

Proposal for Special Issue in *Pacific Affairs*

## Asian Casinos as Sites of State Power

*Issue guest editors*

Juan Zhang (University of New England), Email

Melody Chia-Wen Lu (University of Macau) (corresponding editor), Email

### **Introduction**

In the aftermath of the global economic crisis since 2007, an unexpected Asian casino boom has grabbed the attention of the media and the public. Luxurious megacasino resorts mushroomed across Asian countries. In places as different as Singapore and the Philippines, Laos and Macau, grand casino resorts become the newest development projects that promise to bring in foreign direct investment, increase state tax revenue, boost local employment, and deliver transformative results to the national economy. As a potent antidote that revives the sluggish market, the casino industry carries high hopes from many of the Asian states to stimulate economic growth, as well as project a new national image as modern, cosmopolitan, and progressive.

However, the casino industry often exhibits a Janus-faced nature that few other sectors have. Although casinos stimulate new desire and excitement, they also attract strong suspicion and criticism across many Asian societies. Even as modern commercial establishments, casinos are often associated with problem gambling, money laundering, pawn brokerage, commercial sex trade, organized crime and other underground activities.<sup>1</sup> It remains unclear whether the development of the casino sector will lead to a monopoly of casino conglomerates, diminished economic diversity, and the loss of long-term economic sustainability. Furthermore, as huge spatial enclaves, casinos dominate certain aspects of the urban landscape; and in some cases they even redefine the face of a city (e.g. Macau and Singapore, see Lee in this issue). The possible socioeconomic effect of such spatial dominance remains to be interrogated.

The impact of casinos on Asian cities and states are far-reaching and controversial. Yet very little is known, both in academia and amongst the general public, about exactly how the casino economy is reshaping the regional political economy, experiences of urban life, paces of development, and questions of morality. This special issue is based on first-hand observations and offers a timely investigation on the emerging casino economy in different Asian societies and its varied effect on states, institutions, and individuals.

We take casinos *not* as venues merely for gambling, entertainment, and speculation, but as multilayered social and political spaces where different networks assemble and different practices reshape power configurations. Casinos are productive sites where contesting practices and experiences produce new realities of citizenship, consumption, work, and governance. With a collection of interdisciplinary essays, this special issue takes a first step towards understanding Asian casinos as contested spaces

of power and agency. Moreover, we argue that casinos can offer a unique analytical lens on the dynamic relationship between the state, the market, and individuals who inhabit new social spaces of opportunity and discipline.

While remaining privately owned, many of the Asian casinos can in effect be seen as state projects of progress and modernity. The state's political investment and intimate involvement in megacasino projects are two of the most defining features of this new phase of casino development in Asia. Articles in this special issue show that Asian casinos entail both the economic and ideological interests of the state. Casinos are built not only to articulate the ambition for economic prosperity, but also to promote implicit (and sometimes explicit) political agendas involving nationalizing, globalizing, and modernizing local societies. Casinos thus become productive sites of desire and discipline, as the state and market join hands to produce new promarket institutions, new urban environments, new moral orders of risk mitigation and responsabilization,<sup>2</sup> and last but not least, new locations of work and consumption.

The articles in this special issue introduce parallel experiences and contrasting processes of casino development in five Asian countries – Singapore, Macau, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines. Together, these articles claim that Asian casinos are fundamentally different from the established casinos in the United States (especially in Las Vegas) and Europe, in the sense that Asian casinos are not merely economic products of late capitalism from a purely commercial perspective. Instead, Asian casinos are unorthodox projects of development,<sup>3</sup> and (perhaps unexpected) sites of state power. They are often seen as catalysts of improvement on material conditions in underdeveloped countries (such as Cambodia and Laos),<sup>4</sup> as well as a quick means of makeover for developed countries (such as Singapore) that are in need of transformation. Regarding casinos as sites of state power, this special issue takes a critical view on the curious ways in which the political interests and nationalist agendas of Asian states are embodied by grand casino resorts. Driven by a strong profit motive, and legitimized by the dominant development discourse in the region, both the state and private sectors strategize, normalize and even ethicalize the presence of the casinos as they experiment with new forms of accumulation and regulation.<sup>5</sup>

### **Casino Development across Asia**

In recent years, nation-states across Asia have been competing with each other to build the latest and grandest megacasino projects. Many also devote significant amount of effort and money to transform and modernize existing small gambling houses and hotels into Integrated Resorts. Map 1 shows the mushrooming of new casino resorts in countries across East and Southeast Asia.

