger generations, who blame baby-boomers for economic and environmental woes, and the baby-boomers who perceive youth as entitled and lazy.
- *implosion of meaning*: the cultural fixation on superficial symbols and televisual spectacle - the Olympics, endlessly replayed footage of the latest militarized conflict or natural disaster, etc. - all of which distracts people from imagining a collectively transformative project.<sup>9</sup>

Within “the cultural logic of late capitalism,”<sup>10</sup> consent is organized around the market and fostered by the lack of other forms of social cohesion. The divisions between social groups pose a challenge to oppositional movements intent on moving beyond the fragments of single-issue politics and liberal multiculturalism that reinforce the pattern of ideological diversification.

### **Insulation and Dispossession:**

In the 1970s and 1980s, neoliberal politics, best exemplified by Thatcherism and Reaganomics, reorganized hegemony, and government efforts enabling this project were explicit. The main tenets of

neoliberalism are the priority of 'sound money' and low inflation, attacks on unions, flexible labour markets, policies of fiscal retrenchment, deregulation, and free trade - all of which are meant to strengthen the role of markets in human affairs. These policies have indeed amplified the impact of global market forces on working people and communities, thereby shifting the balance of class power toward those who command capital.<sup>11</sup> Neoliberalism strives to restore the optimal conditions for capital accumulation at the expense of social protections inscribed within welfare state institutions: social housing provisions, public pensions etc.

At the heart of neoliberal economic policies is the *insulation* of both capital and the state from democratic control. A key hegemonic claim is that the market provides a natural mechanism for rational economic allocation. Thus, attempts to regulate capital via political decisions produce suboptimal outcomes. This hegemonic claim is based on the fiction of a free market comprised of many small firms. In fact, giant corporations and financial institutions, commanded by members of a transnational capitalist class, dominate contemporary capitalism.<sup>12</sup> Deregulating these centres of class power insulates them from democratic control. The promise of increased freedom is belied by the reality of ever-more concentrated economic power.

By the same token, neoliberalism insists that key state agencies be insulated from popular will. Central banks and institutions like the International Monetary Fund must be insulated from "myopic" elected governments, so that they can foster "sustainable real economic growth."<sup>13</sup> Allowing politics to influence monetary policy would result in unstable financial markets, reduced growth, or a recession. This perspective assumes that managing the economy independently from politics results in increases in private investment. However, the opposite has been shown. Since the 1970s, investment has decreased in relation to GDP.<sup>14</sup> Profits for many businesses have increased as a result of market liberalization, but that capital is accumulating as private wealth. This is referred to as the phenomenon of over-accumulation. As Jim Stanford observed, "while neoliberalism has been successful in restoring business profitability and, more generally, business power, it has not lead to stronger world growth."<sup>15</sup>

We can see neoliberal insulation at work in the paradigm shift from the welfare state to the "competition state."<sup>16</sup> In a competition state, the state's role is to promote its territory as a site for investment. To accomplish this, the state must be insulated from popular will, and free to enact business-friendly policies. Promoting individual economic freedom as the highest virtue is at the core of this aspect of hegemony.

Citizens are asked to trade away any modicum of democratic control over economic decisions for the promise of enhanced personal opportunities in markets buoyed by pro-business policies.

Alongside what we have called insulation, a second hegemonic element in neoliberal economic policies arises from what David Harvey calls *accumulation by dispossession*.<sup>17</sup> The insulation of capital and the state from democratic constraint is directed at promoting depoliticized economic activity within liberalized markets. In contrast, accumulation by dispossession refers to the process of *privatizing commonly-held assets* (or rights to assets). These include public utilities, educational institutions, and transportation networks among others. By selling these assets, governments free up new venues into which over-accumulated capital can flow. Harvey has connected the dots between a wide range of examples - biopiracy and the wholesale commodification of nature, commercialization of culture and intellectual creativity, corporatization and privatization of public institutions and utilities - in short, the enclosure of the commons. What gives these initiatives persuasive power in managing dissent is the disempowering implications of successful enclosure. As the elements of life are privatized, people lose collective capacity to resist. They become increasingly 'free agents' acting individually in various markets, rather than members of communities knit together through social stewardship.

