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ABSTRACT

The paper represents a study of papers published in Antipode – A Radical Journal of Geography, from 2010 to 2013, in which, as to the author’s assessments, a highly critical stance towards contemporary neoliberalism exists. Hence Antipode publishes “a radical analysis of geographical issues and its intent is to engender the development of a new and better society”, a critical stance towards neoliberalism in the papers published is of course expected. However, it is the intent of this paper what kind of critical stance was present in the texts published in Antipode in the period of four years. A basic content analysis was used, in order to analyse the discourse that was used to describe, characterize and critically judge the contemporary relationship of neoliberalism towards local communities, especially regarding nature and natural resources. The topics followed in the study were privatization of natural resources and natural monopolies, as well as privatization of nature and nature-based activities in local communities. The focus of the analysis was on the words used to describe neoliberalisation of the aforementioned areas of social life and the context in which those words were used, through the analysis of full citations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The paper represents a study of papers published in Antipode – A Radical Journal of Geography¹ (further in the text: Antipode), from 2010 to 2013, in which, as to the author’s assessment, a highly critical stance towards contemporary neoliberalism² exists. Hence

¹ According to the AntipodeFoundation.org, which publishes Antipode – A Radical Journal of Geography, since August 1969 Antipode has published peer-reviewed papers which offer a radical analysis of geographical issues and whose intent is to engender the development of a new and better society.

According to: http://antipodefoundation.org/about-the-journal-and-foundation/a-radical-journal-of-geography/.

² Neoliberalism can be defined as:

A project primarily aimed at freeing capital from the constraints imposed by these “embedded liberalisms”, and more directly as a process ultimately focused on restoring the class power of economic elites. (Harvey, 2005: 11);

An approach to governing capitalism that emphasizes liberalizing markets and making market competition the basis of economic coordination, social distribution, and personal motivation. It recalls and reworks the 18th and 19th century liberal market ideals of economists such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo. And yet it is new –
Antipode publishes “a radical analysis of geographical issues and its intent is to engender the development of a new and better society”, a critical stance towards neoliberalism in the published papers is expected. However, it is the intent of this paper what kind of critical stance was present in the texts published in Antipode in the period of four years (2010-2013).

We have found similar research (Kurečić, Vusić, Primorac, 2015) that analyzed definitions of neoliberalism in the selected texts form Antipode journal and used it as a guidance for our research.

2. METHODOLOGY
The paper analyses the critical stance towards neoliberalisation of nature and natural resources, present in the texts published in Antipode, through the basic content analysis. Much of the text revolves around relationships between markets and nature. In order to analyse the discourse that was used to describe and characterize the relationship of neoliberalism towards nature, natural resources, natural monopolies, and local communities, the basic content analysis was used: the research focused on key words and phrases that were identified in most of the texts, and the presence of these key words and the context in which they were used was at the same time the criteria for the selection of the texts that were analysed. The key words used for the analysis were the following: neoliberalism and/or neoliberalisation (i.e. neo-liberalism). The

hence the ‘neo’ – insofar as it comes after and actively repudiates the interventionist state and redistributive ideals of welfare-state liberalism in the 20th century. (Sparke, 2013: 1);
Neoliberalism is an ideological hegemonic project, selectively rooted in the free market and non-interventionist state philosophy of classical liberalism, and internationally propagated by think tanks and intellectuals like Hayek and Friedman in their assault on “egalitarian liberalism”. (Peck and Tickell, 2007);
Neoliberalism is a simple withdrawal of the state from markets and society via trade liberalization, privatization, reduced entitlements, and government deregulation. (Hess, 2011: 1056).