[Map 1 about here]

In countries where casino developments have always been part of the national economy, such as Macau, Malaysia, South Korea and the Philippines, new regulatory regimes are configured and business models are revamped. These countries become possible examples for neighbouring countries to imitate. Local tycoons and established capitalists are aggressively expanding their operations throughout the region and beyond thanks to the emerging opportunities and networks that come along with

growing interests and investments in the casino industry. The Malaysian conglomerate Genting Group, for example, used to operate only one moderate casino resort in Genting Highland, Malaysia. Now it owns a fleet of casino cruises, the Resorts World Sentosa in Singapore, two Resorts World projects in the Philippines, one resort in South Korea, forty-seven small casino clubs in the UK, and five casino resorts in the US and the Caribbean (including those under construction).

For Asian countries that relied on tourism for economic viability but shunned casinos in the past, South Korea's recent turn towards casino development offers some insight into a new hope in casino magic. The South Korean state has licensed sixteen foreigner-only casinos in its capital Seoul and on the popular tourist destination Jeju Island, with one casino permitting Korean citizens to enter in remote Kangwan province. In view that the scale of these casinos might still be too small to attract international tourists, the South Korean state designated an entire area in the Yeongjong Special Economic Development Zone, located next to the Incheon International Airport and approximately 30 kilometers away from Seoul, as a reserved site for several mega Integrated Resorts. The first licensed resort in the Zone, a joint venture between South Korea's Paradise Group and the Sega Sammy Holding – Japan's largest gaming machine manufacturer – is scheduled to open in 2017.

Countries that have been conventionally viewed as “weak” or economically “uncompetitive” seem to have adopted a more aggressive approach with regard to casino construction, hoping that with numbers huge profit would also follow. Cambodia owns the highest number of casinos in the region, with a total of fifty-seven casinos, which have served as a “rare and dependable cash cow” for years, and generating over US\$25 million in 2014.<sup>6</sup> It is a small amount compared to the billions that are generated by casinos in Macau, Singapore, or the Philippines; it is however a decent profit for the Cambodian state especially when the GDP per capita in Cambodia remains one of the lowest in the region. The proliferation of casino development in Cambodia is not without controversy though, particularly given the fact that Buddhist beliefs remain at the core of local moral codes and practices. The Naga World Resort in Phnom Penh, for example, continues to stir up protest and negative emotions among the public based on the fact that the resort is located in the center of the national and religious monuments and in the vicinity of a Buddhist monastery (see Yamada in this issue).

For Asian states that have not yet started building casinos of their own, the pressure is up. Seeing the success of Macau and Singapore, countries such as Japan and Taiwan are desperate in playing catching up. However, the legislative attempt to legalize casinos continues to face mounting public and political resistance. In Japan, the Abe government has proposed several bills with the hope that casinos will be legalized and in operation in time for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. But no definitive results have been reached. In Taiwan, the Offshore Island Development Law revised in 2009 has set the condition for operating casino resorts in outlying islands. Several rounds of local referenda were held ever since. However, a strong nationwide antigambling coalition of civil society groups is also formed in protest, and further legislative processing is put on hold.

As casino development configures different economic conditions and sociopolitical realities across Asian countries, it is pertinent to pay attention to the

ways in which different states and societies experiment with various politics and strategies to maximize value production through casinos, and at the same time deal with the multifaceted impact of casinos. The collection of essays aims to address precisely these issues, and takes Asian casinos as an analytical entry point to engage with current debate on new modalities of state strategies and transforming state spaces in Asia, especially in areas of urban life, regimes of regulation, and the intimate yet contesting relations between the market and the state.