However, as a stable material basis for social cohesion, neoliberal capitalism remains problematic. Both aspects of neoliberal hegemony - insulation and dispossession - create unstable material conditions. Corporate profits have increased since the economic crises of the 1970s and early 1980s, but so have the economic shocks that accompany accumulation by dispossession. Such shocks can be observed as a result of the cumulative privatization campaigns in Argentina and elsewhere, which initially brought massive inflows of over-accumulated capital and a boom in asset values, followed by collapse into general impoverishment and social chaos as capital fled the scene.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, market liberalization may boost profitability in the short term, but it "will not produce a harmonious state in which everyone is better off."<sup>19</sup> Market liberalization and the global integration of deregulated national economies resulted in the most recent, and ongoing, global financial crisis. As of early 2012, large multinational corporations were sitting on trillions of dollars, and even the US<sup>20</sup> and UK<sup>21</sup> governments, which have been the sites of much deregulation, struggle to get those companies to spend the capital on hiring or investment. Moreover, the result of insulation through market liberalization nationally and internationally has been economic polarization - the growing gap between the 99% and

the 1% - even during boom times. Neoliberalism's brutalizing ramifications render claims to hegemony tenuous. (See also Fisher, Chapter 2 and Whyte, Chapter 3.)

Against these weaknesses, however, consider neoliberalism's strategic advantages:

- To the extent that 'the economy' is imagined to be an autonomous rational machine, capitalism becomes an inaccessible topic to opponents of neo-liberal ideology.
- To the extent that the state becomes seen simply as the protector of economic growth, policies that counter-balance the power of capital by addressing the needs of workers, communities and ecology become marginalized. They are viewed as incompatible with the state's main mission.<sup>22</sup>
- To the extent that markets become society's guiding principles, the actions of individuals and social movements conform to market guidelines and must fit institutionally within market confines. Notions of competition and individual or organizational self-interest may come to dominate the social missions of many non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This can render activists and movements disciplined by the market and can instill a kind of fatalism in the general population, setting limits to dissent. However, the full hegemony of market discourse is constantly subverted by the economic and social polarization that stem from neoliberal policy, giving activists fresh opportunities to contest neoliberal hegemony.

The current Conservative federal government of Canada has attempted to mobilize these advantages to suppress environmental concern in the country. The Conservatives are ideologically opposed to accepting climate change and conservation forms of environmentalism alike. This government places emphasis on extraction of natural resources, like bitumen from the Tar Sands in Alberta, above all else and recently put its considerable weight behind the efforts of a multinational corporation called Enbridge. Enbridge has proposed to run a pipeline from the Tar Sands over hundreds of kilometres of remote terrain between the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia (BC) to an inlet in a small community called Kitimat, where the bitumen would be loaded into supertankers, which will attempt to navigate through waters better fit for canoes, eventually bound for China. Despite mass opposition to the pipeline by the citizens of BC and the nation, the

Conservative Minister of Natural Resources stated: “unfortunately, there are environmental and other radical groups that would seek to block this opportunity to diversify our trade.”<sup>23</sup> The reactionary accusations of the government framed the dissent as ‘radical’ and as attempting to undermine the economic good of the nation. In other words, dissent that ignores the economic benefits in favor of an environmental risk assessment cannot be valid. This government has continued this rhetoric stating, “science, not politics, will decide the fate of the pipeline”<sup>24</sup> while also “streamlining” the country’s environmental review process for resource extraction projects. This example shows a government attempting to discipline social movements by critiquing their actions against the insulated economy while attempting to isolate the project from the popular will of the citizenry.<sup>25</sup>

### **Globalization from Above:**

*Globalization from above* is the final mechanism to consider in the recent hegemonic transition.

Globalization is the complex and emergent product of various practices and processes operating on many scales,<sup>26</sup> but our focus here is on the hegemonic implications of international capital accumulation. This form of globalization occurs ‘from above’, as the quest for profit pushes capitalists into a “chase across the globe”<sup>27</sup> and reshapes the world in the image of capital, as more and more people are drawn into commodity relations.

Although capital has been globalizing for half a millennium, a turning point occurred in 1971, when then US President Richard Nixon announced that America was abandoning the fixed exchange rates that made the US dollar the standard for other currencies.<sup>28</sup> Previously, fixed currency exchange rates inhibited the international movement of capital to help prevent the massive financial shocks that were associated with the Great Depression. With Nixon’s decision the globalization of capitalism’s financial circuitry began in earnest.

It is not surprising that globalization in this sense has gone hand-in-hand with neoliberal political transformations.<sup>29</sup> Globalization from above expands the volume and extent of international trade and investment, enabling capital to play some communities and workforces off against others in the competition for jobs and revenue. As capital becomes more internationalized, its structural power, exercised through financial institutions and markets, is amplified, along with the risks of

cascading global crisis.

