

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN SOUTH AMERICA

Sofia Donoso

INTRODUCTION

In democratic regimes, governance encompasses the institutional mediation between government and non-governmental forces through which interests are represented, and social and political inclusion is secured and sustained in accordance with the rule of law. When governance is in place, then, governments are able to exert effective and accountable public authority. Yet, this is not set in stone; governance is produced through an interactive process in which actors' interests are constantly redefined. Social movements play an important role in this redefinition. Hence, one cannot understand how governance is generated and upheld without analysing the role played by social movements in this process.

A cursory review of South America's recent history shows numerous examples of social movements articulating grievances, exerting pressure on the political authorities to address their demands, and – when not heard – disputing power on the electoral arena on their own or in alliance with other political forces. In 2001, the world witnessed how massive uprisings in Argentina – spearheaded by the *Piqueteros* – demanded *Que se vayan todos!* and forced the resignation of five presidents in one week. Since the early 2000s, the *Movimiento al Socialismo* (MAS), a political party that emerged from the *Cocalero* movement under the leadership of Evo Morales, has dominated politics in Bolivia. The student movement in Chile, in turn, has put into question the political consensus in place since the return of democracy, and influenced the last years' policy agenda in significant ways. Lastly, recent protests in Brazil, both supporting former President Dilma Rouseff from the Workers' Party and calling for her impeachment, shacked the country with important implications for governance.

These are only a few examples of how social movements have driven the restructuring of state-civil society relations in contemporary South America. There are many more. In a region where political and socio-economic exclusion has been persistent throughout history, pressure “from below” has put into question both the content and the

procedures of the region's predominant political and development models. Since the early 2000s, especially, social movements have articulated old and new demands, and by doing so, altered the terms through which governance is maintained and shaped democratisation in fundamental ways.

This chapter reviews the relationship between democracy and social movements in South America. It begins with an overview of the role played by social movements in the double transition that South America has experienced during the last three decades: from authoritarianism to democracy, and from state-led economies to neoliberalism. It then analyses how social movements have articulated emerging discontent with the faults of both democratic rule and the neoliberal model. The last section examines how the region's various social movements have engaged in institutional politics during the "turn to the left" that has marked South America and the rest of the region since the late 1990s. I conclude by referring to the political influence of social movements and how this has reshaped the terms through which governance is produced and kept in contemporary South America.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS DURING THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY AND NEOLIBERALISM

South America had a troubled history of democracy during the twentieth century. In the context of corporatist governments and authoritarianism, social mobilisation was generally driven by demands for the expansion of labour and agrarian rights (Ortiz 2015:43). Collier and Collier's (1991) seminal book, *Shaping the Political Arena*, set out to demonstrate how the political development in South America and other Latin American countries during the twentieth century was defined by the way in which labour was incorporated into the political arena. After the economic crisis of the early 1930s, the introduction of state-led import-substitution industrialisation models (henceforth ISI model) across the region led to a significant growth of the labour force. In turn, this led to a process of incorporation of the working class into the political arena through the expansion of social and political citizenship.

Also Rueschemeyer et al's (1992) *Capitalist Development and Democracy*, the scope of which goes beyond South America, stressed the importance of workers'

organisations such as trade unions and socialist parties as driving forces of democratisation in both South America and Southern Europe. Specifically, the authors argued that the reason why democracy has advanced farthest in capitalist Western countries is that industrialisation has created a large and powerful working class that have put pressure for the instatement of democratic rule. Arguing against Marxist perspectives, which claimed that democracy emerged because it allowed the dominant classes to maintain their power and economic interests, Rueschemeyer et al. showed that capitalists, and especially the agrarian landlords, in fact, have been strong opponents to democratisation. Historically, the importance of the agrarian society in the case of Latin America has therefore constrained the development of democracy. Where industrialisation was absent, authoritarian regimes kept an oligarchic system deeply rooted in labour-intensive agriculture (Rueschemeyer et al. 1992). In spite of this, countries such as Chile, Argentina and Brazil, amongst others, established democracy during the first half of the twentieth century.

Yet, from the early 1960s onwards, increased social pressure on the democratic regime and political polarisation undermined democracy in the region. At the mid-1970s, all countries in South America, with the exception of Colombia and Venezuela, experienced a breakdown of their incipient democracy. This also defined the fate of social forces. With the onset of authoritarian rule, activists experienced imprisonment and torture, and social movements demobilised as a result. At the same time, the struggle for human rights became the centre of the initial resistance against the dictatorships across South America. Human rights movements constructed clandestine networks of activists and staged international campaigns to denounce the systematic violation of human rights in the region. The most emblematic of these movements is the Madres de Plaza de Mayo in Argentina (e.g. Navarro 1989; Brysk 1994).