### **Asian Casinos and New Theoretical Insights**

The surge of recent Asian casinos requires, first and foremost, a more careful analysis of the geopolitical conditions that underpin these recent developments. Gambling and casinos have existed for centuries; but the sudden spur of interest in the establishment of casino resorts across the region is directly linked to the rapid accumulation of wealth in China. China's relationship with its neighbouring countries, its shifting state policies, the channels for wealth dissipation, and the mobility of wealthy Chinese gamblers and tourists all indicate the fact that the entire casino economy in Asia is closely linked to China, so much as the global financial sector is linked to the Wall Street and the US economy. The surge of Asian casinos may be understood as the manifestation of an emerging regional economy, which corresponds to a specific phase of capitalist development and market reform in China. Moreover, Asian casino development can be easily turned into a "state project" that delivers more than just economic outcomes. Strong states such as Singapore are inspired to create a "model" (e.g. the Singapore model) in casino capitalism that would surpass the familiar Las Vegas model. Weaker states (such as Cambodia and Laos) can take advantage of casino-led development to achieve modernity without providing strong capacity for policy implementation or meritocratic policy-making apparatus. The comparison of the strategies various Asian states adopt, their varying capacities, as well as the nature of these interstitial spaces created, will yield theoretical insights for state governance and market-society relations.

Asia's casino boom also invites a new theoretical perspective that challenges the dominant US and Europe centred frameworks of analysis. Current mainstream literature on the casino and gaming industry in the social sciences predominantly adopts a framework that we call "cost-and-benefit analysis," especially when it comes to issues related to the legalization of gambling, the licensing of casinos, and similar policy and public debates. In "cost-and-benefit analysis", the state and regulatory bodies are treated as rational agents that hold the power to weigh the economic benefits of casinos against estimated social costs.<sup>7</sup> This framework tends to postulate that the economic and the social are compartmentalized and itemized in separated realms of policy-making, and that each item can be singled out, compared and calculated. This is problematic because the economic and the social are often inseparable. In many cases, economic rationality could be at the root of social problems, and social issues are always reflected in economic activities. Separating the economic and the social is thus reducing the complexity of contemporary lives under capitalism for the sake of overly simplified analysis and operable policy-making.

Moreover, Asian casinos play right into the politics of turning "gambling" into "gaming" as the global casino industry reinvents itself. With this turn, "gambling" loses the negative connotation as it is now repackaged as "gaming", and gambling-related "social costs" – such as addiction, crime and vice – can be covered by income

generated from gaming – which connotes leisure, entertainment, and legitimate fun seeking. “Recreational gaming” and “problem gambling” are treated under very different categories as a result of adopting the “cost-and-benefit” framework. “Recreational gaming” is often placed under the “benefit” category associated with revenue and leisure, whereas “problem gambling” is placed under the “cost” category associated with an array of problems and concerns. By separating “recreational gaming” – highlighting free choice, and “problem gambling” – highlighting individual pathology, one’s presence and consumption in the casino becomes an individual decision. Individuals are thus advised to monitor their own behaviours and to act responsibly in the interest of family and community. Social responsibility is thereby transferred from the industry and the state to individuals.<sup>8</sup> This dual discourse of “free choice” versus “individual pathology” not only refashions how gaming and casino operations are locally defined, licensed, managed, and regulated, it also informs a particular research agenda that overly focuses on “responsible gaming” in psychology, social work, casino management, and governance.

### **Asian Casinos as Sites of State Power**

A new focus on Asian casinos also challenges the so-called Las Vegas model of casino operations<sup>9</sup> and leads to critical debate on whether Asia is merely copying the West, or is in fact producing something unique. The Las Vegas model has in the past heralded novel practices of casino operation where casinos are placed together with hotels, entertainment facilities, retail, and convention venues in one huge complex. As casinos now become grandiose multipurpose resorts, they are no longer simply the dingy old gambling dens in the past as they are transformed into modern consumption paradises. As new casino resorts dissolve boundaries between gambling, shopping, and fun seeking, they normalize gambling practices by reducing the shame and guilt associated with it, and they encourage all-round consumption of things that used to be peripheral to gambling.<sup>10</sup>