As a hegemonic idea, 'globalization' conveys a metanarrative that trumps Fordist-era narratives of national development. The story suggests that international trade and investment provide *the* formula for development. The implications of globalization from above for the organization of consent are important. Where the Fordist-era narrative presented a collective whose unity was based on national identity,

The global narrative displaces human subjectivity, dramatizing instead the integration of markets... 'Globalization' offers a story in which the new world order will culminate, not in an undifferentiated whole, but in an endlessly differentiated circuit of exchangeability. It tells a story, not about our sameness, but about our fungibility.<sup>30</sup>

To be fungible is to be universally exchangeable, and interchangeable. This applies not only to objects, but to human beings and their capacities. Each location for investment, each job, is interchangeable as far as international capital is concerned and organizations have been created to extend this sensibility. The World Trade Organization, for example, "provides a forum for negotiating agreements aimed at reducing obstacles to international trade and ensuring a level playing field for all, thus contributing to economic growth and development."<sup>31</sup> The aim is to eliminate the so-called myopic public control of investment and trade. Global governance recognizes the need to solve 'world problems' such as economic instability, poverty, and ecological destruction, cooperatively and in dialogue by bringing together not only state actors, but also NGOs and private enterprises from civil society. As the state withdraws from interventionist public policy, NGOs often step in to fill the void, but the playing field is hardly level and they do this from a position of vulnerability and often marginality. The key global actors appear as hierarchical and corporatized organizations, for instance, the powerful corporate alliances that have repeatedly scuttled any real progress toward an international agreement on preventing catastrophic climate change. As one author observed, "international relations have become 'privatized'... Non-state actors are increasingly integrated in the operations of the liberal world market which has affected even the NGO sector where the corporate model of organization has grown in popularity."<sup>32</sup> (See also Merz, Chapter 10.)

The phenomenon of 'NGO-ization' vividly illustrates how globalization-from-above co-opts its own potential opposition. This refers to the creation of non-government organizations (NGOs) as a way

of organizing around an issue like environmental degradation or the oppression of women. These organizations become the institutional representatives of social movements, often to the detriment of grassroots democracy. The dependence of NGOs on foundation funds can cause them to act as brakes upon radical ideas from the global South. To secure and maintain funds from liberal-humanitarian foundations, many NGOs must moderate and 'mainstream' the radical demands and visions that often come from the grassroots. Such NGOs act as social control agents, policing social movements through the management of dissent. Only movement groups whose projects fit within the overall agenda of the foundations get promoted and supported.<sup>33</sup> (See also Barker, Chapter 11.) In this and other ways, global organizations of many different stripes have embraced the formation and indeed the goals of neoliberal capitalism. Within this framework, the economy is the place of legitimate competition; politics is the place where cooperation smooths out the rough edges of the primary competitive process.<sup>34</sup>

## Conclusion

The prioritization of the market links the practices and projects discussed here to the deeper structures of transnational neoliberal capitalism. Throughout cultures of the Global North, it naturalizes market relations and infuses them into an organization of consent that operates both locally and globally. This hegemonic system tends to co-opt dissenting groups through commodification of subcultures and the active expansion of neoliberal projects that limit politics to 'what works' within an increasingly international and privatized economic framework. Yet this is an unstable, crisis-ridden way of life. The paradigm shift has accomplished only a *thin* hegemony and weak basis for social cohesion.

Neoliberal hegemony's key elements - cultural fragmentation, dispossession and market insulation, and globalization-from-above - do not comprise a singular project created from a conspiracy to construct a new world order. Instead, these elements have come together as an *assemblage*. What unites them is the support they provide for a certain form of capitalism. Commodification, deregulation, and the expanding transnational reach of accumulation together enable a lifestyle of affluence for the elect, and the semblance of that lifestyle for affluent segments of the working class in the global North. However, the social and ecological base for this assemblage is shrinking. Capital makes

allegiances of convenience and may abandon them during times of crisis; this has been the fate of organized labour in the North. Less favoured groups are actively repressed in the interest of capital accumulation and demonized in the corporate media as welfare cheats, illegal migrants, treacherous environmentalists, overpaid unionized labour and violent radicals. Ecosystems at varying scales also are harmed through capital's endless expansion, whose effects include resource depletion, pollution, species loss and most significantly, climate change. In short, the system tends to undermine its own human and natural infrastructure while sharpening social inequities.