However, as Rossi and Della Porta (2011) point out, other social movements also played an important role. In many countries, organised labour catalysed the transition from authoritarianism in important ways, especially in the initial processes of political liberalisation (Collier and Mahoney 1997; Drake 1996; Valenzuela 1989; Payne 1991). As previous research has pointed out, labour mobilisation, in fact, tended to precede other social movement activity in the struggle to re-gain democracy (Foweraker and Landman 1997:133). But also shantytown organisations, such as the ones in Chile, mobilised in the

big cities and joined students, workers, and the opposition parties in protesting (Hipsher 1996; Hipsher 1998a; Oxhorn 1995; Schneider 1995). Additionally, indigenous movements, environmental movements, and women's rights movements (e.g. Lind 1992; Baldez 2003) were active and joined broader mobilisation efforts to regain democracy (see Eckstein 1989 for a general overview). Once dictatorships started to tumble, social movements exerted pressure to introduce democratic rule by staging protests and engaging in other repertoires of contention such as strikes. In sum, then, the rise of a vast array of social movements calling for democracy –which the transition literature referred to as the “resurrection of civil society” (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986:48)– contributed to the reestablishment of democratic rule from the late 1970s onwards.

Few would take exception with the claim that the reinstatement of democracy brought about objective possibilities for more citizen participation in general, and social movements in particular. Most obviously, the associational space for social actors to congregate publicly increased considerably (Silva 2009:30). At the same time, regime transitions involved new opportunities for societal demand-making, new expectations regarding the accountability of state officials, and a pledge for more inclusive and integrative polities (Berins Collier and Handlin 2009:3).

In addition, the adoption of institutional forms of participation opened up new spaces (Avritzer 2008). For example, Brazil's participatory budgeting, arguably the most heavily scrutinised case, was introduced with the aim of strengthening social actors and to thereby reinforce democracy (Abers 1996; Abers 1998; Baiocchi 2001; Goldfrank 2011; Hochstetler 2000; Wampler and Avritzer 2004).

Once the transition from authoritarian rule was completed and electoral democracy installed, however, social mobilisation tended to wane. As a large body of literature has underlined, the restoration of party politics and elite-level compromises frequently came at the expense of social movements (Almeida 2007; Hipsher 1996; Hipsher 1998b; Oxhorn 1996; Roberts 1998a). Many times, the interlinked relationships between the leaders of social movements and political parties also meant that party goals were translated into base-level action. With the aim of preserving democratic stability, these party guidelines often put forward a limited definition of democracy that discouraged protest. More broadly, this motivated political parties to seek to moderate societal demands (Oxhorn 2009:222). This

was an intentional and strategic response to the need of assuring the economic elites that the reinstatement of democratic rule would not threaten their interests (Paley 2001; Panizza 2009; Roberts 2008:330). Demobilisation thus signified that subordinate groups lost their capacity to pursue collective goals (Remmer 1980:276). In this way, as Garretón notes (1990:2), political transitions tended to leave pending the problems of social democratisation, that is, meaningful social change that renders opportunities for social participation more equal. So, while political rights were reinstated, the agenda on social rights tended to lag behind. The uncoupling of political and social rights reflected the shifts in relative power to varying degrees in different Latin American countries. But common causes were a weakened labour movement, the increased structural power of private capital, and states that had been scaled back and were consequently less capable of responding to social rights demands (Roberts 1998a).

The difficulties to advance an agenda on social rights was also closely related to the introduction of the neoliberal model in South America. The free-market approach, which gained momentum under President Ronald Reagan in the United States and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom, was preceded by Chile, where the military regime had begun to introduce market reforms already in the mid-1970s. In other parts of the region it was only after the debt crisis of the early 1980s that governments introduced short-term stabilisation programmes, which then were followed by neoliberal reforms with more permanent consequences. According to a view which soon became hegemonic, the origins of the debt crisis was caused by the excessive intervention of the state in the economy (Huber and Stephens 2012:156). Accordingly, international institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund spearheaded policy initiatives that sought to scale back the state, reduce fiscal imbalances, and deregulate the economy. The so-called “Washington Consensus” further promoted fiscal orthodoxy, liberalisation, and the privatisation of previously state-owned companies (Williamson 1990). With different timings and varying intensity, the vast majority of Latin American countries had adopted substantive market reforms by the early 1990s (Roberts 2008:328).