The new Asian casinos are mostly operating as Las Vegas style casino resorts – and many are indeed operated by Las Vegas casino chains such as Sands, Wynn, and MGM – creating impressions that Asian casinos are merely copies of the Las Vegas model. It is as if the Las Vegas casino can be packaged as a model product and transplanted neatly across Asia despite the drastically different political, sociocultural and historical conditions in many of the Asian casino destinations. Scholars of Asian casinos have questioned whether such copying exist, and if so, what has been copied and to what effect.<sup>11</sup> This copying, whether comprehensive or partial, successful or disastrous, is often seen as an unquestionable result of deepening globalization facilitated by the circulation of capital and the institutionalization processes that are designed to facilitate the establishment and operation of transnational businesses.

Unlike casinos in Las Vegas or Europe, where the state’s presence is largely invisible or reduced to a minimum, Asian casinos are evident sites of state power and involvement with global capitalism. In Macau, the Special Administrative Region (SAR) state banked on the fast paced development led by global casino establishments so as to break the monopoly of local casino tycoons under the Portuguese colonial rule. In doing so the SAR state was able to establish authority and projected new images of power (see Zandonai in this issue). New casinos have not only generated immense wealth but also helped to put Macau on the map as a global entertainment

destination and gambling hotspot.

In Singapore, despite strong rejections from large sections of the society, the state pressed forward and opened two casino resorts after years of heated public debate. The casinos are deemed both an exception to Singapore's conservative politics and an exceptional industry that stopped Singapore's economy from slowing down,<sup>12</sup> and even changed the city-state's reputation from being restrictive and dull to exciting and fun (see Zhang and Yeoh in this issue).

In the Philippines, in a bid to attract global casino operators, the state inaugurated "Entertainment City," a major strip of land in Manila Bay developed solely as a special zone for gaming and entertainment. Under the arrangement of public-private partnerships, which is now at the forefront of the state's development agenda as best practice, the Philippine state stays at arm's length away from the casino operations yet manages to maintain a strong presence on all casino licensing conditions and processes, commanding casino operators' financial and developmental commitment. The luxurious resort City of Dreams Manila, for example, was granted only a provisional (temporary) casino license by the state, which could be cancelled or revoked any time, until it reached the promised US\$1 billion investment.<sup>13</sup> The state shows its capacity to "roll back" and incentivize casino development, and "roll out" to maintain its hold on control and regulation. This dual process of rescaling state power is not unique to the Philippine case, but present in all Asian casino destinations that are discussed in this special issue.

However, this is not to suggest that the exercise of state power in casino development indicates a top-down process of authoritarian control. It would be mistaken to assume that the global economic integration and the "consolidation of new supranational and cross-border institutions"<sup>14</sup> start at the state and institutional level and gradually trickle down to the ground. The Philippines, for example, offers another interesting example of the complicated exercise of state power. As Reyes shows (in this issue), the Philippine state itself is not an "entity" but a confusing web of interacting bureaucracies, contesting institutions, and power players with different interests and priorities. Together they form what Reyes calls "networks of (dis)trust" where nationalist agendas of development, pragmatic political motivations, back-door dealings, corruption charges, private-public liaisons, compromise and negotiations all come into play to redefine state and its controversial casino development project. The Philippine example shows that in Asia, what is happening now suggests a multi-faceted process. Apart from state power holders, other casino operators, private corporations, networks of business elites, "high" and "low" rollers, mobile individuals, and transnational labour and services, are enabling economic connectedness and pushing boundaries. Their practices and experiences indicate social conditions shaped by transnational capital and national territorialized regulation.

