Neoliberalisation, city, and spatial justice

Marianne Morange
UMR CESSMA, Université Paris Diderot / Institut Universitaire de France
Sylvie Fol
UMR Géographie – Cités, Université Paris 1 Panthéon – Sorbonne
Translation : John Crisp

References to neoliberalism (as an ideology) and to neoliberalisation (as the means of its dissemination, in particular through public policy) have proliferated in English language urban studies since the beginning of the century. In this colossal body of work, largely originating in neo-Marxist political economics, neoliberalism is anything but "laissez-faire". It is an ideology founded on the spread of competitive and market principles to all spheres of public and private life: "neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). For David Harvey, neoliberalism is a strategy promulgated by the dominant class to restore its power, a power eroded by post-war social and political compromise and threatened by the crisis of the 1970s. For other Marxist analysts, it is an ideology that seeks to promote new ways of regulating capitalist accumulation, since the crisis in the Fordist welfare state regime (called by some the Keynesian Welfare National State) in the 1970s and the global recession that followed. It aspires to replace demand-side policies with supply-side policies, by promoting business competitiveness, a process that has been described in particular by Bob Jessop (2002) and Jamie Peck (2001). It constitutes a *qualitative* transformation in the practices of the State rather than a *quantitative* one (a reduction in its role). It entails the "naturalisation" (to quote Jamie Peck) of imperatives that seem to arise ineluctably from a disembodied process – globalisation, but which in reality reflect a political offensive designed to establish a global "neoliberal environment" (Peck, 2001) through budgetary and fiscal austerity, deregulation, privatisation, financial liberalisation...

A genealogy of the notion of neoliberalism, of its origins, of how its meaning has evolved and shifted, would no doubt be interesting and necessary. However, it would be a monumental task that is not in question here. We will restrict ourselves, like other authors (Béal, 2010), to recalling that the word appeared in the late 1930s, at

the Walter Lippman Colloquium in Paris in 1938, and was then disseminated by the Mont Pèlerin Society, created in 1947 by Friedrich Hayek, and by the Chicago School of economists, embodied in the person of Milton Friedman (Audier, 2012). From the start, the nexus of ideas that formed around neoliberal thought was very heterogeneous, drawing authors who wished to re-establish "the primary role of the state in setting the rules of the economic game" (Magnan de Bornier, 2013) as well as proponents of radical laissez-faire economics (Audier, 2012). Michel Foucault (1979)[1] highlighted these ambivalences in his analysis of the differences between German neoliberalism (or ordoliberalism, also studied by Audier, 2012) – an "expression of market policy whose action involves society as a whole" – and American neoliberalism, in which "the process of state integration and subordination to economic logic" goes much further (Lazzarato, 2013). As with the neo-Marxist authors, neoliberalism, in Foucault's writings,[2] far from representing the withdrawal of the state, is seen as a "state capitalism", "a practical redefinition of government intervention in its relation to the market", and is distinguished in this from classical 18th-century liberalism. While for classical economists, trade and competition were natural features not to be disturbed (Adam Smith's invisible hand of the market), neoliberal doctrine by contrast considers competition as a "formal structure" that needs to be constructed and put into operation by state intervention (Dardot, 2013).

1- Cities and neoliberalisation: a newly demarcated field

Cities quickly came to be an essential part of this dynamic. Indeed, the scale and space of the city are favourable to the introduction of strategies of competitiveness, because of the "rescaling" of public action (Brenner 1999 and 2004). From this perspective, cities are not merely theatres of neoliberalisation: "*cities have become strategically crucial arenas in which neoliberal forms of creative destruction have been unfolding during the last three decades*" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). They are at the heart of this process and neoliberal practices are partly forged in the arenas of local governance: dismantlement of public agencies for the provision of urban services, affirmation of economic actors in the production of urban spaces, working in ever closer partnership with the public sector (public-private partnership principle), propagation of *New Public Management* in local government... At the level of urban policies, neoliberalisation reflects the adhesion by cities to urban

---

[1] The pioneering aspect of Foucault's analyses is noteworthy. In his 1979 course on biopolitics (published in 2004), he anticipated the change of direction in public policies, just before Margaret Thatcher's rise to power (Gros et al., 2013).

[2] For an in-depth summary of Foucault's contributions to the notion of neoliberalism, see the special issue of the journal *Raisons Politiques* published in October 2013, focusing on "Foucault's neoliberalisms".

entrepreneurship in order to develop their appeal in the face of the international competition between them. It is accompanied by a repudiation of spatial planning in favour of the new competitive regionalism embodied in strategic urban planning. All this seems to reflect the transition to a workfare postnational regime (Jessop, 2002) in which the city ceases to be a space of social reproduction to become a space of competition.

Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore (2002) proposed a unifying theoretical framework to help develop an understanding of this process.[3] They invited urban studies specialists and geographers to enter this debate by studying "the urbanisation of neoliberalism", the title of the special issue of the journal *Antipode* that they coordinated in 2002. With this clever coinage, they succeeded in establishing a now well-defined field of research. Their article is extensively quoted, since it is often considered a founding text for this systematic theoretical perspective. By generating a dialogue between urban studies, geography and political economics, they helped to reformulate in more political terms the question of the relations between the city and capitalism. They suggested that the restructuring of the relations between capitalism and the city should be seen as a new "regulatory fix".

This analytical framework united works that explored neoliberalisation through the study of its tangible manifestations (gentrification, privatisation of public housing stocks...), elements easier to grasp than the spread of an all-encompassing rationality that was "everywhere and nowhere at the same time" (Peck, 2001). However, it had its roots in older works, in soil already excavated by precursors. As far back as the 1970s, Harvey Molotch (1976) was writing of the formation of land-based "growth coalitions". He brought to light the coalitions of interests between capitalist elites and local governments, which formed to promote "growth" – demographic, economic... – that would support the accumulation of capital ("the growth machine", Logan and Molotch, 1987). Less well-known works explored the phenomenon of what was then called "privatism": the influence of local entrepreneurial elites on urbanisation (see the McGregor/Barnekov and Rich debate, 1977a and b). In the 1980s, Clarence Stone (1989) showed how political and economic actors forge alliances and form "urban regimes" that influence investment and urban development. And of course, David Harvey developed a systematic theory of the relations between city and capitalism: the rise of "uneven spatial development", together with the transition from "managerial" urbanism to "entrepreneurial" urbanism (an expression employed in a very famous 1989 article, which was very

---

[3]Their article was published in a special issue of the radical journal *Antipode* (vol. 34, No.1, published in the same year in book form by Blackwell). It contains the papers from a conference held at the University of Illinois (*Centre for Urban Economic Development*) in 2001, which explored the relations between the city and neoliberalisation.

quickly adopted and became almost generic – Hall and Hubbard, 1998). Within the same current, Neil Smith began in 1982 to view gentrification as a means of restructuring urban spaces in order to tackle the crisis of accumulation, and "uneven urban development" between centre and periphery as the outcome of spatial strategies for capital investment.

These authors in fact borrow significantly from regulation theory, whether in their emphasis on the politically constructed nature of economic relations, in their highlighting of the rules, norms and compromises that enable institutions to regulate the interactions between economic actors and overcome the contradictions inherent to the workings of capitalism, or in the importance they attribute to the long history of reforms of capitalist accumulation and to the variability in time and space of its methods of regulation (Boyer and Saillard, 1995). References to the works of Aglietta, Boyer or Lipietz abound in their work,[4] largely drawing on their analyses of the transformations brought about by the crisis in the Fordist mode of accumulation (Boyer and Saillard, 1995) and of the spatial effects of post-Fordist restructurings (Benko and Lipietz, 1995).[5] For the Anglo-Saxon current of radical geography, which they partly sought to represent, the aim was to re-politicise the debate on "globalisation" by critiquing the term, which they perceived as too neutral and as masking the processes of domination, exclusion and exploitation at work. This was at a time when, for example, Savitch and Kantor (2002) were stressing the room for manoeuvre available to local governments in response to the somewhat disembodied imperatives of globalisation.

These discussions had the effect of lifting an ambiguity linked with the public and academic success of the notion of neoliberalisation since the 1990s: neoliberalisation cannot simply be equated with the withdrawal of the state, nor with deregulation or privatisation. The dismantlement of local Fordist systems of production and the challenge to the state level of regulation (a phase described as proto-neoliberalism in the genealogy proposed by Peck and Tickell and adopted by Brenner and Theodore in 2002) certainly signified the roll-back of the Keynesian welfare state. However, the state quickly redefined its modes of action by placing itself at the service of the market (so-called roll-out), in particular to open up to the market spheres of social life previously outside its ambit. What occurred at this moment of "creative destruction" (an expression borrowed from Schumpeter and Harvey, 2006 and 2007[6])

---

[4] Their work is also inspired by Marxist works on the State, by Henri Lefebvre or by Bob Jessop, who also has links with the Regulation School.

[5] In their article on the spaces of regulation, Benko and Lipietz (1995) also emphasise the convergence between the French regulationist approach and radical Anglo-Saxon geography, represented at the time by Harvey or Gregory and Urry.