Free-market reforms discouraged the emergence of social movements and other forms of political engagement in at least two ways. First, by reducing the scope of what is decided politically and accomplished through public policies, the neoliberal prescriptions

arguably created disincentives for political action (Kurtz 2004:272). At the same time, the introduction of neoliberalism led to the withdrawal of government from many of its adjudicatory functions in the economy (Arce and Bellinger 2007:98). For example, trade liberalisation and enterprise privatisation, implemented for the sake of economic efficiency, transferred what used to be highly consequential policy decisions such as setting price and employment levels, to markets that were at the whim of the international economy (Kurtz 2004:273). Additionally, the increasing technocratisation that often accompanied free-market reforms had a depoliticising effect on the policy-making process, which was now considered a technical matter (Oxhorn 2009:220; Lechner 2002:119). As Oxhorn argues, “[p]roponents of neoliberal reforms viewed neutral or apolitical market mechanisms for deciding distributional issues as inherently superior to state (i.e., political) institutions, if not as panaceas” (2009:223). Finally, it is also important to note that in light of the high social mobilisation and polarisation that had characterised much of the 1960s and early 1970s in Latin America, a technocratic approach to policymaking was also promoted in the post-transition period as the only guarantee of “rational and coherent” policies (Silva 1991:386).

Secondly, the neoliberal reforms themselves complicated collective action in that they inhibited the formation of groups or the formation of collective interests that are crucial antecedents of political engagement (Kurtz 2004:272). In particular, they transformed the social, political, and cultural landscapes that had developed during the mid-twentieth century through the implementation of the ISI model. Specifically, the introduction of the neoliberal model involved the weakening of the class-based collective actors of the ISI era, i.e. organised labour and labour-based parties (Roberts 2007a; Roberts 2007b). The decline of the ISI model and the liberalisation of the markets across the region were followed by the loss of industrial jobs (Huber and Stephens 2012:158). In turn, the dismantling of the manufacturing sector – commonly the most heavily unionised economic sector – weakened the national trade union movements considerably. Additionally, the freeze in public employment that accompanied this economic shift also debilitated the trade unions in this sector. These processes went hand in hand with the expansion of the informal sector, which is much harder to organise (Panizza 2009:104; Roberts 1996:70).

The decline of the national trade union movements that resulted from the dismantling of the ISI model often coincided with the liberalisation of labour legislation. The flexibilisation of the legal frame, which had previously facilitated the organisation of workers and sometimes also peasants, further complicated collective action (Kurtz 2004:272). Legal changes also eroded the historical gains of the trade union movement by scaling back on job security and increasing contract work, amongst other things (Rice 2012:40). Efforts to abolish collective bargaining at the sectoral level and facilitate hiring and firing further undermined organisational rights (Kurtz 2004:287).

Neoliberal reform also had an impact on collective action in other ways, notably through the transformation of the region's party systems and political regimes (Murillo 1997; Murillo 2001; Roberts 2007a; Roberts 2012; Roberts and Wibbels 1999; Weyland 2004). Scholarship has shown that market reforms did not only weaken organised labour – a central constituency of the Left – but also eroded corporatist structures of interest representation. Moreover, by scaling back the state, the introduction of neoliberalism weakened and transformed clientelistic networks of party-society relations.

Scholars have also investigated the relationship between the decline of organised labour and the transformation of the political parties that historically supported labour movements (e.g. Levitsky 2003; Murillo 1997; Murillo 2001). For example, as noted by Roberts and Wibbels, the parties that had traditionally promoted state-led development have either collapsed (e.g. Peru's APRA and United Left coalition), been considerably weakened (e.g. Mexico's PRI, Venezuela's AD, the Chilean Communist Party, the Nicaraguan Sandinistas), or become defenders of free-market reforms (e.g. the Argentine Peronists under Menem, the Chilean Socialists, the MNR in Bolivia, and the Mexican PRI) (1999:585).

Recognising that neoliberal reforms have challenged the privileged position of trade unions as interest mediators, a growing body of literature has sought to conceptualise the implications for political representation (e.g. Berins Collier and Handlin 2009; Hagopian 2009) and citizenship (e.g. Oxhorn 2011). In sum, then, the adoption of the neoliberal model in the region complicated the articulation of collective action through various mechanisms. In the words of Oxhorn (2009:222), "[t]his weakness in social mobilisation

and civil society more generally meant that alternatives to neoliberalism would take a long time, at best, to emerge”.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE ARTICULATION OF DISCONTENT

While many “traditional” social movements lost influence with the double transition to democratic rule and a free-market economy, the persistence of inequality and socio-economic exclusion created a fertile soil of discontent (Rice 2012:42). By the mid-1990s, survey data and academic analyses already highlighted existing disillusionment with democratic rule among Latin Americans (Panizza 2009:89). New actors eventually articulated this disgruntlement and mobilised to extend citizenship rights from the political to the social and economic spheres (Roberts 2008:329).