- Neoliberalism is based on free markets, free flow of capital, free trade;
- Neoliberalism promotes individualism, atomizing the population;
- Neoliberalism is a type of authoritarianism, a masque behind liberal democracy;
- Neoliberalism is a type of totalitarianism, based on efficiency, and it is non-negotiable;
- Neoliberalism has populist tendencies;
- Neoliberalism treats citizen as a client and customer;
- Neoliberalism establishes competition between every worker on the planet;
- Neoliberalism shifts the balance of power in the society in favor of the bourgeois class;
- Neoliberalism wants to attenuate or nullify social transfer programs; it promotes an active „recruitment” of the poor into a flexible labor regime of low-wage employment;
- Different variations of neoliberalism exist in capitalism: in reality there is one capitalism and different kinds of neoliberalism;
- Existing kinds of neoliberalism are hybrid and are composite structures; they are path dependent and geographically uneven;
- “Roll-back” and “roll-out” types of neoliberalism exist as different phases in the development of neoliberalism; the “roll-back” phase precedes the “roll-out” phase;
- Neoliberalism is the ideological component of the capitalist symbolic;
- Neoliberalism universalizes capitalist practices and relationships through discursive, institutional, and policy work.
- There is possibly a self-defeating irony at the core of neoliberalism. Neoliberal intellectuals, set out to lead liberalism out of the political wilderness by making it over into something more mainstream, more conservative, and less afflicted by interest group fragmentation. Yet by demonizing „liberal fundamentalists“ e.g. civil rights groups, advocates of broad social insurance, feminists, trade unionists, neoliberals become part of the problem they set out to solve, thus becoming one more source of self-righteous division, as well as a force for the further fragmentation of policy constituencies. (Kurečić, Vusić, Primorac, 2015: 142)
context of the use of the key words was analysed, through the analyses of the sentences and/or full citations in which the key words were used. Key words used in a direct link with the key words were identified and analysed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main topics that were analysed in the selected texts were the following:

1. Privatization of natural resources and natural monopolies, such as for example the water supply privatization;

2. Privatization of nature, especially nature based activities in the local communities and in the natural habitats;

Privatization of natural resources and natural monopolies

Cocq and McDonald (2010) discussed water privatization in Cuba, pointing out that: “The privatization and commercialization of water has proven to be one of the most controversial policy developments of the past 20 years. Largely associated with the neoliberalisation of the world economy, it comes as a surprise to many that the socialist government of Cuba signed a 25-year contract with a Spanish multinational in 2000 to manage the supply of water in Havana. This paper provides an historical context for water reforms in the country and the first comprehensive study of this little-known contract. Based on key interviews and primary documentation we argue that there are no easy explanations for why the contract was signed, or whether it has achieved its objectives. There are, however, interesting lessons to be learned for public–private partnerships elsewhere in the world, and insights into the changing fabric of socialism in Cuba.” (6)

Nash (2013) discussed the neoliberal water governance mechanisms in Durban, South Africa: “I argue that some approaches to “participation” within neoliberal governance systems can, in part, be understood as moments within a protracted process of passive revolution. The argument is traced through eThekwini municipality’s Community Participation Programme and the related extension of Free Basic Water (FBW).” (101)

“The adoption of neoliberal economic theory has shaped the way in which basic service delivery occurs in South Africa. In relation to water, this meant a commitment to cost recovery principles, which refers to the objective of recouping the full cost, or as close to the full cost as possible, of providing a service (McDonald, 2002:17). Water, in this context, is understood as a commodity, a private good which is best, and most justly, distributed when bought and sold on the market or, at least, in accordance with market principles (McDonald and Ruiters, 2005:21).” (106)

4 “The mobilization of notions of scarcity in the Cuban case is, of course, very different from its use in the context of neoliberalism, where the answer lies in greater production to facilitate the drive for further growth while downplaying the redistributive ethic. In Cuba, the growth imperative is not as strong and is framed within, and thus heavily constrained by, broader and sustained commitments by the state to the redistribution of consumption, investment and wealth.” (36)
“The use of market mechanisms to distribute water, in particular the commitments to cost recovery, highlights the continued perceived importance of the exchange or monetary value of water. This history of water, politics and neoliberalism represents the backdrop to the passive revolution.” (107)

Narsiah (2010) discusses the privatization of water services in Cape Town, South Africa, pointing out: “Neoliberalism has percolated through to the local scale, leading to the neoliberalisation of the local state. One of the ways in which this has been articulated is through privatization strategies.” (374)

“In South Africa, and with special reference to the city of Cape Town, the ostensible corporatization of water services is evidence of the “rollout” phase of neoliberalism.” (378)