[6] For Harvey (2006), neoliberalism is a process that destroys institutions, powers, social relations and even ways of life, but has the capacity constantly to recreate new modes of operation to the exclusive

was the invention of new practices of governance. The "roll-back"/"roll-out" sequence of proto-neoliberalism is chronological, and corresponds to the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s in the North American and British cases described by Peck and Tickell (2002). Moreover, neoliberalisation should not be taken as referring to a phase of capitalism that ended with the crisis of 2007-2009, as sometimes implied by over-reductive media interpretations.

The explosion of works that have since sought to explain these processes would render any attempt at a summary fruitless. Most look at the impact of the entrepreneurial shift on urban policies, through multiple prisms: urban services (Graham and Marvin, 2001; Swyngedouw, 2009), urban regeneration, big urban projects (Swyngedouw et al., 2002), inner-city regeneration policies leading to gentrification (Ward, 2003; Boland, 2008; MacLeod et al., 2003; Van Gent, 2013), housing policies (Harloe, 1995), management of urban housing stocks (Perkins, 2013). They prioritise the local scale and intra-urban analyses. While these various topics are often encountered in both cities of the North and of the South, they are broached according to the specificities of the spaces they are embedded in. For instance, research dealing with the rise of PPPs in cities of the South focus mostly on the relations between the State and communities, or the State and NGOs (Miraftab, 2004b on South African housing policy; Gopakumar, 2014 on water management in Bengaluru). In cities of the North on the other hand, the main focus is on the relations between the State and the private sector, in order to produce an analysis of what some have dubbed "public-private networks".

The transport sector (Siemiatycki, 2013; Haughton and McManus, 2012) is often used as a laboratory for these analyses. Other works explore urban social conflicts, the resistance to neoliberalisation (Leitner et al., 2007; Künkel and Mayer, 2012). A third group examines the processes of adaptation/reception of neoliberalism and considers the small-scale conditions of its propagation: they question the success of international urban visions, borrowing for example from Florida's 'creative city' (2002), the flow of models from North to South, but also between South and South. Several authors (Jessop and Peck, 2001; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Peck 2011) highlight "fast policy transfer", i.e. the processes of dissemination of ideas and strategies, mainly originating in the US, and the accelerating life cycle of urban policies (see also Ward 2011 and McCann and Ward 2013 who apply it to the Business Improvement Districts). They stress the co-evolution of generic neoliberal models and their avatars, the sharing of criteria, referents, vocabulary, the development of "benchmarking".

---

benefit of the upper classes and to the detriment of vulnerable populations and territories. It is accompanied by a growing "volatility" of global capitalism, marked by successive periods of boom and bust.

More recently, certain works have sought to develop theoretical debate (Jessop, 2013) by challenging the relevance of the neoliberal agenda since the crisis of 2007–2009 and exploring "post-neoliberalism". The prefix "post" corresponds to the political summons to grasp the possibilities offered by this historic moment in order to go beyond neoliberalism, on the grounds that it has sapped confidence in the regulatory power of the market. This assessment draws above all on the analysis of the attempts at reform by left-wing South American regimes (Brand and Sekler, 2009). These works attempt to lay the foundations of an equitable urban reorganisation (see the special issue of *Development Dialogue*, published for the 2009 World Social Forum, No. 51, January 2009): "*The focus is not on the question of whether a new, postneoliberal era in general has begun and what might be the criteria supporting or contesting such an assessment. Rather, we propose to consider postneoliberalism as a perspective on social, political and/or economic transformations, on shifting terrains of social struggles and compromises*" (page 6). It is about opening up a domain of ideas on emancipation. Peck et al. (2010, 2013), like Sheppard and Leitner (2010), dispute this analysis and maintain that the crisis has only led to adjustments designed to consolidate neoliberalism: it would no longer operate by promoting market dogma but would find roundabout ways to express itself through a false neo-Keynesianism (Aalbers, 2013). According to these authors, there would be no emergence of "new rationalities of urban governance", but simply readjustment processes that would reflect a capacity to adapt to the crisis (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2013). Oosterlynck and González (2013) show, for example, that post-2008 OECD discourses are dominated by continuities. This reluctance to embrace the debate on post-neoliberalism is partly driven by confusions linked with the media use of that concept: in journalistic analyses it is often equated with the idea of the death of neoliberalism and the belief in the advent of a "postneoliberal" era, in which neoliberalism is conquered by the return of the neo-Keynesian state, hitherto reduced to a role as regulator of the abuses of financial capitalism.

These debates converge on the question of the plasticity of neoliberalism. This question is formulated by Brenner and Theodore (2002) in the form of a research programme. They propose to examine what they call "actually existing neoliberalism": how this ideology adjusts to specific local contexts within the framework of dependence on a meta-context, on the existence of a globalised neoliberal environment, what they call "path dependency": "*An understanding of actually existing neoliberalism must therefore explore the path dependent, contextually specific interactions between inherited regulatory landscapes and emergent neoliberal, market-oriented restructuring projects at a broad range of geographical scales*" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). This demands the development of close-grained periodisations to reflect the specificity of the modes of adaptation of

neoliberalism outside its heartland (Peck and Tickell, 2002). In a more recent text, in response to criticisms of the excessively rigid and diffusionist nature of their approach, Brenner and Theodore (2010) shift the emphasis by talking about the "variegation" of neoliberalism, defined as the "systematic production of geoinstitutionnal differentiation". This firstly reflect the fact that neoliberalisation precedes unevenly from one context to another, and secondly the capacity of neoliberalism to incorporate a constant need for reform into the framework of experimental trial and error procedures, in order to overcome its internal contradictions. The aim of this standpoint is to avoid the twin trap of the determinism of neo-Marxist structuralism, which inevitably culminates in convergence, and of the poststructuralist fluidity of Foucauldian approaches to neoliberalism (Barry et al., 1996; Ong, 2006; Miller and Rose, 2008; Nadesan, 2008), which emphasise hybridity and variability and, in their view, lead to impasse.

Through these theoretical debates, a dynamic approach to neoliberalisation has emerged: while in the mid-2000s some continued to speak of neoliberalism or of the "neoliberal city" from a fixist perspective, and indeed without always defining it (Hackworth, 2007), most authors now see neoliberalisation as an unstable and perpetually self reinventing process. Neoliberalisation does not act as a stabilising force for a political and economic state. It is rife with tensions and contradictions that destabilise local governance and generate phenomena of urban crisis, which – because of the process of creative destruction inherent in the dynamics of neoliberalisation – forces a constant reinvention of the neoliberal project at local scale to overcome these phenomena. The question is how to approach this "failure regulation system" theoretically, with its constant shifts between disequilibrium and reequilibrium, how to account for disturbance rather than stability.

2- "Backing off": a tricky and controversial translation

Setting the debate in these terms is both ambiguous and stimulating. It has enabled certain authors to leave the northern hemisphere and enter or re-enter the terrains of the South armed with a different theoretical framework than the dominant and previously customary perspectives of development and globalisation. They were able to express the normality of the cities of the South in their permeability to this ideology, indeed regardless of the nature of their political regimes. Neoliberalism would prosper equally in a democratic, authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regime (see Ong, 2006 and her work on the "exceptional" character of neoliberalism in the authoritarian regimes of Asia, a long way from what she calls the realm of "neoliberalism with a big N"). In fact, works on neoliberalisation in the cities of the

South are becoming increasingly numerous. They focus particularly on the big cities of the emerging countries which, in the face of global economic competition, have adopted entrepreneurial agendas. This paradigm shift offers a way to rethink the role of the southern hemisphere, particularly the emerging countries, in globalisation, if we accept that neoliberalisation is not simply a disciplinary regime, emanating from the big international agencies and imposed on these countries as passive recipients.

Nevertheless, the question of the application and of the diffusion of neoliberal doctrine in the South and in cities of the South is contested: many authors (Peck, 2001; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Sheppard and Leitner, 2010) allude to the effects of the "Washington consensus" which, in the 1980s, imposed "structural adjustments" on then so-called Third World countries through the intermediary of the big international institutions and in particular the World Bank, which led to the widescale diffusion of policies of budgetary and fiscal discipline, service privatisation, deregulation and redirection of public spending towards sectors of high "investment return" (but also towards greater income redistribution). In this respect, David Harvey (2005) reduces the countries and the cities of the South to the role of mere "followers" and Peck et al. (2008) refers to them as a vague, undifferentiated "elsewhere". However, far from resulting in completely uniform policies, the Washington consensus met with opposition, resistance and local adaptations (Sheppard and Leitner, 2010), and culminated in a wide variety of models.