As a large body of literature has shown, since the late 1990s growing grievances stemming from the shortcomings of the neoliberal model and the unfulfilled promises of democratic rule have animated different protest movements which challenge both neoliberalism and the governments that attempt to impose it (Almeida 2007; Arce 2008; Bellinger and Arce 2011; Eckstein 2004; Kuecker 2004; Roberts 2008; Roberts 2009; Silva 2009; Stahler-Sholk, Vanden and Kuecker 2007; Vanden 2003). Instead of being staged under the trade union banner, protests have involved ethnic, civic, or sectoral identities (Rice 2012:10). One of the most elaborated attempts at systematising the current tide of mobilisation and its implications for political representation is Berins Collier and Handlin’s edited volume *Reorganizing popular politics* (2009), in which the editors and the contributors analyse the emergence of a new interest regime in the region. Recognising that neoliberal reforms have challenged the privileged position of trade unions as interest mediators, Berins Collier and Handlin argue that the new interest regime is instead characterised by the proliferation and activation of a broad array of urban popular organisations, including community-based associations and nongovernmental organisations (NGOs).

So, led by new and old actors – indigenous peoples, the unemployed, and neighbourhood associations, amongst others – these protests stemmed from the formation of new social movement organisations and reflect that while neoliberal reforms

considerably weakened class-based actors such as organised labour, new actors have mounted a significant challenge to the flaws of the neoliberal transformation and of procedural democracy (Silva 2009; Silva 2012).

One particularly visible social movement is the Argentine Unemployed Workers' movement – the Piqueteros – which has been the principal social actor in calling into question the mismanagement of the economy and the faults of the country's neoliberal model (e.g. Rossi 2011; Svampa and Pereyra 2003). The Piqueteros were part of the mass mobilisation that rocked the country in late 2001, culminating in the resignation of President Fernando de la Rúa and paving the way for the articulation of social demands for the incorporation of the poor (Svampa 2005; Rossi 2011).

Yet, Argentina is not unique in having experienced processes of mass mobilisation against the existing economic and political order. In Bolivia, for example, different protest waves against the neoliberal model – triggered by the privatisation of water rights in 2000 and the exploitation of the country's vast natural gas reserves – sparked massive protests and came to a head in 2005 with the rise of the Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS), a leftist and indigenous party, and the electoral triumph of MAS leader Evo Morales (Madrid 2012). Venezuela and Ecuador equally experienced periods of mass mobilisation staged by social groups hurt by neoliberal reforms (Silva 2009). Much like in Argentina and Bolivia, these protest waves helped to bring leftist leaders to power. In Chile, in turn, the Student Movement has spearheaded the largest protests since the reinstatement of democracy (Donoso 2013; 2016). In 2006, and most notably, in 2011, students put pressure on the incumbent governments and forced a debate on education and political reforms.

Seeking to explain the emergence of these national movement, Silva's (2009) comparative research argues that neoliberalism enabled the formation of linkages of disparate social groups which, in turn, paved the way for the episodes of mass mobilisation in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela. In his explanation of this phenomenon, Silva (2009:17) draws on the work of Polanyi who argued that market society, by fostering a process of commodification of social relations, created tensions that complicated the construction of a stable and just social order. In this way, the market society which results from the subordination of economic, political and social organisations to market norms incites people to seek to protect themselves from the often destructive consequences of the

free-market. Within this frame, the current tide of social mobilisation represents an expression of a “double movement” through which protectionist counter-movements arise as a reaction to the precarity that often accompanies neoliberal transformation.

Another interpretation suggests that the articulation of discontent by an emerging set of social actors can be understood as a “second” historical process of mass political incorporation (Roberts 2008; Rossi 2011). This idea makes reference to the “first” historical wave of incorporation of the popular sectors discussed in the work of Collier and Collier (1991), in which they set out to demonstrate that Latin America’s political development during the twentieth century was determined by the way in which labour was incorporated into the political arena. In particular, Collier and Collier showed that the ISI model led to an increased labour force, which made necessary a process of incorporation of the working class to the political arena. While it was highly contentious and played out with great variation across the Latin American countries, this process of political incorporation involved a close relationship between social and citizenship rights. Against this background, Roberts (2008) and Rossi (2011) argue that the present call for “re-incorporation” expresses the dissatisfaction with the uncoupling of political and social rights that has followed the reinstatement of democracy and neoliberal reforms. It has materialised in social movements calling for the expansion of social citizenship rights, governmental efficiency and political inclusion (Dagnino, Olvera and Panfichi 2006a:15). In other words, contemporary movements contest the very terms under which popular sectors have been politically reincorporated after the reinstatement of democratic rule in Latin America (Roberts 2008:327).