### **Asian Casinos and the Deep Marketization of Development**

The Asian casino boom is a recent phenomenon. And academic scholarship that links the mushrooming of casino projects with the broader local and national development processes in Asia has just begun to emerge. Some studies offer timely observations on the regulatory mechanisms and zoning strategies that are designed to brand a nation's image as part of the national strategic planning, and to attract foreign investments for

local development and modernization in underdeveloped regions.<sup>15</sup> Others approach casino governance as part of urban governance and planning. Lee has, for instance, studied the spatial design and aesthetics of casino architecture in Macau and Singapore comparatively to reveal the different and competing roles that the state and the industry play in branding a global city image and in boosting consumptive desires.<sup>16</sup> The state has shown capacity to devise clever legal and financial infrastructure to facilitate cross-border capital flows that enable Asian casinos to attract high rollers, even when this entails turning a blind eye to some of the less licit dealings and operations common in the industry that may seem to pose a challenge to state authority.<sup>17</sup>

In view of these new developments, Asian states are fashioning novel strategies that turn casinos into spaces of exception that can be governed both flexibly and stringently. Theorists of neoliberalism have long argued that the deregulation of markets does not suggest that the state has now taken a back seat; on the contrary, state involvement has adopted many forms and becomes more calculated as well as flexible.<sup>18</sup> Among the most cited scholarship, Aihwa Ong's work on graduated sovereignty indicates clearly the kind of flexible experimentation that the state has engaged in as the relationship between market, state and society changes.<sup>19</sup> Targeted governance of different population groups, and tailored regulation of special zones and territories are exemplary strategies of states' managing varying political spaces and citizens.<sup>20</sup> In Asia's emerging casino economy, a similar process of Ong's "graduated sovereignty" is taking place as Asian states regulate new casino spaces and casino-related populations (e.g. consumers, employees, managers, regulators) through hybrid politics of "graduation."

Ong's analysis of "graduation" is arguably celebratory of market-oriented rule and new bio-political spaces that legitimize conditions of precarity, and indeed this view is in itself problematic.<sup>21</sup> But in the case of Asia's casino development, the processes of "graduation" and the unevenness it produced (exceptional or not) is indicative of a particular form of contemporary capitalism where the state becomes more "entrepreneurial"<sup>22</sup> and more entrenched in what Toby Carroll describes as the deep marketization of development in the Asia-Pacific.<sup>23</sup>

For Carroll, in the current new phase of capitalist development – often pictured through a neoliberal image – in many parts of Asia, both state and society are entwined in "market building" measures that constitute new capitalist social relations.<sup>24</sup> These measures, argues Carroll, are "compatible with key material interests under late capitalism and the ideological interests supportive of these material interests."<sup>25</sup> As a result, market activities and state transformation are meshed together, contributing to new forms of public-private engagements that normalize and consolidate profit-seeking agendas as serving the public good. Carroll puts it eloquently:

Indeed, deep marketisation organisations are increasingly central players *in forging new opportunities of accumulation in high-risk/high-return areas* in extractive industries, financial services, and in water and energy, where political, social, economic and environmental factors cause concern but where significant opportunities for profit exist and where the profit motive can be pitched as an opportunity for improving governance and social conditions.<sup>26</sup>

While Carroll's main critique of deep marketization is targeted at private sector-oriented organizations such as the International Finance Corporation, what he describes as a troubling process of "market building" is curiously reflected in casino development across Asia. Martin Young in teasing out the relationship between gambling and the state under contemporary capitalism has already contextualized the strategic roles the state plays as both the regulator and financial beneficiary when "market building" is realized, in part, through casino building. The state is thus liable for producing a new dialectic of the risk society by producing individually differentiated risks that are associated with pleasure and desire.<sup>27</sup>

For both developing and developed countries in Asia, megacasino resorts as a high-risk/high-return industry marketed themselves as opportunities to enhance economic competitiveness, to brand a new national image, to boost employment, and even to strengthen infrastructural capacity and service delivery. Although casinos continue to cause considerable public concern with regard to crime and security, public health, and morality, these problems become resolvable under an all-encompassing technocratic approach of regulation and risk management. This way, the state exercises "regulatory authority"<sup>28</sup> without arbitrary intervention that may stop the money flow. As a result, risk to capital is prioritized and carefully managed, and risk to society is shifted towards communities and individuals.