However rich the approach in terms of variation/variability, therefore, it still comes up against the question of the relevance of neoliberalisation as a frame of reference: if everything is just variation and instability, where do we start talking about neoliberalisation, and where do we stop? Lurches towards neoliberalism may be very apparent in certain southern countries, particularly those that underwent structural adjustments in the 1980s, but they are far from being generalisable. This is evidenced by the polemic over the adaptability of this theoretical framework to the South African case (see inset). In addition, this problem requires a diachronic approach able to identify historical shifts and temporal discontinuities. Here again, though, interpretation is tricky. In this issue, Martine Drozdz mentions the critiques of Chris Pickvance (2012) in this respect. The latter points out that the system of public-private partnership in the construction of social housing in England predates the introduction of neoliberal urban policies. Peter Shapely (2013) maintains that PPP have been at the heart of all British urban development since the 19th century. We can only speak of neoliberalisation, therefore, with respect to their recent spread. But how can we measure its durability, especially since the social consequences of these policies have already led to corrective adjustments to public action (the famous "roll-out")? This raises questions about the nature and meaning of the swings between roll-back and roll-out: corrections to the devastating effects of the previous phase,

changes in global capitalism, or transformations in local urban societies and the operation of their elites (Pinson 2009, quoted by Béal, 2010)? Thus, Sheppard and Leitner (2010) speak, in the case of the globalisation of neoliberalism and its penetration into the southern hemisphere, of a "post-Washington consensus" which, in response to the financial crisis and the growing opposition to neoliberalism from civil societies and even nations, has led to less talk about the need for structural adjustment and privatisation and more about governance and poverty reduction.

South Africa neoliberal?

In South Africa, the neoliberal framework is mobilized by neo-marxist scholars, either in their underlining of the variety of capitalism or in their analysis of the financialization of the South African economy (Fine, 2013). They draw on the neoliberal theme to describe the transformation of postapartheid macroeconomic policies and their social consequences (Bond, 2000 and 2002; Narsiah, 2003; Miraftab, 2004a; Desai, 2002; Desai and Pithouse, 2004): the move from the RDP (*Reconstruction and Development Programme*, redistributive, 1994-96) to the GEAR (*Growth, Employment and Redistribution*, growth programme, 1996-2006). They blame this move for the subordination of human rights to fiscal constraints, with the abandonment of the RDP's ambitions regarding fundamental needs having led notably to massive industrial job losses. At the urban scale, price increases have primarily hit urban services (Desai, 2002) as a result of corporatisation or privatisation (McDonald and Pape, 2002; McDonald and Smith, 2004; McDonald and Ruiters, 2005), which have led to an extension of the principle of cost recovery by means of prepaid meter systems, resulting in large-scale evictions and disconnections. The ANC, which holds power at national level and in almost all the big cities (except Cape Town), contests this interpretation and virulently rebuts descriptions of its political programme as neoliberal. Activist intellectuals with links to the state sector and action research support this analysis. For Susan Parnell and Jennifer Robinson (2010), to superimpose on the South African context the prism of a neoliberal analysis developed by reference to North America and the United Kingdom, results in a failure to carry out a fine-grained analysis of dynamics that do not chronologically reflect the "roll-back/roll-out" sequence. This interpretation would, moreover, minimise the fact that in South Africa redistributive efforts run alongside the commodification of services, the implementation of PPP... which would tend to disguise the scale of the developmental challenges and the moral imperative to participate in the reorganisation of a postapartheid city alongside the

---

authorities (Morange, 2011). These authors ask us not to give up on the developmental debate, but to re-engage with it in terms of the establishment of "rights to the city", linked in their view with the "reinforcement of the state's regulatory capacities". The postapartheid "transition" is in fact characterised by strong public interventionism, expressed within the constraints of the global post-Fordist economy. For example, housing policy relies on significant institutional and financial commitment by the state (Morange, 2006). In reality, what we find are concomitant forms of dismantlement and reinvention of public interventionism (Didier et al., 2013). This controversy relates to the ideological dividing lines between the otherwise closely linked academic and political worlds: some see in the theme of the "developer state" a barely concealed version of neoliberalism and a way of bringing in elements of redistributive rhetoric and practices in order retrospectively to justify the ANC's neoliberal turn, by redefining it in developmental terms (supposedly the goal of the *Shared Growth Initiative* which succeeded the GEAR in 2006); others reject the description neoliberal and consider the pairing of neoliberalism and development to be an oxymoron. This is connected with internal political debates within the party machine, where proponents of an orthodox line consistent with the ANC's historical Marxist commitment confront artisans of a liberal policy in breach with the tenets of the Communist Party and COSATU (South Africa's big trade union congress).

Moreover, the option of local variability seems difficult to employ within the framework of a globalising neo-Marxist interpretation of the evolution of objects of public action. If there is a global trend towards neoliberalism, whatever the local nuances, how can the principles of convergence and divergence between the various forms that neoliberalisation can undertake be articulated? This perhaps partly explains the difficulties, in France, of coming to grips with the debate. Indeed, it runs counter to the efforts of neo-institutionalism to think about the variability of capitalism and its manifestations (national or local). Thus, for Dominique Lorrain (2013), the neo-Marxist approach to neoliberalism, as developed for example by Brenner and Theodore (2002), in stressing the big structural factors that explain the phases in capitalism's evolution, "*does not encourage an examination of the processes that explain the shift from one regime to another, nor close study of the actors who contributed to these transformations. These approaches are more interested in the determinants than in the actors, and in the social forces that trigger the determining mechanisms*". Distancing himself both from these approaches and from those based on growth coalitions (Logan and Molotch, 1987) and urban regimes (Stone, 1989) which, in his view, "remain at a level of excessive generality",

Dominique Lorrain – while highlighting the rise of the role of markets in the city – pleads for greater attention to be paid to all the "second rank" institutions (and not only the most visible and "traditional" ones), to the tools (e.g. Accounting), to the standards, which assist the actors in a given local context. Vincent Béal (2010) has similar criticisms of the works on neoliberalisation, though welcoming their contributions (notably the identification of the mechanisms of domination and the inequalities produced by urban policies). For him, these works do not go far enough in explaining the mechanisms that change urban policies and pay too little attention to the local political factors influencing these changes. With Max Rousseau (Béal and Rousseau, 2008), he pleads for a stronger "empirical anchorage" in neo-Marxist approaches to neoliberalisation.

Following the example of these authors, some French political scientists have seized on the literature on neoliberalisation and drawn from it very stimulating elements for their own research. Renaud Epstein (2013), in his analysis of urban renovation policies, shows how the establishment of France's National Urban Renewal Agency reflects the application of theories of New Public Management and the introduction by the state of a method of "remote control government".[7] Gilles Pinson and Max Rousseau (2011) have largely drawn on neo-Marxist works to demonstrate the replacement of town planning policies with policies of metropolitanisation, reflecting an approach to cities as spaces where market players interact and therefore a scale to be prioritised in public policies. Christelle Morel Jourdel and Valérie Sala Pala (2011) have sought to apply the theoretical framework of neoliberalisation to the population growth policies conducted in Saint-Etienne, from the perspective of strategies of residential attractiveness and gentrification.

However, most of these authors distance themselves from the Anglo-Saxon approaches, first by showing the difficulties of applying these approaches mechanically in the French context, where the domination of market players is substantially tempered by the influence of national and local public actors and the capacity of the latter to negotiate and impose their point of view, and second by highlighting the diversity of local forms of regulation (Le Galès, 2001 and 2011; Pollard, 2009; Morel Jourdel and Sala Pala, 2011). Generally speaking, these authors stress the failure of critical Anglo-Saxon works to pay sufficient attention to political factors and the limitations of importing them into the French context. The collection edited by Bruno Jobert (1994) explored the spread of neoliberalism into European economic and social policies. Even then, it stressed the gradual penetration of this ideological norm, the unevenness of its acceptance by the systems of production of

---

[7] This remote action model is already present in Foucault's analysis of neoliberalism, which shows that governmental action seems to be limited to interventions of an indirect kind, which are nonetheless effective for all that (Paltrinieri, 2013).

public action depending on the permeability of national cultures, the partial persistence of the Keynesian current and an unevenly implemented alteration in the rules of social dialogue (the shift from the post-war redistributive state to the state as arbiter and regulator).

The debates on neoliberal urbanisation therefore arouse strong curiosity in France, but also a certain mistrust. They are tackled in the form of questions,[8] or through epistemological readings by political analysts who reflect the difficulties of French urban geography and political science in establishing a dialogue with Anglophone urban studies. Max Rousseau (2013) looks at their complementarity and what they can contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the policies underway in deindustrialised cities, especially by reintroducing the long term into the analysis. The 5-phase periodisation he proposes of the image policies conducted in Sheffield and Roubaix helps to refine the frame of regulationist interpretation by going beyond a simple sequential account of Fordism and Post-Fordism. Vincent Béal (2010) questions the divergence of these research traditions in the light of the history of the structuring of the two worlds' disciplinary fields. Finally, amongst the French works, even those that attempt a dialogue with the English-speaking world rely on the French tradition of social science research, which values fieldwork over theory and places the emphasis on local political choices rather than economic accumulation, revenues and capital flows (see the work by Max Rousseau 2011 on the redevelopment strategies of the deindustrialised cities of Roubaix and Sheffield). Where Anglo-Saxon research primarily considers the external constraints associated with neoliberal globalisation, its French counterpart looks at local nuances through the lens of policy and via empirically highly documented comparative approaches (Béal and Rousseau, 2008).