Carroll (2012) studied neoliberal risk mitigation connected with the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline: “Crucially, the article makes clear how the material realities of capital accumulation, propelled by the language of CSR (corporate social responsibility), and imbued with the ideology and practice of “social neoliberalism” (which attempts to extend the logic of the market into social life with the aid of social and environmental impact assessments and consultation processes (Carroll, 2010; Rodan, Hewison and Robison, 2001: 2-3), generate messy outcomes that safeguard the interests of capital while delivering rather precarious outcomes for citizens. These range from the empowering of patrimonial autocracies to fostering intra-village conflict.” (282-283)

“This social neoliberalism also involved the increasing internment of NGOs and social and environmental “experts” into “development” practice, with organizations such as the World Bank “reaching out” to civil society during the late 1980s and early 1990s (Craig and Porter, 2006: 61; Davis, 2004: 4, 13). In the case of BTC, these two very compatible trends (CSR and social neoliberalism) came together in a highly symbiotic way. Emphases upon transparency, accountability, community consultation and involvement, and environmental and social safeguards were placed at the forefront of the project’s design.” (289)

To be sure, the BTC is far from the only factor encouraging US involvement in Georgia (and the region). However, the pipeline has been a key part of the increasing expansion of Western commercial and strategic interests on the doorstep of a Russia heading in an increasingly ersatz nationalist trajectory. How such a situation could have been averted or “better managed” with the new tools and methods of risk mitigation and social neoliberalism is far from clear. However, the BTC’s role in the increase of supra-regional tensions should be taken into consideration in any assessment of the limitations of contemporary risk mitigation efforts. (297-98)

---

5 “The analysis suggests that in many ways the methods of social neoliberalism cannot come close to dealing with some of the most significant repercussions and associated risks of mega-projects in the underdeveloped world.” (298)
Mirosa and Harris (2012) studied the privatization of water resources: “As expressed by Anand (2007:517): “A human right to water means giving priority to drinking water supply, particularly to those who do not have access to the basic level of service.” (936)

“The increasing privatization of water, combined with a focus on devolved, participatory and commodified water management promoted by entities such as the World Bank and the World Water Council, have been discussed as examples of increasingly “neoliberalized water governance”, part and parcel of the increasing neoliberalization of resources more generally (Bakker, 2005; Goldman, 2007; Harris, 2009)6.” (935)

Privatization of nature, especially nature based activities in the local communities and in the natural habitats

Brockington and Duffy (2010) discussed the topic of neoliberalisation of tourism, emphasizing: “Nature-based tourism actually allows capitalism to identify, open and colonize new spaces in nature. However, it does so in variable ways in different contexts. The essay offers an explanation for why and how neoliberalism is shaped by its encounter with existing social and cultural dynamics. Neoliberalism, it seems, does not displace or obliterate existing ways of valuing, owing and approaching nature; instead it mixes with local dynamics to create new dynamics. The essay presents a snapshot of neoliberalism “as it exists” on the ground7. (478)

Igoe, Neves and Brockington (2010) discussed about convergence of biodiversity conservation and capitalist expansion: “The inherent exchangeability of parks has become most salient as it is has intersected with the logic of exchangeability so pervasive in global neoliberalism. This is especially visible in mitigation policies, which assume degraded nature and environmental harm can be balanced by pristine nature and environmental protection.” (495)

They have also specifically discussed the topic of networks of conservation: “Networks of conservation, commerce and the state are forged in conditions of fragmented state control that exist in postcolonial contexts. They are effectively bargains to which outsiders, such as conservation NGOs, bring money, expertise and technology, on which officials from impoverished states are highly dependent. These officials in turn bring the legitimacy and power of sovereignty (Mbembe, 2001: 78). Ferguson (2006) has labeled such bargains “the privatization of sovereignty”, and emphasizes that neoliberalism exacerbates and legitimizes this sort of fragmentation.” (496)

6 Social movements related to global water issues have had a very strong presence at international meetings, including the 2009 Istanbul World Water Forum. Hundreds of activists from all over the world travelled to the meetings, both to influence the official Forum and to participate in two separate alternative Water Forums that were organized based on different principles from those underlying the official event.16 Given the diversity of water issues across locales, differences in national and regional contexts, and in legal and policy environments, and so forth, it is relevant to focus attention on the extent to which activists managed to relate to each other. In this sense, the idea and language of the HRW played a central role in discussions and negotiations—in both the official and alternative Water Forums. (Mirosa and Harris, 2012: 942)

