

A Brief History Of Neoliberalism

A Brief History Of Neoliberalism

Downloaded from app.ardentx.com by Shaniya & Rocco

INTRODUCTION: UNDERSTANDING NEOLIBERALISM’S RISE AND INFLUENCE

In the closing decades of the twentieth century, a new economic and political ideology reshaped the globe. From the financial districts of New York and London to the capitals of the Global South, a set of ideas came to dominate policymaking, influencing everything from trade agreements to public services. This ideology is neoliberalism. At its core, it argues that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The state’s role is to create and preserve that framework, but to otherwise refrain from intervening in the economy.

To understand the world we live in today—marked by rising inequality, populist backlashes, and recurring financial crises—it is essential to grasp **A Brief History Of Neoliberalism**. This concept, often used as a pejorative, has a specific intellectual and political lineage that explains how it moved from the margins of economic thought to the center of global governance. This article explores that journey, from its philosophical origins in the 1930s to its consolidation as the dominant economic paradigm of the late twentieth century.

THE INTELLECTUAL ROOTS: FROM CLASSICAL LIBERALISM TO THE MONT PELERIN SOCIETY

The term “neoliberalism” itself suggests a rebirth of classical liberalism, the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. That earlier tradition championed free markets, free trade, and limited government. However, by the post-World War II era, classical liberalism seemed all but dead. The Great Depression had discredited laissez-faire policies, and the state-led recovery of the 1930s and 1940s, coupled with the success of wartime planning, created a broad consensus around Keynesian economics and the welfare state in much of the Western world.

It was in this context that a small group of intellectuals gathered to revive and redefine liberal thought. In 1947, at the invitation of the economist **Friedrich Hayek**, 36 scholars met in Mont Pelerin, Switzerland, to found the Mont Pelerin Society. Among them were the economist **Milton Friedman**, the philosopher Karl Popper, and the historian Ludwig von Mises. Their goal was to counter the dominant trend of collectivism, socialism, and state intervention they saw both in communist countries and in the mixed economies of the West. They argued that individual freedom was under threat and that only a reinvigorated commitment to free markets could preserve it.

This early neoliberalism was not simply a return to nineteenth-century laissez-faire. Neoliberals like Hayek and Friedman recognized that the state had a crucial role to play in establishing the legal and institutional conditions for markets to function. They advocated for **strong property rights**, the rule of law, and the enforcement of contracts, but also for a stable monetary framework and, in Friedman’s case, a negative income tax. Crucially, they believed that the state should not own the means of production or intervene to redistribute wealth. Instead, the state should actively promote competition and market mechanisms, even in areas previously considered public goods, like education, healthcare, and pensions.

For several decades, the Mont Pelerin Society remained a relatively obscure network of academics and think-tank intellectuals. They funded journals, wrote books, and built fellowships. Their ideas were largely rejected by the mainstream. Yet they laid the groundwork for a counter-revolution, awaiting a moment of crisis.

THE FIRST EXPERIMENT: CHILE AND THE CHICAGO BOYS

The first implementation of neoliberal policies on a national scale did not occur in the United Kingdom or the United States, but in a country far from the intellectual heart of the movement: **Chile**. In 1973, a military coup led by General Augusto Pinochet overthrew the democratically elected socialist government of Salvador Allende. The coup was supported by the United States. In the ensuing chaos, a group of Chilean economists, many of whom had studied at the University of Chicago under Milton Friedman and others, became the key economic advisors to the new regime. Known as the **“Chicago Boys,”** they prescribed a radical shock therapy.

They implemented a program of rapid privatization, deregulation, and the dismantling of social services. The state was dramatically shrunk, tariffs were slashed, and foreign investment encouraged. While these policies brought short-term stabilization and attracted some investment, they also led to a devastating economic crisis in 1982, with unemployment soaring to over 20% and poverty rates skyrocketing. Nevertheless, the Chicago Boys’ experiment was studied and admired by neoliberal advocates elsewhere. It demonstrated that such a program could be forcefully implemented, even if it was done so by an authoritarian regime that suppressed labor unions and political opposition.

Chile thus became the first test case of **A Brief History Of Neoliberalism** in practice, showing both the potential for radical market reforms and the human cost involved.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN REVOLUTION: THATCHER AND REAGAN

The political breakthrough for neoliberalism came in the late 1970s and early 1980s in two of the world’s most influential economies: the United Kingdom under **Margaret Thatcher** and the United States under **Ronald Reagan**. Both came to power amidst stagflation—a combination of high inflation and high unemployment that orthodox Keynesian economics seemed unable to solve.

Thatcherism in the UK

Margaret Thatcher, elected Prime Minister in 1979, declared that “there is no alternative” (TINA) to her program. She framed the Keynesian welfare consensus as a form of collective failure. Her government embarked on an aggressive program of privatization, selling off state-owned industries such as British Telecom, British Gas, and British Airways. Trade unions were confronted and weakened, especially after the miners’ strike of 1984–85. Regulations on finance were rolled back in a process later known as the “Big Bang” in the City of London. Housing policy shifted from public provision to homeownership, with millions of council houses sold to tenants.