A similar analysis for French geography and for urbanism and planning would make little sense, because these disciplines largely ignore the debate. The authors who consider the question of neoliberalisation do so through connected issues, which shift the focus. They approach neoliberalisation indirectly, for example from the perspective of the dissemination of so-called models of "best practice", through questions of sharing, learning, reinterpretation, "experience making" (Navez-Bouchanine and Valladares, 2007) or else from the perspective of "nomad expertise" through an approach based on social networks, know-how transfer and professional practices (Verdeil, 2005). They also approach it via the comparative study of regeneration policies (e.g. the "heritagisation" of the old historic districts of Genoa,

---

[8] See for example the colloquium "La ville néolibérale: une thèse crédible ?" [The neoliberal city: a credible thesis?], held in September 2012 at the University of Lyon. Its briefing document emphasises the tension between neo-Marxism and neo-institutionalism, but does not mention the efforts of the former to establish a theory of variability.

Valparaiso and Liverpool, for Sébastien Jacquot, 2007), or by questioning the nature of public space in the areas produced by private action (in the case of the London Docklands studies by Perrine Michon (2008), which draw on the contributions of Augustin Berque). Only Xavier Desjardins (2008) analyses the changes in social housing policy with explicit reference to the rise of neoliberalism. However, he relies only marginally on Anglo-Saxon studies and draws primarily on Foucault's work. Even research on the role of the World Bank in cities in the era of structural adjustments is tackled by Annick Osmont (1995), for example, from the perspective of global discipline, but not within the neoliberal framework. Only a particular geography of urban services in the southern hemisphere falls within the debate on neoliberalisation, in relation to the question of privatisation and public-private schemes (see for example Baron and Peyroux 2011 or work by Sylvy Jaglin cited below), represented in this issue in the contributions of Jérémy Robert and Judicaëlle Dietrich. More recently, the neoliberal theme has been associated with the classical topics of marginality (and citizen resistance) in studies on the cities of the southern hemisphere (Florin et al., 2014).

3- City, neoliberalisation and … (in)justice ?

The process of neoliberalisation, for all authors belonging to the neo-Marxist current, is by essence geographically uneven and socially regressive (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). Uneven development is seen as inherent to the development of capitalism, in line with the necessity for capital to make use of specific territories as forces of production. Brenner and Theodore speak of "uneven development [as] *a key expression of capital's relentless drive to mobilize particular territories and places as forces of production*". Consequently, uneven spatial development is sometimes understood as a form of spatial injustice in so far as it parallels social and territorial polarization (of the centre/periphery form). Furthermore, neoliberalisation is seen as a roll-back of redistributive and procedural justice, and even as authoritarian in nature ("*the grim scenario of a neoliberalized urban authoritarianism*") : "*cities engage aggressively in mutually destructive place-marketing policies, in which transnational capital is permitted to opt out from supporting local social reproduction, and in which the power of urban citizens to influence the basic conditions of their everyday life is increasingly undermined*" (Brenner et Theodore, 2002, p. 376). Thus, the authors who manipulate this category share a taste for heterodoxy and a form of ideological – if not militant or partisan – commitment, which links them with the very wide field of critical urban studies. For Lagueux (1989), this reflects the division between "champions of social justice (heirs to the philosophy of the Enlightenment) and of individual liberty (liberals)", a difference in his view

central to political science theories of neoliberalism. Nevertheless, while all agree on the utility of the critical scope of this term, they do not all adopt the same ideological frame of reference and do not necessarily agree on the nature of the links between injustice, the city and neoliberalisation.

The renewal of critical thinking on urban issues in the English-speaking world above all drives a highly visible and committed Marxist-inspired geography of exclusion, which aspires to denounce the oppressive character of the capitalist social and urban order. It analyses the consequences of urban entrepreneurship and neoliberal urban regeneration, in particular in the inner cities: control over public spaces, masking of urban marginality, criminalisation of poverty, policies of surveillance, security and "zero tolerance", inspired by the New York model, "urban revanchism" (Smith, 1996) and eviction of working-class populations, all phenomena linked with capital's reoccupation of these spaces. Don Mitchell's work (2001) on the aestheticisation of public spaces and the exclusion of the homeless in the "post-justice city" is a benchmark in the field.

The "fuzzy" (Castree, 2006) or "chaotic" concept of neoliberalism (Jessop, 2013) would thus seem to have become an essential anchor point for any discourse in the radical or critical domain. In this regard, Bob Jessop (2013) notes that the term neoliberalism is used almost entirely by its detractors, and eschewed by its presumed practitioners. To the point that it is to be wondered whether its success as a buzzword (Peck, 2004) does not owe something to the desire to share academic space and visibility through this dialogue with Anglophone radical geography.[9] The conceptual scope of this notion is thus sometimes suspected of being weaker than its motivating power as a socially constructed concept designed to underpin a critical discourse and practice. To all the "antis" who indignantly document the misdeeds of neoliberalisation, Ferguson (2009) has issued the challenge of abandoning a posture that is entirely self-referential and, in his view, generates no counter-rationality.

In any case, the neo-Marxist perspective leaves little room for hope of change, and these critiques are difficult for social movements to run with (Boudreau and Pattaroni, 2011). Recently, therefore, neo-Marxist analysis has tried to incorporate thinking on the opposition to injustices. Loretta Lees (2013), for example, attempts to reposition the horizon of a city with "a more open and hopeful grammar of urban injustice" than that proposed by the pessimistic motifs of "revanchism" and the "death of politics", by studying the protest movements of public housing tenants (Southwark, London) against urban regeneration. These debates link with certain discussions on the "right to the city" (Brenner et al., 2012; Smith and McQuarri, 2012), which have experienced

---

[9] This perhaps explains the lesser success of these approaches in France, where this imperative is (still) less pressing than in other European and/or English-speaking countries.

a revival of interest with the rereading of Henri Lefebvre's texts. Participants in the "Cities for people" project[10] thus speak about agents of change (who should bear the right to the city?) and how they can be mobilised, and the content of emancipatory claims, from a more optimistic perspective. They also link with works on anti-neoliberal social movements and on their capacity to oppose neoliberal rationality: Sagie Narsiah (2007), for example, studies how social movements have given rise to alternatives to commercial logic in the domain of urban services in South Africa.

Although critical urban studies are dominated by the neo-Marxist current, Boudreau and Pattaroni (2011) have stressed that there also exists more "ordinary" critiques of neoliberalisation.[11]. They emanate from within the system and seek to achieve corrective effects. In particular, they denounce the abandonment of the goal of equality between territories (territorial planning/spatial redistribution) and between individuals (social redistribution) in favour of a target of equity measured by universal access to services; for example, the neglect and decline in quality of service to disadvantaged areas in urban transport policies and the concentration of public investment on nodes or strategic axes and the involvement of private actors in the field of urban transport. Here we might allude to the work done by Siemiatycki (2005) on Vancouver, Grengs (2004) on Los Angeles, Farmer (2011) on Chicago, or Enright (2013) on Grand Paris. This critique is often rooted in nostalgia for a Keynesian welfare state perceived as fairer (if not fair). This motif of socio-spatial inequality and inequality of service between territories is present in both the neo-Marxist approach and the neo-Keynesian approaches: they come together around the notion of the State (failing, absent, rolling back...). The eviction of the working classes from the old inner cities by policies of demolition/conversion applied to the social housing stock is thus condemned equally by neo-Keynesians and neo-Marxists, although from a Marxist perspective, these housing stocks are the result of demand-side policies developed by the Fordist regime of accumulation.

All these texts, however, postulate more than they analyse the link between injustice and neoliberalisation. Often, neoliberalism constitutes something of a backdrop, the setting in which the contemporary urban tragedies of exclusion, dispossession,

---

[10] This was a working group that formed around Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse and Margit Mayer at a conference in Berlin in 2008. Their texts were published in a special issue of *City* in 2009 Vol. 13 Nos 2-3) and in book form.

[11] The question of inequalities, alienation or domination in the city is of course tackled by authors who do not draw on the neoliberal vein: David Imbroscio (2010), for example, sees in the division between state and market, between economics and politics (the founding principle of the liberalism of American urbanism, which imbues political representations), the reason why urban development is largely left to the market. Susan Fainstein (2010) discusses the emergence of counter-models of the entrepreneurial city, through a dialogue that goes beyond the neo-Marxist current (with feminism, with John Rawls...). Being unable to tackle all these rich debates, we content ourselves with an exploration of the link between justice and neoliberalisation.

exploitation are played out. This body of work thus condemns an infinity of injustices that derive from different registers. Gordon McLeod (2002), for example, in his study of the regeneration of Glasgow, in turn denounces "jobless regeneration", the lie of the promise of "trickle down", the relocation of the poor and the spatial and social exclusion associated with the clearance of space, the budget cuts that have led to an increase in public health problems. Social marginalisation, territorial dispossession, socio-spatial exclusion, declining urban services, all these linked dynamics are attributed wholesale to neoliberalisation. Here we see the nebulous character of a notion that one moment is synonymous with entrepreneurial gentrification/regeneration, at another, for example, with austerity.