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS’ ENGAGEMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL POLITICS DURING THE “TURN TO THE LEFT”

Since the late 1990s, social movements have contributed to the election of left of centre political leaders. The rise of different social movements and protests groups illustrate that there is a real demand for the implementation of policies that aim to go beyond the neoliberal model implemented across the region during the 1980s and 1990s (Luna and Filgueira 2009b). In this debate, scholars generally agree on the distinction of two different

types of left-of-centre governments. On the one hand, a “moderate” variant which is characterised by a consensus-seeking approach and which does not eschew the policies of the so-called Washington Consensus, probably best exemplified by Chile’s Concertación and Brazil’s Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT). On the other hand, the “contestatory” variant, which is at odds with the idea of the free market and seeks to mobilise the masses to press for the implementation of far-reaching reforms in favour of socioeconomic redistribution.

The rising tide of social movements referred to in the previous section has contributed to the election of both types of left-of-centre political parties across South America. Democratically elected presidents such as Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela, Rafael Correa in Ecuador, and Evo Morales in Bolivia are all examples of the first variant that seeks to mobilise existing social movement organisations. Their governments have been marked by initiatives such as drafting a new constitution by setting up a constituent assembly, the nationalisation of economic resources, and the development of a new foreign policy against the interests of the United States. Given that many of these initiatives are highly contested and not few of them are at odds with the liberal democratic model, some scholars have claimed that the contestatory Left is on its way towards building competitive authoritarian regimes (e.g. Levitsky and Loxton 2013).

At the same time, it is important to note that the “pink tide”, as it has been referred to, has coincided with and been facilitated by the economic boom that Latin America has experienced since the early 2000s (Levitsky and Roberts 2011a). This has expanded the room of manoeuvre for left-of-centre governments who favour “statist, nationalist, and redistributive political projects and associated challenges to U.S. hegemony” (Remmer 2012:953). The favourable economic scenario, in turn, has fostered citizenship claims that are framed in terms of rights (Grugel, Singh and Riggirozzi 2013).

Another part the debate on the “turn to the Left” has centred on determining its influence on social movements (e.g. Garay 2007; Prevost, Campos and Vanden 2012; Rice 2012; Rossi 2011; Ruiz 2012). The rise of indigenous movements that enter the electoral arena constitutes one of most important changes in this regard. As the literature has documented, the socio-political transformations experienced in the region have redefined the recurrent “indigenous issue” (e.g. Almeida 2008; Madrid 2012; Rice 2012; Van Cott 2005; Yashar 1999; Yashar 2005). Yashar (2005) analyses the shift from what she refers to

as a “corporatist citizenship regime”, which unintentionally enabled indigenous communities to carve out spaces of local autonomy, to a “neoliberal citizenship regime” that threatens the autonomy that had previously been secured. This process, she argues, has politicised ethnic cleavages and motivated social mobilisation (Yashar 2005:54). The work of Van Cott (2005), which encompasses an in-depth analysis of the cases of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru, and includes a comparative chapter on Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela, deals with the formation and electoral performance of indigenous parties and movements. It argues that the re-emergence of the Left in the Andean countries is directly related to the capacity of social movements and civil society organisations to provide resources – from domestic and international allies to a professional staff able to articulate a coherent political programme – that are crucial for triumphing in the electoral arena. In a similar fashion, Rice (2012) claims that the characteristics of domestic political institutions and the historic patterns of popular political incorporation have defined the rise of ethnic parties in Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru. Finally, Madrid (2012), whose book focuses on the electoral performance of ethnic parties, shows that a populist rhetoric that seeks to include those social groups that historically have been excluded has provided electoral gains in countries such as Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru.

In sum, then, the predominance of the Left in South America and the rest of the region from the late 1990s onwards has redefined the structure of political opportunities for social movements. It has both enhanced the possibilities for broader social and political reforms and carved out space for the creation of new political parties. Without a doubt, social movements have played a key role in putting this onto the political agenda.

CONCLUSION

A cursory review of South America’s recent history shows that social movements have been an important actor in the definition of political agendas, and in ensuring the instatement and enhancement of democracy. While the twin transition to neoliberalism and democratic rule constrained and fragmented collective action in many ways, social actors have reacted to the fault lines of this double transition. After a process of reconstruction of

collective action, social movements have re-emerged in South America with renewed vigour.