Thatcher’s rhetoric emphasized individual responsibility, enterprise, and the need to “roll back the frontiers of the state.” Her policies were deeply divisive, leading to deindustrialization and rising inequality in the north of England and parts of Wales and Scotland, but they reconstituted the British economy and society around market principles.

Reaganomics in the US

In the United States, Ronald Reagan came to office in 1981 on a similar platform of tax cuts, deregulation, and a strong anti-communist foreign policy. He famously declared that “government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.” His economic policy, dubbed “Reaganomics,” included major tax cuts, especially for the wealthy and corporations, the deregulation of industries such as airlines, banking, and telecommunications, and the slashing of social programs.

Reagan also took a hard line against labor unions, famously firing striking air traffic controllers in 1981. His policies accelerated the decline of the manufacturing sector and the rise of a finance-dominated economy. American inequality, which had been relatively stable since the New Deal, began to increase sharply. Yet Reagan’s popularity remained high, as his optimistic, patriotic rhetoric resonated with many Americans who felt threatened by economic decline and global competition.

Together, Thatcher and Reagan transformed the political landscape. Their success legitimized neoliberal ideas, which then spread globally through international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

THE WASHINGTON CONSENSUS AND GLOBAL SPREAD

By the 1990s, neoliberalism had become the dominant economic ideology, not just in the West, but across the world. The term **“Washington Consensus”** was coined in 1989 by economist John Williamson to describe a set of ten policy prescriptions that had come to represent the standard reform package for developing countries facing debt crises. These included fiscal discipline, tax reform, financial liberalization, competitive exchange rates, trade liberalization, openness to foreign direct investment, privatization, deregulation, and secure property rights.

The IMF and World Bank, based in Washington D.C., began to enforce these policies through **structural adjustment programs (SAPs)**. Countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia that needed loans to service their debts were required to cut public spending, privatize state enterprises, open their markets to foreign imports, and reduce tariffs. The results were often devastating. Public health and education systems collapsed, poverty and inequality surged, and local industries were wiped out by cheaper foreign imports.

Nevertheless, the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 seemed to confirm the superiority of market capitalism. The post-communist states of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union were advised—and sometimes forced—to adopt “shock therapy” transitions to market economies, often with chaotic and impoverishing results. By the late 1990s, neoliberalism appeared to be the only game in town, an assumption captured in the phrase “the end of history” by political scientist Francis Fukuyama.

KEY TENETS: THE CORE PRINCIPLES OF NEOLIBERAL POLICY

To understand the power and influence of neoliberalism, it is useful to outline its core principles as they have been applied in practice:

- **Privatization:** Transferring state-owned enterprises and public services to private ownership. The assumption is that private firms are inherently more efficient and innovative than public ones.
- **Deregulation:** Removing government restrictions on business activity, particularly on finance and labor markets. The goal is to allow “free markets” to allocate resources without government interference.
- **Trade and Financial Liberalization:** Removing barriers to trade and capital flows between countries. This aims to integrate national economies into a global system, but often leaves them vulnerable to volatile capital flows.
- **Austerity:** Reducing government spending, especially on social welfare programs, in order to balance budgets and reduce public debt. The belief is that fiscal discipline will foster investor confidence and long-term growth.
- **Individualization of Risk:** Shifting responsibility from the collective (the state or community) to the individual. This is seen in the privatization of pensions, the emphasis on personal responsibility for healthcare and education, and the weakening of social safety nets.
- **Market-Friendly State:** The state’s role is not to replace markets but to create the conditions for them to thrive. This includes protecting property rights, enforcing contracts, and maintaining a stable currency.

These principles were sold as neutral, efficient, and modern, but in practice they often served to concentrate wealth and power in the hands of a small elite, while leaving the majority of citizens to fend for themselves.

CRITICISMS AND CONSEQUENCES

By the early 2000s, a growing body of evidence pointed to the harmful consequences of three decades of neoliberal dominance. **Inequality** soared in almost every country that adopted neoliberal policies. The share of national income going to the top 1% skyrocketed, while wages for the middle and working classes stagnated. Financial crises became more frequent and more severe, from the Mexican peso crisis (1994) to the Asian financial crisis (1997) and, most dramatically, the global financial crisis of 2008.

The 2008 crisis was a direct result of deregulation in the financial sector, particularly in the United States. When the housing bubble burst, banks that had been allowed to take excessive risks collapsed, leading to a worldwide recession. Governments responded by bailing out the very banks whose reckless behavior had caused the crisis, while imposing austerity on ordinary citizens. This double standard fueled public anger and disillusionment.

Critics also argue that neoliberalism has eroded democratic institutions and civil society. By elevating the market above all else, it has turned citizens into consumers and reduced the space for collective decision-making. International trade agreements like NAFTA and the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership were negotiated in secret, giving corporations and investors the power to sue governments for policies that might affect their profits. This has been described as a “policy of depoliticization,” where key economic decisions are removed from the democratic process and placed in the hands of technocrats and market forces.

THE CONTEMPORARY LANDSCAPE: BACKLASH AND POST-NEOLIBERALISM?

The global financial crisis of 2008 was a turning point. It shattered the credibility of neoliberal

orthodoxy. For a brief period, governments around the world intervened massively in the economy to prevent a total collapse. However