In addition, cities did not wait until the 1970s to become unjust. Don Mitchell (1997) acknowledges that the criminalisation of the poor and laws against the homeless date back (at least) to the 19th century and, quoting Marx, that they already played a role in the social regulation of the threat constituted by the "army of the poor". However, he maintains that neoliberalisation generated a proliferation of regulatory and legislative provisions intended to attract and retain capital and that a "degree" was crossed in this respect. The neo-Marxist response is generally articulated around the idea of a great of exclusion, which we find again in the southern hemisphere in the thesis of an exacerbation of the inequalities inherited from colonisation.

On this issue, certain works question the conditions of the spread of neoliberalism, maintaining that this derives from its capacity to take account of local demand for justice. They break down its dissemination into fine-grained periodisations to show its capacity to overcome its internal contradictions. It is true that neoliberalisation is often accompanied by the reformulation of discourses on justice, because in even the most aggressive projects the objectives of social and spatial justice are rarely entirely disregarded. The social consequences of the phases of proto-neoliberalisation or roll-back (structural adjustments in the southern hemisphere) are also often followed by phases of roll-out during which public policies attempt to correct the social consequences of the previous period, in particular by introducing greater participation and procedural justice. In cases where the roll-back/roll-out sequence does not operate, neoliberalism's adaptation to local demand for justice can be the condition for its initial spread. For example, in Cape Town, Sophie Didier et al. (2013) discuss the emergence of "local third ways", which incorporate elements of classical liberal charity policies that make inner-city urban regeneration policies more consistent with postapartheid transformation goals. In this case, the adjustment took 5 years, against significant political and social opposition. Similarly, Michael Harloe (2001) shows that the purpose of the anti social exclusion policy introduced by Tony Blair's government in 1997 was to reconcile competitiveness with social cohesion, the latter having been undermined by the previous Conservative governments. The

pursuit of social justice (in particular distributive justice) was thus at the heart of a policy that was nevertheless fully embedded in a neoliberal perspective.

The interpretation of the consequences of neoliberalisation is therefore ambiguous, with regard to distributive justice, as well as with regard to procedural justice. James Ferguson (2007) for instance insists on the ambivalence in the discourses of pro-BIG supporters in South Africa (the Basic Income Grant campaign of the 2000s, which would consist in a universal social grant only conditioned by nationality): these discourses, driven by an altogether pro-poor and neoliberal rationality, redefine the place of "informal" activities in the States project. In works on the rise of citizen participation, the authors emphasise both the limitations of neoliberal participation and the forms of procedural justice with the capacity to produce corrective outcomes. Thus, the empowerment procedures deployed in contemporary regeneration policies have sometimes fostered the involvement of community organisations and the development of local social services, leading to forms of power sharing, while still being compatible with a neoliberal system of management (Bacqué and Biewener, 2013). The same ambiguity is found in works on the devolution-delegation of traditional public service roles to communities. Certain authors note that it can improve access to services for the poorest, thanks to forms of community privatisation compatible with a degree of social integration (Jaglin, 2005; Jaglin and Zérah, 2010). The "pro-poor" service privatisation policies implemented in certain countries show the same ambivalence (Poupeau, 2007; Spronk, 2009). Neo-Marxists see them as twisting the rhetoric of social inclusion in favour of material exclusion (e.g. for waste collection in Cape Town, Miraftab, 2004a) and emphasise the exploitation of an underpaid labour force in the name of "sweat equity". Sternberg (2013) thus analyses the processes of regularisation and inclusion of informal practices within the neoliberal framework (garbage collection in Buenos Aires). Issues of different kinds are in the balance: the city dweller as user/inhabitant (service access register); the city dweller as embodiment of the exploitation and dispossession of his class, owning only the power of his labour.

This raises a problem of historical referents that echoes the debate on the North-South divide. Redistribution and territorial rebalancing are considered in relation to a possible model at a given moment in the history of the cities of the northern hemisphere, which has little meaning for the cities of the South. Access to services has never been widespread here because of the relative weakness of the state and because of colonial segregation or apartheid. The historical reference here is the motif of territorial inequality and segregation (whether institutional or not), not territorial disconnection. James Ferguson (2009) emphasises that the restoration of the welfare state in situations of massive underemployment, where the informal economy is the norm, is historically meaningless. It corresponds to an idealisation of

what the African states were in the 1970s, or to a developmental myth. Which does not mean that neoliberalisation does not accentuate inherited inequalities in access to services. The question of justice can therefore be thought of in relation to an ideal situation (historically situated or not, idealised or not), or in relation to an already unjust starting point that is becoming more unjust. Another way of posing the question of colonial continuities is to think not in terms of raising injustices, but in terms of a qualitative change in the way they are perpetuated. Marianne Morange (publication pending) thus shows how the banning of street trading in Nairobi, a neo-hygienist obsession that dates back to the colonial period, now entails the recruitment of traders into a process of participation based on entrepreneurial rationality and imposed on the authorities by a private urban regeneration agency.

These analyses of participation relate to the emergence of the figure of the self-made individual entrepreneur, highlighted both in neo-Marxist works and in Foucault's analysis, which describe a neoliberal subject "who constructs himself by constantly assessing his capacities in order to improve and increase them, making his life itself a permanent test of his human capital" (Paltrinieri, 2013). When it comes to the struggle against social exclusion, workfare policies (Peck, 2001) developed in numerous countries from the 1990s onwards clearly reflect this logic. We shift from a conception of solidarity as a collective construction guaranteed by rights, to a contractual and conditional interpretation, based on a logic of mutual advantage and individual responsibility (Castel and Duvoux, 2013). The policies of subsidy for individual mobility introduced since the late 1990s form part of this process: mobility is seen as a personal resource that needs to be mobilised in order to maximise the employability of individuals (Fol, 2009).

Rather than accepting the implicit presupposition of an automatic link between neoliberalisation and injustice, we wish in this issue to raise the question of that link explicitly and directly. In other disciplinary fields (environmental studies, gender studies…), this debate is well underway. In urban studies, however, we feel that the debate is still in its infancy, and we aspire to move it forward. We felt that this would perhaps enable us to avoid the trap exposed by Cochrane (2008, quoted by Béal, 2010): he sees the neoliberal analytical framework as a way to identify the general principles of the progression of urban policies, outside their local specificities, and to think about the drivers of these shared transformations; the danger, however, is that of being content with labels and nothing more, as if characterising these processes as neoliberal were enough to explain and account for them, notably with respect to injustice.

The authors who answered our call tackle these questions from different contexts and horizons. Four articles focus on northern subjects (London, New York and Sheffield)

in the English-speaking world and on Italy (Savona). Their authors are very familiar with the debates within Anglophone radical geography, and indeed in some cases have written about them (e.g. Max Rousseau). Martine Drozdz is in direct contact with the field, since she works in London, in an Anglophone institutional environment. These texts explore the classic topics of neoliberal urbanisation studies: property speculation and urban renewal, urban marketing and gentrification, access to services. They tackle this debate in terms of redistributive justice and exclusion, governance and PPP. Two of them take us out not only from the "heartland of neoliberalism", but also from the "commonplaces" of neoliberalisation, because they make their subject medium-sized cities (Roubaix, Sheffield, archetypal instances of deindustrialisation-regeneration) and one "provincial" example, Savona.

Martine Drozdz periodises the relation between justice and neoliberalisation in the case of London's urban policies. She shows how the injustices produced by the Conservative government during the period of the state's neoliberal shift (1979-1997) (diminution of political equality and degradation of the socio-economic conditions of the most disadvantaged) were picked up in the speeches of New Labour (1997-2010) and reformulated in terms of a crisis of political representation. This led to the introduction of participatory approaches designed to strengthen procedural justice. However, these approaches malfunctioned. Her diachronic analysis of the *New Deal for Communities* (NDC), a territorialised programme of resistance to exclusion in marginalised urban areas, thus shows that injustices that arise from the maintenance of neoliberal economic policies coexist with new injustices originating in institutional and procedural dysfunctions.

Charlotte Recoquillon studies gentrification policies in New York City's West Harlem district. These policies, implemented by both public and private actors, are analysed as the embodiment of a neoliberalisation of New York City, in the sense that public intervention was used to create the conditions for the influx of private investment into Harlem. This neglected and much rundown district then began a new cycle of improvement with strong municipal backing. As with the case of the declining cities studied by Max Rousseau, the benefits of these gentrification policies are nevertheless unevenly distributed, leading to a situation of racial injustice. Indeed, the transformation of the district led to the eviction of part of the poor black population. Similarly, the planned University of Columbia extension, backed by the municipality, will bring about the relocation of large numbers of families and the disappearance of many jobs occupied by local people, and the compensations negotiated with local associations will not offset the damage caused by this operation.

Max Rousseau explores phase 5 of the neoliberalisation policies in Sheffield and Roubaix, which he describes as "late urban entrepreneurial". He analyses the process whereby capital previously invested in the productive sector is transferred to the urban and residential economy, and describes the strategies of "upscaling" (an expression he prefers to gentrification which, in his view, is incapable of doing justice to the degree to which these strategies seek to transform all social practices) employed to change the social profile of the inhabitants and resident consumers. These upscaling strategies reverse the traditional paradigm of urban policies, since social transformation precedes and is supposed to potentiate economic transformation, by giving declining areas a new image, a signal to potential investors. For him, these policies are fundamentally unjust, insofar as they redistribute public investment to the benefit of the middle and upper classes, a minority but a minority to be retained or attracted, to the detriment of the working classes which were the social and political bedrock of these cities and now find themselves marginalised, with no benefit from the effects of these transformations.