7 “The difficulty with examining the usefulness of a term like “neoliberal conservation” is that neoliberalism, in Peck and Tickell’s, Harvey’s and others’ depictions, is a fundamentally uneven project (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Harvey 2005; Peck and Tickell 2002). It is applied with differential rigor across space, and often in direct conflict with its ideological precepts. Neoliberalism can be hard to identify as such in these circumstances. Nevertheless some neoliberal aspects of contemporary conservation are obvious. Conservation is extensively promulgated by NGOs, and in new hybrid governance arrangements of “privatized sovereignty” that appear to be direct products of neoliberal thinking. Conservation strategies can hinge on the deregulation and reregulation of nature based industries and environmental services. This is, plainly and simply, neoliberalism in practice.”
MacDonald (2010) discusses the topic about the influence of private sector on restructuring of biodiversity. The author starts with the general remarks about neoliberalism and neoliberalisation of nature: “If we view neoliberalism as a process in which a transnational capitalist class has shaped the state to its own requirements, structural control over new forms of international environmental governance that might challenge those requirements becomes a key component in reducing or eliminating obstacles to capital accumulation.” (533)

“Ironically, the growth of conservation organizations facilitated by neoliberalism in the 1970s and 1980s is partially responsible for their subordination as it developed an infrastructure grounded in short-term, project-based support rather than reliable core funding.” (534)

“In an institutional environment, shaped by neoliberalism, that increasingly accommodates and privileges the interests of business in pursuing an eco-modernist version of sustainable development, access to the resources allocated through that institutional context relies on an organization visibly and legibly aligning its activities, capacities and objectives with the ideological and material interests of the dominant actors within that institutional context (Maragia, 2002).” (535-36)

Brockington and Scholfield (2010) explore the roles of conservation NGOs with respect to capitalism: “We use an analysis of the conservation NGO sector in sub-Saharan Africa to examine the ways in which conservation NGOs are integral to the spread of certain forms of capitalism, and certain forms of conservation, on the continent.” (551)

“Our survey showed that conservation NGOs have kept pace with the global expansion of NGOs that is associated with neoliberalism. Conservation NGOs in sub-Saharan Africa expanded rapidly from the 1980s onwards, and most especially in the 1990s. (…) Conservation NGOs have not just grown in number with time, they have also grown in size and influence. Major new organizations have come into existence, other older players have expanded their work dramatically.” (561-562)

Corson (2010) explored “the formation of a dynamic alliance among members of the US Congress, the US Agency for International Development (USAID), an evolving group of environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the corporate sector around biodiversity conservation funding.” (576)

Building on the 1980s momentum around neoliberalism and sustainable development, the 1990s marked a turning point in which environmentalism began promoting the commodification of nature. (587)

Neoliberalism of nature—seen in measures such as privatization and regulatory rollback, commodification of nature, and new enclosures (for overviews see Castree, 2008; Heynen et al, 2007). (580)

The advocacy alliance behind USAID environmental programs was transformed from the initial group of environmental activists who protested against neoliberal policies to a collection of USAID grantee organizations with a specific programmatic interest, and who would ultimately endorse neoliberalism. (587)

Holmes (2010) studied conservation as an elite process in the Dominican Republic. At the beginning, the author explains “showing how conservation at a global level is an elite process,

8 “Ecological modernization has a rational and material core that does address real problems—the problems that historical modes of biodiversity conservation posed to the continued accumulation of capital. And it is through the dominant position of this class that neoliberalism and ecological modernization have not only acquired a purchase on conservation practice around the world, but have become written into the materiality of biodiversity. The organization of biodiversity conservation has been successfully restructed so that it serves capitalist expansion, just as it once served imperialist and nationalist expansion.” (542)
driven by a small powerful elite.” (…) In the Dominican Republic, the levels of protection are: “extraordinary and have been achieved by a small network of well-connected individuals, who have been able to shape conservation as they like, while limiting the involvement by the large international conservation NGOs who are considered so dominant throughout Latin America.”

“NGOs, as part of the transnational conservation elite, can become involved in environmental management in the global South. Governance states literature argues that states compete with NGOs for control of policy. The case of the Dominican Republic provides a useful counterpoint, giving a different perspective to theories of weak Southern states and powerful global NGOs.”