This process of articulation of societal demands is closely related to the search of new development models in South America and the rest of the region. The new regional scenario, characterised by the search for new development models that tackle the tension between the maxims of neoliberalism and democracy, is the focus of an ongoing and high profile scholarly discussion (Cameron 2009; Grugel and Riggirozzi 2009a; Mettenheim and Malloy 1998; Oxhorn 1995; Oxhorn 2009; Oxhorn and Ducantzenzeiler 1998; Roberts 2009; Silva 2009). These scholarly efforts recognise that in contrast to the early 1990s, when the challenge was to reinstate democracy in the region, the current contention concerns the quality of the existing democracies (Dagnino, Olvera and Panfichi 2006b; UNDP 2004a; Weyland 1996).

Another part of this debate has discussed a possible shift to a post-neoliberal era (e.g. Grugel and Riggirozzi 2009b; Macdonald and Ruckert 2009; Oxhorn 2009). “Post-neoliberalism” refers, in simple terms, to the distance from the prescriptions of the Washington Consensus that has characterised many the left-of-centre governments since the late 1990s. Yet, while the neoliberal model adopted across the region is being contested at both elite and mass levels, it is not clear whether an alternative development model has emerged as of yet (Roberts 2009). Although it is true that left-of-centre forces in the region have articulated an influential discourse on the faults of liberal democracy and economic neoliberalism, it is still too early to fully assess how these critiques are expressed in terms of an alternative political and economic model (Panizza 2005). So, rather than a coherent and alternative governance model, what we are observing in contemporary South America is social and political actors’ gradual effort to address the existing model’s most salient shortcomings.

As this chapter has shown, examining social movements and their engagement with institutional politics is of central importance to grasp both how countries advance the quality of their democracies, and the discussion of new development models. The study of social movements can thus help us to shed light on the rise of broader citizenship demands through the empowerment of less privileged sectors of society who organise for socioeconomic inclusion and more responsiveness from the political system. Furthermore,

scrutinising social movements' engagement with institutional politics helps us understanding the processes of alliance building between social and political actors that have allowed for the scaling-up of reform processes. This, in turn, constitutes a key dimension of the explanation of how governance is maintained and advanced in South America.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abers, Rebecca. 1996. "From ideas to practice: The Partido dos Trabalhadores and participatory governance in Brazil". *Latin American Perspectives* 23 (4): 35-53.
- Abers, Rebecca. 1998. "Policy, and civic organizing in Porto Alegre, Brazil. From clientelism to Cooperation". *Politics and Society* 26 (4): 511-37.
- Almeida, Paul. 2008. "The sequencing of success: Organising templates and neoliberal policy outcomes". *Mobilization: The International Quarterly* 13(2):165-87.
- Almeida, Paul D. 2007. "Defensive mobilization: Popular movements against economic adjustment policies in Latin America". *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (3):123-39.
- Arnson, Cintia J., and José Raúl Perales (Eds.). 2007. *The 'new Left' and democratic governance in Latin America*. Washington, D.C.: The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Arce, Moisés. 2008. "The repoliticization of collective action after neoliberalism in Peru". *Latin American Politics and Society* 50(3):37-62.
- Arce, Moisés, and Paul T. Bellinger. 2007. "Low intensity democracy revisited: The effects of economic liberalization on political activity in Latin America". *World Politics* 60(1):97-121.
- Avritzer, Leonardo. 2008. "Democratization and citizenship in Latin America. The emergence of institutional forms of participation". *Latin American Research Review* 43(2):282-89.
- Baiocchi, Gianpaolo. 2001. "Participation, activism, and politics: The Porto Alegre experiment and deliberative democratic theory". *Politics Society* 29(1): 43-72.
- Baldez, Lisa. 2003. "Women's movements and democratic transition in Chile, Brazil, East Germany, and Poland". *Comparative Politics* 35(3), pp. 253-272.
- Bellinger, Paul T., and Moisés Arce. 2011. "Protest and democracy in Latin America's market era". *Political Research Quarterly* 64(3):688-704.
- Berins Collier, Ruth, and Samuel Handlin (Eds.). 2009. *Reorganizing popular politics. Participation and the new interest regime in Latin America*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Brysk, Allison. 1994. *The politics of human rights in Argentina. Protest, change, and democratization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cameron, Maxwell A. 2009. "Latin America's Left turns: Beyond good and bad". *Third World Quarterly* 30(2): 331-48.
- Cameron, Maxwell A., and Eric Hershberg (Eds.). 2010. *Latin America's Left turns: Politics, policies, and trajectories of change*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the political arena. Critical junctures, the labor movement, and regime dynamics in Latin America*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Collier, Ruth Berins, and James Mahoney. 1997. "Adding collective actors to collective outcomes. Labor and recent democratization in South America and Southern Europe". *Comparative Politics* 29(3):285-303.
- Dagnino, Evelina, Alberto J. Olvera, and Aldo Panfichi. 2006a. "Introducción: Para otra lectura de la disputa por la construcción democrática en América Latina". México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica and Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (Universidad Veracruzana), pp. 15-97.