None of the hegemonic mechanisms we have reviewed here hold a lock upon popular consciousness. Indeed, particularly since the rise of alter-globalization politics in the 1990s, social movements and communities across the globe have resisted neoliberalism while attempting to construct new paths to an alternative future. Although the question of how to transform the global structure remains to be answered, our analysis suggests several important points worth considering to avoid the trail of co-optation:

- Each of the mechanisms we have discussed tends to disorganize the opposition and to recruit support for the current regime of transnational neoliberal capitalism. Democratic movements need to counter them, with an alternative social vision that inspires people to struggle for a better world. But constructing such a counter-hegemony does not mean simply reversing or inverting the dominant perspective.
- In the case of cultural fragmentation, democratic movements need to foster political organisation, discussion and networking across and within the different stands of activism, North and South, without repressing cultural difference. Diversity and solidarity must be core values of any post-capitalist world.
- In the case of neoliberal insulation of economics from politics, democratic movements need both to demand the democratization of economic life and to put such demands into practice by creating participatory-democratic alternatives, as in co-operatives, participatory budgeting and the like. Likewise, effective responses to dispossession and privatization need both to insist on the value of public goods as a basis for democracy itself and to create new commons, as in cyberactivist open-source initiatives and the land invasions of Brazil's landless workers' movement (MST).

▪ Finally, in response to globalization-from-above, democratic movements need to build upon the globalization-from-below exemplified by movements like La Via Campesina, but they also need to ensure that any engagement with the existing organizations of global governance, such as the UN institutions, is conducted with critical awareness of their power. The UN institutions, particularly those involved in development, aid or so-called ‘democracy promotion’ are themselves mechanisms of co-optation, and have swallowed up and diverted the paths of many well-meaning NGOs and social movements. Any engagement with these institutions is perilous, and must proceed from an insistence on their democratization and extrication from the global nexus of elite and corporate power. Enacting this risky form of engagement requires that movements retain at their core a commitment to democratic practice (again, La Via Campesina offers an example) while building alliances with other democratic actors at the international level. At the same time, local bases for activism need to be cultivated: globalization-from-below can only develop from democratic initiatives at the grassroots.

In our view, the most compelling counter-hegemonic vision that can respond to the deepening economic and ecological crisis of our time is what Foster and Magdoff have called “sustainable human development”: a transformation in community, culture and economy that reduces humanity’s ecological footprint while producing “*enough* for everyone, and no more.”<sup>35</sup> Valuing human thriving and ecological health rather than unsustainable capital accumulation, this vision provides a basis for both North-South solidarity and solidarity across the domains of social and environmental justice. The challenge for activists is to find, or create, pathways in the present toward this alternative future.

## Notes

- 
- 1 A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 12.
  - 2 J. Joseph, *Hegemony: A Realist Analysis* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 211.
  - 3 D. Tetzlaff, ‘Divide and Conquer: Popular Culture and Social Control in Late Capitalism.’, *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 13, (1991), pp. 9-33, p. 22.
  - 4 Ibid.
  - 5 Tinted Lens: Musings on Culture and Beyond, ‘The Beauty Myth: Dove Cosmetics rides the wave’, 28 February, 2008.