“More importantly, the global and the national elite both share the same non-critique of global and national capitalism. Conservation elites are interesting because they, with their links to corporations and trends in neoliberalism, seem unable or unwilling to engage with the environmental consequences of capitalism. Global scale conservation actors have been heavily criticized in recent years for becoming complicit in the destruction of the environment by large corporations, particularly by refusing to criticize corporations who have provided them with money or board members (Chapin 2004; Dowie 1995; McAfee 1999; Rothkopf 2008).”

Carrier (2010) discusses commodity fetishism and ethical consumption, present in capitalism as a way in which capitalism and conservation intersect: “One of the ways that conservation and capitalism intersect is in ethical consumption, the shaping of purchasing decisions by an evaluation of the moral attributes of objects on offer. It is increasingly important as a way that people think that they can affect the world around them, including protecting the natural environment. This paper describes commodity fetishism in ethical consumption, and the degree to which this fetishism makes it difficult for ethical consumers to be effective both in their evaluation of objects on offer and in influencing the world around them. It looks at three forms of fetishism in ethical consumption: fetishism of objects, fetishism of the purchase and consumption of objects, fetishism of nature.”

“From that perspective, ethical consumption is natural in two ways. Firstly, it reflects the importance of market transactions as a fundamental aspect of people’s lives, what Adam Smith (1976 [1776]:17) famously described as an aspect of human nature, the “propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another”. Secondly, it reflects the importance of the autonomous individual and of that individual’s freedom.”

Neves (2010) explored making profits on “cetourism”, studying discourses on whaling, cetacean conservation, and whale watching: “In reality most whale watching occurs in places where whale hunting was either never practiced or died out long ago. People thus often make fictional historical claims to whale hunting in order to make whale watching viable for their communities. In cases where whale hunting previously did exist it requires converting skills and technology to whale watching activities, something that local people often recognized and undertook without any external prompting. These transformations are indicative of larger transformations away from material commodities to service-based commodities in the context of global neoliberalism.”

Duffy and Moore (2010) studied the neoliberalisation of nature, through the examples of elephant-back tourism in Thailand and Botswana. First, they have pointed out some general remarks about the neoliberalisation of nature and tourism: “The spectacular growth in the global tourism industry has been one of the core drivers of neoliberalism in the last 20 years. It

---

9 Despite this, conservation both globally and in the Dominican Republic is shown to share similar political structures and the same lack of critique of capitalism or its environmental impacts.” (Holmes, 2010: 624)
constitutes one of a number of global processes that allows neoliberal norms and values to travel over time and space (Castree, 2009).”  

“Despite claims that alternative tourisms such as ecotourism, responsible tourism and nature-based tourism offer a challenge, our analysis of elephant back safaris demonstrates that they have been central to the expansion and deepening of neoliberalism at a global scale.” (742)  

“The tourism industry is one means by which nature is neoliberalised, since it allows neoliberalism to target and open up new frontiers in nature (Castree 2008a: 141; Castree, 2009).  

“Neoliberalism, through tourism, reconfigures and redesigns nature for global consumption (West and Carrier, 2004).” (743) “Tourism, as a global industry, is not just reflective of neoliberalism, it drives, expands and deepens it. Tourism has experienced a sustained period of growth; this occurred from the 1970s onwards against a backdrop of global shifts and especially benefited from the expansion of neoliberalism across the world.” (745)  

“The elephant-riding industry has targeted and opened up new frontiers in nature (elephants) for colonization by neoliberalism.” (752)  

Lansing (2011) studied the carbon’s value in the production of carbon forestry offsets in Costa Rica11: “Castree theorizes the proliferation of “neoliberal natures” as a global-scale phenomenon, where he seeks to answer the question: “Why are human interactions with the nonhuman world being ‘neoliberalised’ across the globe?” (Castree, 2008a: 131). (733)  