Casinos therefore occupy the interstitial space between "neo-liberalisation and active state intervention."<sup>29</sup> This interstitial space indicates the working of procedural urban governance centring on technologies of graduation, marketization and processes of rescaling state spaces.<sup>30</sup> State governance can scale up by surveillance, law making, regulation and intervention; and scale back to encourage flexibility, creativity, movement, networks, and other organic entrepreneurial experiments and formations. The scalar organization of state power should be recognized as "a constitutive, contested, and therefore potentially malleable dimension of political-economic processes."<sup>31</sup> Asian states are actively experimenting with producing new state spaces that can stretch or contract, reach out or scale back, in response to a casino dominant economy, in spite of all the controversies and challenges. It is in this sense that we call Asian casinos contested sites of state power.

### **Introducing the Articles**

The collection of articles in this special issue offers first-hand analyses from both mature and emerging casino destinations in the region, including Macau, Singapore, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines. Together, these articles show how the state and the booming Asian casinos are intertwined in complex ways. As contested sites of state power, Asian casinos embody state agendas and ideologies, and produce new orders of a transnational labour regime. The articles also show that state power can be stretched beyond its reach, challenged, and penetrated by the forces of vice economies, junket networks, underground connections, and systematic corruption. This special issue is divided into three main themes:

*[Note: This section should go on to discuss each paper in a little more detail and describing how the papers will work together. This may include discussing certain themes they will treat or common elements in their theoretical approach, analysis, methodologies, etc.]*



## Manuscript Abstracts

*[Note: We provide as an example, some abstracts below. Of course your proposal should include abstracts for all the proposed papers.]*

### **The State of Fun: Casinos and Experiential Capitalism in Singapore**

Juan Zhang  
University of New England, Armidale, Australia  
Email

Brenda S. A. Yeoh  
National University of Singapore  
Email

When Singapore opened two luxurious casino resorts in 2010, fun was a key rationale that legitimized the state's project of reinventing Singapore as an exciting global city attractive not only to the rich and famous, but also transnational tourists with money to spend. The shaping of the "state of fun" in Singapore entails that fun has become a key strategy to the city-state's image making and cosmopolization. Fun is carefully designed and promoted, and skilfully regulated. Through both the market and state enticement, having fun becomes a new practice of the wealthy middle-class and tourists that drives consumption and capital accumulation. As casinos are carved out as a space of exception, fun becomes a legitimating factor that not only normalizes their operation, but also ethicizes their moral presence. This article examines how fun is both promoted and governed, by the state, the market, and the individuals themselves. It argues that fun is both an attraction and an act of discipline. It provokes desires of excess and self-indulgence; at the same time it orders self-responsibility and self-restraint.

### **Gambling on the Future: Casino Enclaves and the Making of a Modern Laos**

Kearrin Sims  
University of Western Sydney  
Email

Following the extraordinary wealth that has been generated by casinos within cities such as Macau and Singapore, both private sector investors and national governments across East Asia have promoted gambling enclaves as a means to fast-track economic growth. However, not all casinos have lived up to expectations. This article examines some of the place-based specifics of two casino towns in northern Laos and the manner in which they have reconfigured the livelihoods and sociocultural practices of local residents. I argue that Laos' casinos share similarities with other gaming venues in the region; however, they cannot be understood independently of their particular sociocultural and political-economic contexts. In particular, I examine the complex interplay between the dynamics through which the Government of Laos has used casinos to expand state power, the transnational vice economies in which these zones of exception are embedded, and the linkages between casinos and the growing privatization of the country's development sector. Drawing these themes together, I

question the viability of the casino town as a model for sustained economic growth and poverty alleviation. The article draws on desk-based analysis, three visits to each of the casino sites in 2011-2012 and a follow-up visit in August 2015.