Dario Colombo and Manuela Porcu condemn the effects of a property speculation unconnected with demographic and social realities in Savona: thousands of high status dwellings and second homes have replaced the industrial spaces, and the productive industrial base has been dismantled in order to promote the fantasy of a service economy that has never been fulfilled, while the new homes remained empty. In their view, neoliberalisation has prospered in the fertile soil of an urban and economic planning void.

Three authors are working on southern hemisphere cities. They enter less directly into dialogue with radical or critical geography. They primarily draw on the neoliberal theme to take a new look at the traditional objects of developmental studies (access to water and health services in conditions of high urban growth, natural risk and urbanisation), by reconsidering the question of territorial inequalities, segregation and access to urban services. In these contexts, the link with justice seems more obvious because of the patent social and spatial injustices in these cities, features that seem even to define them when observed and analysed from a northern hemisphere perspective.

Judicaëlle Dietrich explores urban policies in Jakarta, in particular the privatisation of water management. In a context marked by very poor development of water supply networks and sharp inequalities in access, the Indonesian government, with the support of the World Bank, launched an international invitation to tender for the management of water production and distribution. The two chosen companies operate via a public-private partnership, through which private capital can be injected into infrastructures and management, whereas the municipality retains both

ownership of the network and a right of oversight with regard to future investment and pricing policy. While the pricing system reduces the cost of the service for modest households, the municipality's assumption of the cost does not encourage it to consider extending the service to poor neighbourhoods still without provision. At the same time, the different types of subsidy offered by NGOs to help certain households connect to the system are conditional on the beneficiary's readiness and ability to pay, and are part of a process of individualisation of development initiatives which is tending to perpetuate or even reinforce both inequalities and injustices.

Jérémy Robert, in his study of access to hospital care in Lima, shows how, since the 1990s, the implementation of neoliberal policies has led to an aggravation of inequalities in access to care, linked with the "*abandonment of the spatial planning of care provision in favour of development based on funding opportunities, through one-off projects*". Apart from the quantitative aggravation, he argues that neoliberalisation produces a qualitative shift: a "dislocation of the care system" linked with the emergence of new private actors in this field and the multiplication of local services with no connection to a planned metropolitan system, resulting in a social stratification of care. Finally, he describes how, paradoxically, this unequal territorial provision can be seen as a necessary correction to the organised public failure of the previous period, and therefore an improvement in level of service that certain inhabitants approve and are ready to defend through activism. Here we encounter again the debate on the interpretation of the justice or injustice of territorialisation, extended to the question of its political reception.

Claudio Pulgar analyses the effects of the 2010 earthquake in Chile, as revealing the inequalities and spatial injustices shaped by 40 years of neoliberalisation in the country. He also studies the processes of resilience and resistance that followed a shakeup which, according to him, was as much social as chthonic. Indeed, the earthquake highlighted the very sharp inequalities in Chile, especially in the sphere of housing, resulting from policies that tend primarily to favour private investment. While the reconstruction policy introduced after the quake was intended to maintain this preference for private actors, the resistance of social movements challenged this model and opened up new areas of debate.

All these authors, we believe, belong to the family of critical urban studies, in the sense that they deploy a discourse of change, normative to differing degrees, but political in bent. It is the researchers from the north (French and Italian) who have embraced the Anglophone interpretative framework. Their ideological frames of reference and relations to neo-Marxism are nevertheless variable: the adherence is very marked in the articles by Colombo and Porcu and by Recoquillon, for whom the link between neoliberalisation and injustice is direct, and who situate themselves

within a now classical geography of exclusion; it is less sharp in the texts by Rousseau and Drozdz, who conduct an arms-length dialogue with this tradition and think more in terms of the periodisation of neoliberalisation processes. We also find here two examples of the emergence of "French style" critical thought (Calbérac and Morange 2013). Robert and Dietrich, for their part, situate their critical stance in the debates on the territorialisation of public policies against a background of strong budgetary constraint, and on the question of access to open services in cities with limited amenities. Here, the developmental prism combines with neoliberalisation to condemn the aggravation of spatial injustices. This approach is identified with the emergence of a global discipline arising from structural adjustments that are seen as exacerbating inherited inequalities. This relates to the debate on the historical divide and neo-Keynesian nostalgia, which takes a different form in the context of the southern hemisphere: Jérémy Robert stresses that "*the absence of a regulatory state and the existence of inequalities have marked the history of Peru since its independence*", but he maintains that neoliberalisation has accentuated them by concentrating resources on central hospitals and by allowing the rise of private provision which reinforces social segregation, the divide between centre and periphery and the rise of inequalities between peripheries.

Researchers from the southern hemisphere are little represented. Only Claudio Pulgar, PhD researcher at the Institute of Higher Social Science Research, teaches in the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism at the University of Chile. As for anglophone researchers, they are the big no-shows in this issue. Not that we wanted to exclude them. Simply, and it is a matter of great disappointment to us, they did not respond to the call, which was widely disseminated in the English language community of critical ideas. Martine Drozdz has suggested that our approach was out of step with the debates currently underway in the United Kingdom and North America (focused on questions of adaptability, variability, post-neoliberalism...), which could explain a difficulty of reception. Nevertheless, we hope that the arena we have opened up here in both languages will constitute the start of a continuing and fruitful discussion with our English-speaking colleagues on these issues.

About the authors: Marianne Morange UMR CESSMA, Université Paris Diderot / Institut Universitaire de France.

Sylvie Fol UMR Géographie – Cités, Université Paris 1 Panthéon – Sorbonne.

To quote this article : Marianne Morange et Sylvie Fol, «Néolibéralisation, city and spatial justice», **justice** spatiale | spatial **justice**, n° 6 juin 2014, http://www.jssj.org

Bibliography

AALBERS, Manuel, "Neoliberalism is Dead … Long Live Neoliberalism!", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°3, 1083–1090, 2013.

AUDIER, Serge, *Néo-libéralisme(s) – une archéologie intellectuelle*, Paris: Grasset, coll. « Mondes vécus », 2012.

BACQUÉ, Marie-Hélène, BIEWENER Carole, "Different Manifestations of the Concept of Empowerment: The Politics of Urban Renewal in the United States and the United Kingdom", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°6, 2198–2213, 2013.

BARNEKOV Thimoty, RICH Daniel, "Privatism and urban development. An analysis of the organized influence of local business elites", *Urban Affairs Review*, vol. 12, n°4, 431–460, 1977b.

BARNEKOV, Thimoty, RICH Daniel, "Beyond privatism: a rejoinder", *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 12, n°4, 469–474, 1977a.

BARON, Catherine, PEYROUX Elisabeth, « Services urbains et néolibéralisme. Approches théoriques et enjeux de développement », *Cahiers d'études africaines*, 2011/2-3, n°202-203, 369–393, 2011.

BARRY Andrew, OSBORNE Thomas and ROSE Nikolas (dir.), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, and Rationalities of Government*, University of Chicago Press, 1996.

BÉAL, Vincent, 2010, « *Does neoliberalism matter*? Apports et limites d'une notion montante des urban studies dans la science politique française", Working paper of the Program « Villes et territoires », Sciences Po Paris.

BÉAL, Vincent, ROUSSEAU Max, « Néolibéraliser la ville fordiste. Politiques urbaines post-keynésiennes et re-développement économique au Royaume-Uni : une approche comparative », *Métropoles*, n°4, 160-202, 2008.

BENKO, Georges, LIPIETZ Alain, « De la régulation des espaces aux espaces de la régulation », in *Théorie de la régulation. L'état des savoirs*, edited by Robert Boyer et Yves Saillard, 293-303, Paris: La Découverte, 1995.

BOLAND, Philip, "The construction of images of people and place: Labelling Liverpool and stereotyping Scousers", *Cities*, Vol.25, n°6, 355–369, 2008.

BOND **Patrick**, 2002, *Against global apartheid: south Africa meets the World Bank, IMF and International Finance*, Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

BOND, Patrick, 2000, *Elite transition: from apartheid to neoliberalism in South Africa*, London: Pluto Press.

BOUDREAU, Julie-Anne, PATTARONI Luca, « Ville, capitalisme et souffrances. Quelques repères sur le renouvellement de la théorie urbaine critique », *Métropolitiques*, 25 mai 2011. URL : http://www.metropolitiques.eu/Ville-capitalisme-et-souffrances.html

BOYER, Robert, SAILLARD Yves (dir.), *Théorie de la régulation. L'état des savoirs*, Paris: La Découverte, 1995.

BRAND, Ulrich, SEKLER Nicola, "Postneoliberalism: catch-all word or valuable analytical and political concept?", *Development Dialogue*, n°51, 5–13, 2009.