- <<http://interculturaljournal.wordpress.com/2011/02/28/women-and-advertising-the-power-myth/>>
- 6 O. Falcione, and L. Henderson, 'The Dove Campaign for Beauty', 1 March, 2009. <<http://psucomm473.blogspot.ca/2009/03/dove-campaign-for-real-beauty.html>>
  - 7 J. Johnston, and J. Taylor, 'Feminist Consumerism and Fat Activists: A Comparative Study of Grassroots Activism and the Dove Real Beauty Campaign', *Signs*, Vol. 33 (2008), pp. 941-966.
  - 8 C. Mui, 'Five Dangerous Lessons to Learn From Steve Jobs"', 17 October, 2011. <<http://www.forbes.com/sites/chunkamui/2011/10/17/five-dangerous-lessons-to-learn-from-steve-jobs/>>
  - 9 W. K. Carroll, 'Hegemony, counter-hegemony, anti-hegemony', pp. 29-30.
  - 10 P. Anderson, *The Origins of Postmodernism* (London: Verso, 1998), p. 131.
  - 11 G. Teeple, *Globalization and the Decline of Social Reform* (Second Edition, Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press, 2000).
  - 12 W. Carroll, *The Making of a Transnational Capitalist Class* (London: Zed Books, 2006).
  - 13 T. Lybek, 'Central Bank Autonomy, Accountability, and Governance: Conceptual Framework', (2004), p. 2. <[www.imf.org/external/np/leg/sem/2004/cdmfl/eng/lybek.pdf](http://www.imf.org/external/np/leg/sem/2004/cdmfl/eng/lybek.pdf)>
  - 14 J. Stanford, *Economics for Everyone: A short guide to the economics of capitalism* (Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2008).
  - 15 *Ibid*, p. 149.
  - 16 J. Hirsch, 'Globalisation of Capital, Nation-States and Democracy', *Studies in Political Economy*, Vol. 54 (1997), pp. 39-58.
  - 17 D. Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
  - 18 L. Evans, 'The Crisis In Argentina', *UCLA International Institute*, 4 April, 2003. <<http://www.international.ucla.edu/article.asp?parentid=3566>>
  - 19 Harvey, D., *The New Imperialism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 114.
  - 20 M. Aneiro, 'U.S. Companies Sitting on \$1.24 Trillion Cash Hoard', *Barron.com's Income Investing blog*, 14 March, 2012. <<http://blogs.barrons.com/incomeinvesting/2012/03/14/u-s-companies-sitting-on-1-24-trillion-cash-hoard/>>
  - 21 P. Aldrick, 'Budget 2012: UK companies are sitting on billions of pounds, so why aren't they spending it?', *The Telegraph*, 17 March, 2012. <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/budget/9150406/Budget-2012-UK-companies-are-sitting-on-billions-of-pounds-so-why-arent-they-spending-it.html>>
  - 22 This strategic advantage is particularly tenuous as it hinges on popular acceptance of the claim that the state should be handmaiden to corporate business. Critics of neoliberalism and advocates of radical democratization can contest this claim, not only when markets fail to meet needs (e.g. for

- housing) but in general. In fact, the neoliberal state subverts democracy. It enables the market and the powerful players within the market, at the expense of all those positioned disadvantageously, and often at the expense of ecological well being.
- <sup>23</sup> L. Payton, 'Radicals Working Against Oilsands, Ottawa Says', *CBC News*, 9 January, 2012. <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2012/01/09/pol-joe-oliver-radical-groups.html>>
- <sup>24</sup> P. O'Neal, 'B.C.-Alberta pipeline dispute: Stephen Harper says science, not politics, will determine route', *The Vancouver Sun*, 8 August 8 2012. <<http://www.vancouversun.com/business/energy-resources/Alberta+pipeline+dispute+Stephen+Harper+says/7053256/story.html>>
- <sup>25</sup> The fate of the project is still to be determined. The major provincial parties in BC have expressed opposition to the pipeline, and in August 2012, 59% of citizens in BC were reported to be opposed to the pipeline.
- <sup>26</sup> B. Jessop, *The Future of the Capitalist State* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002), p. 113.
- <sup>27</sup> D. Bryan, *The Chase across the Globe: International Accumulation and the Contradictions for Nation States* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1995).
- <sup>28</sup> N. Beams, 'When the Bretton Wood System Collapsed', *World Socialist Web Site*, 2001. <<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2001/aug2001/bw-a16.shtml>>
- <sup>29</sup> G. Teeple, *Globalization and the Decline of Social Reform*.
- <sup>30</sup> L. Medovoi, 'Nation, Globe, Hegemony: Post-Fordist Preconditions of the Transnational Turn in American Studies', *Interventions*, Vol 7, No. 2, (2005), pp. 162-79, p. 169.
- <sup>31</sup> World Trade Organization, 2012. <<http://www.wto.org/index.htm>>
- <sup>32</sup> R. Väyrynen, 'Political Power, Accountability, and Global Governance', (2003). <[www.tampereclub.org/e-publications/11Vayrynen.pdf](http://www.tampereclub.org/e-publications/11Vayrynen.pdf)>
- <sup>33</sup> A. Choudry, D. and Kapoor (eds), *Learning from the Ground Up: Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). This critique of NGOs is not intended to be universal. Some NGOs are able to maintain their autonomy and political integrity by accessing resources outside of corporate philanthropy and state funding agencies. Others inhabit the grey zone between autonomy and co-optation.
- <sup>34</sup> U. Brand, 'Order and Regulation: Global Governance as a Hegemonic Discourse of International Politics?', *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 12, No. 1, (2005) pp. 155-76, p. 166.
- <sup>35</sup> J.B. Foster, and F. Magdoff, *What Every Environmentalist needs to know about Capitalism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2011).