## **Regulatory Regimes and Transnational Labour Brokering in a Grey Casino Space**

Melody Chia-Wen Lu  
University of Macau  
Email

Kamalini Ramdas  
National University of Singapore  
Email

The recruitment and control of migrant labour have been integral elements of state developmental strategies in East and Southeast Asia. Recently, casino resorts in the region have stimulated particularly feminized and racialized migrant labour to provide round-the-clock services needed in the casino leisure sector. Based on ethnographic research on card dealers and labour brokering agencies, this paper uses the process of labour brokering from China and Taiwan to Singapore to illustrate that a grey zone in the transnational casino space is necessary in resolving conflicting logics in the constellation of overlapping regulatory regimes and inherent moral dilemmas. Using Xiang and Lindquist's concept of "migration infrastructure" we investigate how commercial and regulatory infrastructures interact. As gambling is illegal in China and Taiwan, and Singapore's casino operators are concerned about openly recruiting labour in this inglorious industry, the transnational brokering industry has developed a sophisticated division of labour between counterpart brokers, involving up to five brokers, to externalize risks and to circumvent migration and casino regulatory regimes, manufacturing a legal pathway while maintaining covertness. This grey zone of labour brokering differs from clandestine migration in two aspects: 1) it appeals to the logics of leisure, gaming and cosmopolitan glamour, echoing the rhetoric of the integrated resorts; 2) it is circumscribed by the states' desire to regulate in maintaining a purportedly clean and ethical casino space. We will examine different discursive and practical strategies adopted by the Singaporean, Taiwanese and Chinese brokers which reveal different moral imaginaries of the casino space.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Shiu Hing Lo, "Casino Politics, Organized Crime and the Post-Colonial State in

<sup>2</sup> Ronen Shamir, "The Age of Responsibilization: On Market-Embedded Morality," *Economy and Society* 37, no. 1 (2008): 1-19.

<sup>3</sup> We draw from Craig and Porter and use "development" as it is commonly understood: an improvement on material and socio-political conditions in so-called underdeveloped societies so that they will be more like so-called developed societies. See David Craig and Doug Porter, *Development Beyond Neoliberalism? Governance, Poverty Reduction and Political Economy* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