- Dagnino, Evelina, Alberto J. Olvera, and Aldo Panfichi (Eds.). 2006b. *La disputa por la construcción democrática en América Latina*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica and Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (Universidad Veracruzana).
- Drake, Paul W. 1996. *Labor movements and dictatorships: The Southern cone in comparative perspective* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eckstein, Susan (eds.). 1989. *Power and popular protest*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Eckstein, Susan. 2004. "Globalization and mobilization in the neoliberal era in Latin America". Unpublished work.
- Foweraker, Joe, and Todd Landman. 1997. *Citizenship rights and social movements: A comparative and statistical analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garay, Candelaria. 2007. "Social policy and collective action: Unemployed workers, community associations, and protest in Argentina". *Politics & Society* 35(2):301-28.
- Garretón, Manuel Antonio. 1990. "Las condiciones socio-políticas de la inauguración democrática en Chile". *Kellogg Institute Working Papers* 142 (June).
- Goldfrank, Benjamin. 2011. *Deepening local democracy in Latin America. Participation, decentralization, and the Left*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Grugel, Jean, and Pía Riggirozzi. 2009a. "The end of the embrace? Neoliberalism and alternatives to neoliberalism in Latin America" in *Governance after neoliberalism in Latin America*, edited by Jean Grugel and Pía Riggirozzi. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-23.
- (Eds.). 2009b. *Governance after neoliberalism in Latin America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grugel, Jean, Jojo Nem Singh, and Pia Riggirozzi. 2013. "From above and below: Post neoliberal patterns of citizenship in Chile and Argentina". Unpublished paper.
- Lechner, Norbert. 2002. *Las sombras del mañana. La dimensión subjetiva de la política* Santiago: LOM Ediciones.
- Levitsky, Steven. 2003. *Transforming labor-based parties in Latin America: Argentine Peronism in comparative perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levitsky, Steven, and James Loxton. 2013. "Populism and competitive authoritarianism in the Andes". *Democratization* 20(1):107-36.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Kenneth M. Roberts. 2011a. "Latin America's "Left turn". A framework for analysis" in *The resurgence of the Latin American Left* edited by Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 1-30.
- Lind, Amy Conger. 1992. "Power, gender, and development: Popular Women's organizations and the politics of needs in Ecuador" in *The making of social movements in Latin America: Identity, strategy and democracy* edited by Arturo Escobar and Sonia E. Alvarez. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 134-49.
- Luna, Juan Pablo, and Fernando Filgueira. 2009. "Societies, social policies, and political representation: A Latin American perspective". *International Political Science Review* 30(2):471-85.
- Kurtz, Markus. 2004. "The dilemmas of democracy in the open economy. Lessons from Latin America". *World Politics* 56(2):262–302.
- Kuecker, Glen David. 2004. "Latin American resistance movements in the time of the posts". *History Compass* 2 1):1-23

- Hagopian, Frances. 2009. "Reorganizing representation in Latin America". University of Notre Dame. Unpublished paper.
- Hipsher, Patricia L. 1996. "Democratization and the decline of urban social movements in Chile and Spain". *Comparative Politics* 28(3):273-97.
- . 1998a. "Democratic transitions and social movement outcomes. The Chilean Shantytown Dwellers' movement in comparative perspective" in *From contention to democracy*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 149-68.
- . 1998b. "Democratic transitions as protest cycles: Social movement dynamics in democratizing Latin America" in *The social movement society. Contentious politics for a new century*, edited by David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. pp. 153-72.
- Hochstetler, Kathryn. 2000. "Democratizing pressures from below? Social movements in the new Brazilian democracy" in *Democratic Brazil: Actors, institutions, and processes*, edited by Peter R. Kingstone and Timothy J. Power. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 167-82.
- Huber, Evelyne, and John D. Stephens. 2012. *Democracy and the Left: Social policy and inequality in Latin America* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Macdonald, Laura, and Arne Ruckert (Eds.). 2009. *Post-neoliberalism in the Americas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Madrid, Raúl L. 2012. *The rise of ethnic politics in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mettenheim, Kurt von, and James Malloy (Eds.). 1998. *Deepening democracy in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Murillo, María Victoria. 1997. "Union politics, market-oriented reforms, and the reshaping of Argentine corporatism" in *The new politics of inequality in Latin America. Rethinking participation and representation*, edited by Douglas A. Chalmers, Carlos M. Vilas, Katherine Hite, Scott B. Martin, Kerianne Piester, and Monique Segarra. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 72-94.
- . 2001. *Labor unions, partisan coalitions and market reforms in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Navarro, Marysa. 1989. "The personal is political: Las Madres de Playa de Mayo" in *Power and popular protest*, edited by Susan Eckstein. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 241-58.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from authoritarian rule: Tentative conclusions about uncertain democracies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ortiz, David G. 2015. "State repression and mobilization in Latin America", in Paul Almeida and Allen Cordero Ulate (eds.), *The handbook of social movements across Latin America*. New York; London: Springer, pp. 43-59.
- Oxhorn, Philip. 1995. *Organizing civil society. The popular sectors and the struggle for democracy in Chile*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- . 1996. "Surviving the return to 'normalcy': Social movements, democratic consolidation and economic restructuring". *International Review of Sociology* 6(1):117-34.
- . 2009. "Beyond neoliberalism? Latin America's new crossroads" in *Beyond neoliberalism in Latin America? Societies and politics at the crossroads*, edited by John Burdick,