BRENNER Neil, PECK Jamie, THEODORE Nik, "Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways", *Global Networks*, Vol.10, n°2, 1–41, 2010.

BRENNER, Neil, "Globalization as reterritorialization: the re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 36, n°3, 431–451, 1999.

BRENNER, Neil, 2004, *New state spaces. urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BRENNER, Neil, MARCUSE Peter, MAYER Margit, *Cities for people, not for profit. Criticial urban theory and the right to the city*, Routledge, 2012.

BRENNER, Neil, THEODORE Nik, "Cities and the geographies of 'actually existing neoliberalism' ", *Antipode*, Vol. 34, n°3, 349–379, 2002.

CALBÉRAC, Yann, MORANGE Marianne, « Géographies critiques… à la française ? », *Carnets de géographes*, n°4, 2013.

CASTEL, Robert, DUVOUX Nicolas, *L'avenir de la solidarité*, Paris: PUF, « La vie des idées », 2013.

CASTREE, Noel, "From neoliberalism to neoliberalisation: consolations, confusions, and necessary illusions", *Environment and Planning* A, Vol. 38, n°1, 1–6, 2006.

COCHRANE, Allan, *Understanding urban policy. A critical approach*, London: Blackwell, 2008.

DARDOT, Pierre, « Le capitalisme à la lumière du néolibéralisme », *Raisons politiques*, Vol. 4, n°52, 13–23, 2013.

DESAI, Ashwin, PITHOUSE Richard, "But We Were Thousands': Dispossession, Resistance, Repossession and Repression in Mandela Park", *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 39 n°4, 239–269, 2004.

DESAI, Ashwin, *We are the poor: community struggles in post-apartheid South Africa*, New York: Monthly review press, 2002

DESJARDINS, Xavier, « Le logement social au temps du néo-libéralisme », *Métropoles,* n°4, 26–45, 2008.

DIDIER Sophie, MORANGE Marianne, PEYROUX Elisabeth, "The Adaptative Nature of Neoliberalism at the Local Scale: Fifteen Years of City Improvement Districts in Cape Town and Johannesburg", *Antipode*, Vol. 45, n°1, 121–139, 2013.

ENRIGHT, Theresa Erin, 2013, "Mass transportation in the neoliberal city: the mobilizing myths of the Grand Paris Express", *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 45, n°4, 797–813, 2013.

EPSTEIN, Renaud, *La rénovation urbaine. Démolition-reconstruction de l'État,* Presses de Sciences Po, 2013.

FAINSTEIN, Susan, *The just city*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.

FARMER, Stephanie, "Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA", *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 43, n°5, 1154–1172, 2011.

FERGUSON, James, "Formalities of poverty: thinking about social assistance in neoliberal South Africa", *African Studies Review*, Vol. 50, n°2, 71–86, 2007.

FERGUSON, James, « The uses of neoliberalism », *Antipode*, Vol. 41, 166–184, 2009.

FINE, Ben, ASHMAN, Sam, "Neo-Liberalism, Varieties of Capitalism, and the Shifting Contours of South Africa's Financial System", *Transformation*, n°81/82, 145–178, 2013.

FLORIDA, Richard, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books, 2002.

FLORIN, Bénédicte, LEGROS Olivier, SEMMOUD Nora, TROIN Florence, *Marges urbaines et néolibéralisme en Méditerranée*, Tours: Presses Universitaires François Rabelais, 2014.

FOL, Sylvie, *La mobilité des pauvres*, Paris: Belin, 2009.

FOUCAULT, Michel, *Naissance de la biopolitique. Cours au Collège de France. 1978-1979*, édité par Michel Senellart, sous la direction de François Ewald et Alessandro Fontana, Paris: Gallimard- Seuil, coll. « Hautes Études », 2004.

GOPAKUMAR, Govind, "Experiments and Counter-Experiments in the Urban Laboratory of Water-Supply Partnerships in India", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 38, n°2, 393–412, 2014.

GRAHAM, Stephan, MARVIN Simon, *Splintering urbanism: networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*, New York: Routledge, 2001.

GRENGS, Joe, "The abandoned social goals of public transit in the neoliberal city of the USA", *City*, Vol. 9, n°1, 51–66, 2004.

GROS, Frédéric, LORENZINI Danièle, REVEL Ariane, SFORZINI Arianna, « Les néolibéralismes de Michel Foucault », "Introduction", *Raisons politiques*, Vol. 4, n°52, 5–11, 2013.

HACKWORTH, Jason, *The neoliberal city. Governance, ideology, and development in American urbanism*, Cornell University Press, 2007.

HALL, Tim, HUBBARD Phil (dir.), *The entrepreneurial city: geographies of politics, regime and representation*, Chichester: Wiley, 1998.

HARLOE, Michael, "Social Justice and the City: The New 'Liberal Formulation'", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 25, n°4, 889–897, 2001.

HARLOE, Michael, *The People's Home ? Social Rented Housing in Europe and America*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

HARVEY, David, "From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism", *Geografiska Annaler*, Vol. 71b, n°1, 3–17, 1989.

HARVEY, David, "Neo-Liberalism as Creative Destruction", *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, vol. 88, n° 2, 145–158, 2006.

HARVEY, David, "Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, n°610, 21–44, 2007.

HARVEY, David, *A brief history of neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

HAUGHTON, Graham, MCMANUS Phil, "Neoliberal Experiments with Urban Infrastructure: The Cross City Tunnel, Sydney", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 36, n°1, 90–105, 2012.

IMBROSCIO, David L., *Urban America reconsidered. Alternatives for governance and policy*, Ithaca: Cornwell University Press, 2010.

JACQUOT, Sébastien, *Enjeux publics et privés du réinvestissement des espaces historiques centraux, une étude comparée de Gênes, Valparaiso et Liverpool*, Thèse de doctorat, Université d'Angers, 2007.

Jaglin, Sylvy, « La participation au service du néolibéralisme ? Les usagers dans les services d'eau en Afrique subsaharienne », in *Gestion de proximité et démocratie participative*, edited by Marie-Hélène Bacqué, H. Rey, and Yves Sintomer, 271–291, Paris: La découverte, coll. « Recherches », 2005.

Jaglin, Sylvy, Zérah Marie-Hélène, "Eau des villes : repenser des services en mutation", *Revue Tiers-Monde*, Vol. 3, n° 203, 7–22, 2010.

Jessop, Bob, "Liberalism, neoliberalism and urban governance: a state-theoretical perspective", *Antipode*, Vol. 34, n°3, 452–472, 2002.

Jessop, Bob, "Putting neoliberalism in its time and place: a response to the debate", *Social Anthropology*, Vol. 21, n°1, 65–74, 2013.

Jobert, Bruno (dir.), *Le tournant néo-libéral en Europe. Idées et recettes dans les pratiques gouvernementales*, Paris: L'Harmattan, « Logiques politiques », 1994.

Künkel, Jenny, Mayer Margit (dir.), *Neoliberal Urbanism and its Contestations - Crossing Theoretical Boundaries*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Lagueux, Maurice, « Le néo-libéralisme comme programme de recherche et comme idéologie, *Cahiers d'économie politique*, n°16-17, Paris: L'Harmattan, 129–152, 1989.

Lazzarato, Maurizio, « Naissance de la biopolitique, à la lumière de la crise », *Raisons politiques*, Vol. 4, n° 52, p 51–61, 2013.

Le Galès, Patrick, « Urban governance and policy networks: on the urban political boundedness of policy networks: a French case study », *Public Administration*, Vol. 79, n°2, 167–184, 2001

Le Galès, Patrick, *Le retour des villes européennes : sociétés urbaines, mondialisation, gouvernement et gouvernance*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2ème édition, 2011.

Lees, Loretta, "The urban injustices of New Labour's "new urban renewal", the case of the Aylesbury Estate in London", *Antipode*, early view [DOI: 10.1111/anti.12020], 2013.

Leitner, Helga, Peck Jamie, Sheppard Eric (dir.), *Contesting neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*, New York: Guilford Press, 2007.

Logan John, Molotch Harvey, *Urban fortunes: the political economy of place*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Lorrain, Dominique, « La ville et les marchés : ce qui change au début du 21e siècle », *EspacesTemps.net*, 24.06.2013 http://www.espacestemps.net/articles/la-ville-et-les-marches-ce-qui-change-au-debut-du-21e-siecle/

Mac Gregor, Robert, "Privatism and urban development: a response", *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 12, n°4, 461–468, 1977.

MacLeod, Gordon, 2002, "From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a 'Revanchist City'? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance", *Antipode*, Vol., n° 3, 602–624.

MacLeod, Gordon, Raco Mike, Ward Kevin, Negotiating the Contemporary City, *Urban Studies*, vol. 40, n°9, 1655–1671, 2003.

Magnan de Bornier, Jean, "Regards croisés sur l'histoire du néo-libéralisme", *La vie des idées*, 19 June 2013.

McCann, Eugene, Ward Kevin, "A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: geographies, assemblages, mobilities and mutations", *Policy Studies*, Vol. 34, n°1, 2–18, 2013.

McDonald, David A., Pape John (dir.), *Cost recovery and the crisis of service delivery in South Africa*, New York: Zed Book, 2002.