- <sup>4</sup> See, for example, Pál Nyíri, "Enclaves of Improvement: Sovereignty and Development in the Special Zones of the China-Lao Borderland," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 3 (2012): 533-562.
- <sup>5</sup> See Juan Zhang and Brenda S. A. Yeoh, "Harnessing Exception: Mobilities, Credibility, and the Casino," *Environment and Planning A* (2013), doi: 10.1177/0308518X15609175, accessed 31 January 2016.
- <sup>6</sup> L.H., "Casinos in Cambodia: When the Luck Runs Out," *The Economist* (2014), <http://www.economist.com/blogs/banyan/2014/10/casinos-cambodia>, accessed 5 February 2016.
- <sup>7</sup> Earl L. Grinols, *Gambling in America: Costs and Benefits* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Davis Fong, Hoc Nang Fong, and Shaozhi Li, "The Social Cost of Gambling in Macau: Before and after the Liberalisation of the Gaming Industry," *International Gambling Studies* 11, no. 1 (2011): 43-56.
- <sup>8</sup> Richard A. McGowan, *Government and the Transformation of the Gaming Industry* (Northampton: Edward Elgar, 2001).
- <sup>9</sup> Natasha Dow Schull, *Addiction by Design: Machine Gambling in Las Vegas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); David G. Schwartz, *Suburban Xanadu: The Casino Resort on the Las Vegas Strip and Beyond* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Sytze F. Kingma, *Global Gambling: Cultural Perspectives on Gambling Organizations* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).
- <sup>10</sup> George Ritzer and Todd Stillman, "The Modern Las Vegas Casino-Hotel: The Paradigmatic New Means of Consumption," *M@n@gement* 4, no. 3 (2001): 83-99.
- <sup>11</sup> See e.g. Zheng Gu, "Macau Gaming: Copying the Las Vegas Style or Creating a Macau Model?," *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 9, no. 1 (2004): 89-96.
- <sup>12</sup> Zhang and Yeoh, "Harnessing Exception: Mobilities, Credibility, and the Casino."
- <sup>13</sup> Gavin Bowring and Felipe Salvosa, "Manila's New Casino Seeks Business from Macau, Singapore," *The Financial Times* (2015), <http://blogs.ft.com/beyond-bricks/2015/02/06/manilas-new-casino-seeks-business-from-macau-singapore/>, accessed 3 December 2015.
- <sup>14</sup> Neil Brenner, *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 27.
- <sup>15</sup> Chris Lyttleton and Pál Nyíri, "Dams, Casinos and Concessions: Chinese Megaprojects in Laos and Cambodia," in *Engineering Earth: The Impacts of Megaengineering Projects*, ed. Stanley D. Brunn (Dordrecht: Springer, 2010), 1243-1265; Minho Cho, "Tourism Redevelopment Strategy: The Case of the Kangwon Land Resort Casino," *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 13, no. 2 (2002): 185-197.
- <sup>16</sup> Kah-Wee Lee, "From Casino to Integrated Resort: Nationalist Modernity and the Art of Blending," *Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series*, no. 242 (2015): 1-17, [http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/wps/wps15\\_242.pdf](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/wps/wps15_242.pdf); Kah-Wee Lee, "Transforming Macau: Planning as Institutionalized Informality and the Spatial Dynamics of Hypercompetition," *Environment and Planning A* 46 (2014): 2622-2637; also see Tim Simpson, "Neoliberalism with 'Chinese Characteristics': Consumer Pedagogy in Macao," in *City and Fascination: Beyond the Surplus of Meaning*, ed. Sahr Schmid and John Urry (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011).
- <sup>17</sup> Wuyi Wang and Peter Zabielskis, "Making Friends, Making Money: Macao's Traditional Vip Casino System," in *Global Gambling: Cultural Perspectives on Gambling*, ed. Sytze F. Kingma (London: Routledge, 2010), 113-143.
- <sup>18</sup> Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell, "Neoliberalising Space," *Antipode* 34, no. 3 (2002): 380-404; Toby Carroll, "Introduction: Neo-Liberal Development Policy in Asia Beyond the Post-Washington Consensus," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 3 (2012): 350-58.
- <sup>19</sup> Aihwa Ong, "Graduated Sovereignty in South-East Asia," *Theory, Culture & Society* 17, no. 4 (2000): 55-75.
- <sup>20</sup> Aihwa Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).
- <sup>21</sup> For detailed critiques of Ong, see Jamie Cross, "Neoliberalism as Unexceptional: Economic Zones and the Everyday Precariousness of Working Life in South India," *Critique of Anthropology*

---

30, no. 4 (2010): 355-373; Rebecca E. Karl, "Reviewed Work: Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty by Aihwa Ong," *The China Quarterly*, no. 189 (2007): 188-190.

<sup>22</sup> David Harvey, "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism," *Geografiska Annaler Series B Human Geography* 71, no. 1 (1989): 3-17.

<sup>23</sup> Toby Carroll, "Working on, through and around the State: The Deep Marketisation of Development in the Asia-Pacific," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 3 (2012): 378-404.

<sup>24</sup> Carroll, "Neo-Liberal Development Policy in Asia."

<sup>25</sup> Carroll, "Working on, through and around the State," 379.

<sup>26</sup> Carroll, "Working on, through and around the State," 385, emphasis original.

<sup>27</sup> Martin Young, "Gambling, Capitalism and the State: Towards a New Dialectic of the Risk Society?," *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10, no. 2 (2010): 254-273.

<sup>28</sup> Darryl S. Jarvis, "The Regulatory State in Developing Countries: Can It Exist and Do We Want It? The Case of the Indonesian Power Sector," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 3 (2012): 464-492.

<sup>29</sup> Bae-Gyoon Park, "Spatially Selective Liberalization and Graduated Sovereignty: Politics of Neo-Liberalism and 'Special Economic Zones' in South Korea," *Political Geography* 24, no. 7 (2005): 850-873.

<sup>30</sup> Neil Brenner, "Urban Governance and the Production of New State Spaces in Western Europe, 1960-2000," *Review of International Political Economy* 11, no. 3 (2004): 447-488.

<sup>31</sup> Brenner, "Urban Governance and the Production of New State Spaces in Western Europe, 1960-2000," 449.

Special Issue Proposal  
Pacific Affairs