“In this paper, I take the commodification of carbon to be a discursive process of development in which specific sites and objects enter into a field of intelligibility in a manner that allows for some ways of understanding them while foreclosing on others. Specifically, this is a process by which value is produced in the spaces of indigenous agriculture through its discursive attachment to carbon. While I broadly agree with the idea that the commodification of carbon can be read as a type of environmental fix, as Castree might suggest (Castree 2008a; see also Bumps and Liverman 2008), I resist the idea that these spaces have come to be desirable as commodified spaces because of the extension of global-scale capitalist processes to local sites. Instead, I ground my analysis in discursive formations of development, and show how nature’s continued commodification is a process by which specific spaces, nature, and bodies come to be represented in ways that allow for neoliberal projects to emerge as the logical solution to longstanding development problems, with their final form ultimately conditioned by the requirements of capitalist value.” (734)

---

10 „McCarthy and Prudham argue the connections between neoliberalism, environmental change and environmental politics are deeply, if not inextricably interwoven. In this way neoliberalism can be regarded as an inherently and necessarily environmental project because it changes the relationships between human communities and biophysical nature; neoliberalism and environmentalism have emerged as powerful ideological foundations for social regulation; and finally because environmental concerns are the most powerful source of opposition to neoliberalism (McCarthy and Prudham 2004: 275-277; see also Heynen et al 2007).” (744)  

11 “In 2004, a group that included scientists, economists, indigenous leaders, and state bureaucrats began work on an agricultural development project among indigenous Bribri and Cabecar smallholders in southeast Costa Rica. This project’s original goal was to revive cacao agroforestry practices by linking the production of agroforestry landscapes with an emerging global commodity—the carbon forestry offset. Specifically, project developers wanted to create a carbon forestry offset under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), where indigenous land users would receive a carbon payment for converting their pesticide-intensive plantain fields to more carbon-intensive cacao agroforestry systems. During the course of implementing this project, however, its goals shifted. After project managers completed cost–benefit calculations of various land use practices, they determined that the opportunity costs of switching from plantains to cacao agroforestry were too high for carbon financing to induce this type of change. Instead, their calculations revealed that carbon credits are better positioned to encourage the abandonment of swidden (slash-and-burn) systems of agriculture. In performing these calculations, project managers conceived of recently fallowed land, or rastrojos, as agricultural spaces that lack economic value, but which have high levels of carbon sequestration potential. Today, the project’s largest single source of carbon storage now comes from allowing rastrojos to revert to secondary forest over a period of twenty years (CATIE, 2006: 80).” (Lansing, 2011: 731-732)
“For these calculations to have meaning, however, one must assume that the spaces are “managed” by the rational maximizer of neoclassical economics. This can be read as the application of universal economic theories and assumptions to a local context, a practice that has come under scrutiny of a number of critics of neoliberalism and neoclassical economics more generally (e.g. Peck, 2004; Robertson, 2006). (744)

Hannah (2011) studied bio power, life and left politics: “One thing that has been lost is the underlying biopolitical impulse of twentieth century welfare statism (or “social democracy”), that is, the governmental impulse and injunction to care for the life of a population of human beings. Mika Ojakangas laments that “the era of bio-political societies is coming to an end” (Ojakangas, 2005b: 52). This is not a good thing, for “to the extent that globalization takes place without bio-political considerations of health and happiness of individuals and populations, as it has done until now, it is possible that our entire existence will someday be reduced to bare life, as has already occurred, for instance, in Chechnya and Iraq” (Ojakangas 2005a: 28). (1035)

It is not a great stretch from here to a problematization of the apparent convergence in neoliberal systems of thought between humans-become capital and corporate capital-become-human. Foucault did not take this step in his lecture course. Nevertheless, the return to the German Ordo-Liberalen is interesting because in it Foucault highlights a problem with the general neoliberal “humans as businesses” model, a problem with implications for the question of what to do biopolitically with corporations. The German theorists put forward a neoliberal vision that was in many respects more cautious than the US model. (1045)

“These associations can only be indicative, but it is certainly arguable that neoliberalism, as a form of government which privileges vampiric life over human life, is fundamentally a dangerously erroneous assignment of biopolitical care.” (1046)

4. CONCLUSION
The analysis of texts that have been published in Antipode from 2010 until the end of 2013, has shown that neoliberalism has already permeated the local scale, and has already changed smaller local communities and nature, through the influence on nature-based activities and the privatization of natural resources. The selected texts offer a variety of topics in which the features of neoliberalism’s influence on small communities and nature were described and studied. In all of the analyzed texts a critique towards neoliberalism is present, based on scientific research and a clear radical academic stance.
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