McDonald, David A., Smith Laila, "Privatising Cape Town: From apartheid to neo-liberalism in the Mother City", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 41, n°8, 1461–1484, 2004.

Michon, Perrine, « Le partenariat public-privé et la régénération urbaine. L'exemple de Docklands », *Géocarrefour*, Vol. 83, n°2, 119–128, 2008.

Miller, Peter, Rose Nikolas, *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.

Miraftab, Faranak, "Neoliberalism and casualization of public sector services: the case of waste collection services in Cape Town, South Africa", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 28, n°4, 874–892, 2004a.

Miraftab, Faranak, "Public-Private Partnerships: The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development?", *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 24, n°1, 89–101, 2004b.

Mitchell, Don, "The annihilation of space by law: the roots and implications of anti-homelessness laws in the United States, *Antipode*, Vol. 29, n°3, 303–335, 1997.

Mitchell, Don, Postmodern geographical praxis ? postmodern impulse and the war against homeless people in the "postjustice" city?, in *Postmodern geography: theory and praxis*, edited by Minca Claudio, 57–92, Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Molotch, Harvey, "The city as a growth machine: toward a political economy of place", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82, n°2, 309–332, 1976.

Morange, Marianne (à paraître), « Street trade, neoliberalisation and the control of space: Nairobi's CBD in the era of entrepreneurial urbanism », *Journal of Eastern African Studies*.

Morange, Marianne, « Droit à la ville, néolibéralisme et État développemental au Cap », *Justice Spatiale | Spatial Justice*, n°4, 2011.

Morange, Marianne, *La question du logement à Mandela city (ex Port Elizabeth)*, Paris: IFAS-Karthala, 2006.

Morel-Jourdel, Christelle, Sala Pala Valérie, « Le peuplement, catégorie montante des politiques urbaines néolibérales ? », *Métropoles,* N°10, 2011.

Nadesan, Majia, *Governmentality, Biopower and Everyday Life*, New York-London: Routledge, 2008.

Narsiah, Sagie, "Alternatives to neoliberal governmentality in South Africa", *South African Geographical Journal*, Vol. 89, n°1, 34–43, 2007.

Narsiah, Sagie, "Neoliberalism and privatization in South Africa", *GeoJournal*, n°57, 3–13, 2003.

Navez-Bouchanine, Françoise, Valladares Licia (dir.), numéro spécial *Espaces et sociétés*, n°131/4, « villes et best practices », 2007.

Ong, Aihwa, *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Oosterlynck, Stijn, González Sara, " 'Don't Waste a Crisis': Opening up the City Yet Again for Neoliberal Experimentation", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n° 3, 1075–1082, 2013.

OSMONT, ANNIK, *La Banque mondiale et les villes. Du développement à l'ajustement*, Paris: Karthala, 1995.

PALTRINIERI, Luca, "Quantifier la qualité. Le 'capital humain', entre économie, démographie et éducation », *Raisons politiques,* Vol. 4, n° 52, 89–107, 2013.

PARNELL, Susan, ROBINSON Jennifer, "(Re)theorizing Cities from the Global South: Looking Beyond Neoliberalism", *Urban Geography*, Vol. 33, n° 4, 593–617, 2012.

PECK Jamie, "Neoliberalizing states: thin policies/hard outcomes, *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 25, n°3, 445–455, 2001.

PECK Jamie, BRENNER Neil, THEODORE Nik, "City as Policy Lab", *AREA* Chicago, June 7, 2008.

PECK, Jamie, ''Geographies of Policy: From Transfer-Diffusion to Mobility-Mutation'', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 35, n°6, 773–797, 2011.

PECK, Jamie, "Geography and public policies: construction of neoliberalism", *Progress in Human geography*, Vol. 28, n°3, 392–405, 2004.

PECK, Jamie, NIK Theodore and Neil BRENNER, "Neoliberal Urbanism Redux?", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°3, 1091–1099, 2013.

PECK, Jamie, THEODORE Nik, BRENNER Neil, "Postneoliberalism and its Malcontents", *Antipode*, Vol. 41, numéro special supplémentaire s1, 94–116, 2010.

PECK, Jamie, TICKELL Adam, « Neoliberalizing space », *Antipode*, Vol. 34, n°3, 380–404, 2002.

PERKINS, Harold, "Consent to Neoliberal Hegemony through Coercive Urban Environmental Governance", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°1, 311–327, 2013.

PICKVANCE, Chris, "The limits of neoliberalism, is the concept of neoliberalism helpful in the study of urban policy?", in *Neoliberal urbanism and its contestations*, edited by Margit Mayer and Jenny Kunkel, 46–61, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2012.

PINSON, Gilles, *Gouverner la ville par projet : urbanisme et gouvernance des villes européennes*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2009.

PINSON, Gilles, ROUSSEAU Max, « Systèmes (Les) métropolitains intégrés : état des lieux et problématiques », *Territoires* 2040, n° 3, 29–58, 2011.

POLLARD, Julie, *Acteurs économiques et régulation politique. Les promoteurs immobiliers au centre des politiques du logement dans les régions de Paris et de Madrid*, Thèse de Doctorat en Science Politique, IEP, 2009.

POUPEAU, Franck, « Les ambivalences de la participation communautaire. Le cas du service de distribution des eaux à El Alto, Bolivie », *Autrepart,* Vol. 3, n°47, 245–253, 2008.

RACO Mike, "Delivering Flagship Projects in an Era of Regulatory Capitalism: State-led Privatization and the London Olympics 2012", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 38, n°1, 176–197, janvier 2014.

ROUSSEAU, Max, « Villes post-industrielles : pour une nouvelle approche », *Métropolitiques*, 18 septembre 2013. URL : http://www.metropolitiques.eu/Villes-post-industrielles-pour-une.html, dossier « Y a-t-il des urban studies à la française ? ».

ROUSSEAU, Max, *Vendre la ville (post-)industrielle. Capitalisme, pouvoir et politiques d'image à Roubaix et à Sheffield (1945 2010)*, thèse de doctorat de science politique, université Jean Monnet de Saint-Etienne – Université de Lyon, 2011.

Savitch, H.V., Kantor Paul, *Cities in the international marketplace. The political economy of urban development in North America and Western Europe*, Princeton University Press, 2002.

Shapely, Peter, "Governance in the Post-War City: Historical Reflections on Public–Private Partnerships in the UK", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°4, 1288–1304, 2013.

Sheppard, Eric, Leitner Helga, "Quo vadis neoliberalism? the remaking of global capitalis governance after the Washington consensus", *Geoforum*, Vol. 41, 185–194, 2010.

Siemiatycki, Matti, "The Global Production of Transportation Public–Private Partnerships", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.37, n°4, 1254–1272, 2013.

Siemiatycki, Matti, "The making of a mega project in the neoliberal city. The case of mass rapid transit infrastructure investment in Vancouver, Canada", *City*, Vol. 9, n°1, 67–83, 2005.

Smith, Michael Peter, McQuarrie Michael (dir.), *Remaking Urban Citizenship. Organizations, Institutions, and the Right to the City*, New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publishers, 2012.

Smith, Neil, "Gentrification and uneven development", *Economic Geography*, Vol. 58 n°2, 139–155, 1982.

Smith, Neil, *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*, Londres: Routledge, 1996.

Spronk, Susan, "Making the Poor Work for their Services: Neoliberalism and "Pro-Poor" Privatization in El Alto, Bolivia", *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 28, n°3-4, 397–413, 2009.

Sternberg, Carolina Ana, "From "cartoneros" to "recolectores urbanos". The changing rhetoric and urban waste management policies in neoliberal Buenos Aires", *Geoforum*, Vol. 48, 187–195, 2013.

Stone, Clarence, *Regime Politics. Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*, Lawrence KS: University Press of Kansas, 1989

Swyngedouw Erik, Moulaert Frank, Rodriguez Arantxa, "Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe : Large-Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy", *Antipode*, Vol. 34, n°3, 542–577, 2002.

Swyngedouw, Erik, "The Political Economy and Political Ecology of the Hydro-Social Cycle", *Journal of Contemporary Water Research & Education*, n°142, 56–60, 2009.

Van Gent, W.P.C., "Neoliberalization, Housing Institutions and Variegated Gentrification: How the 'Third Wave' Broke in Amsterdam", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 37, n°2, 503–522, 2013.

Verdeil, Éric, « Expertises nomades au Sud. Éclairages sur la circulation des modèles urbains, *Géocarrefour,* Vol. 80, n°3, 165-169, 2005.

Ward, Kevin, 2003, "Entrepreneurial urbanism, state restructuring and civilizing 'New' East Manchester, *Area*, vol. 35, n°2, 116-127.

Ward, Kevin, 2011, "Policy transfer in space: entrepreneurial urbanism and the making up of 'urban politics'", in *Territory, the State and Urban Politics*, ed. Jonas, A E G., Wood, A, Ashgate, Aldershot

Weinstein, Liza, "One-Man Handled': Fragmented Power and Political Entrepreneurship in Globalizing Mumbai", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.38, n°1, 14–35, January 2014.