- Philip Oxhorn, and Kenneth M. Roberts. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 217-33.
- . 2011. *Sustaining civil society. Economic change, democracy, and the social construction of citizenship in Latin America*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Oxhorn, Philip D., and Graciela Ducantenzeiler (Eds.). 1998. *What kind of democracy? What kind of market? Latin America in the age of neoliberalism*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Paley, Julia. 2001. *Marketing democracy: Power and social movements in post-dictatorship Chile*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Panizza, Francisco. 2005. "Unarmed utopia revisited: The resurgence of left-of-centre politics in Latin America". *Political Studies* 53(4):716-34.
- . 2009. *Contemporary Latin America: Development and democracy beyond the Washington Consensus*. London: Zed.
- Payne, Leigh. 1991. "Working class strategies in the transition to democracy in Brazil". *Comparative Politics*, 23 (2):221-238
- Prevost, Gary, Carlos Oliva Campos, and Harry van E. Vanden (Eds.). 2012. *Social movements and leftist governments in Latin America. Confrontation or co-optation?* London: Zed Books.
- Remmer, Karen L. 1980. "Political demobilization in Chile, 1973-1978". *Comparative Politics* 12(3):275-301.
- . 2012. "The rise of leftist- populist governance in Latin America: The roots of electoral change". *Comparative Political Studies* 45(8):947-72.
- Rice, Roberta. 2012. *The new politics of protest. Indigenous mobilization in Latin America's neoliberal era*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 1996. "Economic crisis and the demise of the legal Left in Peru". *Comparative Politics* 29(1):69-92.
- . 1997. "Rethinking economic alternatives: Left parties and the articulation of popular demands in Chile and Peru" in *The new politics of inequality in Latin America. Rethinking participation and representation*, edited by Douglas A. Chalmers, Carlos M. Vilas, Katherine Hite, Scott B. Martin, Kerianne Piester, and Monique Segarra. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 313-36.
- . 1998. *Deepening democracy? The modern Left and social movements in Chile and Peru*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 2002. "Party-society linkages and democratic representation in Latin America". *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 27(53):9-34.
- . 2007a. "The crisis of labor politics in Latin America: Parties and labor movements during the transition to neoliberalism". *International Labor and Working-Class History* 72(1):116-33.
- . 2007b. "Repolicizing Latin America: The Revival of Populist and Leftist Alternatives" in *Woodrow Wilson Center Update on the Americas*.
- . 2008. "The mobilization of opposition to economic liberalization". *Annual Review Political Science* 11:327-49.
- . 2009. "Beyond neoliberalism: Popular responses to social change in Latin America" in *Beyond neoliberalism in Latin America? Societies and politics at the crossroads*, edited by John Burdick, Philip Oxhorn, and Kenneth M. Roberts. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-13.

- . 2011. "Chile. The Left after neoliberalism" in *The resurgence of the Latin American left* edited by Kenneth M. Roberts and Steven Levitsky. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 325-47.
- . 2012. "Market reform, programmatic (de) alignment, and party system stability in Latin America". *Comparative Political Studies* 20(10):1-31, pp. 1-13.
- Roberts, Kenneth M., and Erik Wibbels. 1999. "Party systems and electoral volatility in Latin America: A test of economic, institutional, and structural explanations". *The American Political Science Review* 93(3):575-90.
- Rossi, Federico. 2011. "The Unemployed Workers' movements and the struggle for the definition of the (post-)neoliberal political arena in Argentina" in *European Consortium of Political Research Congress*. Reykjavik.
- Rossi, Federico and Donatella della Porta. 2011. "Acerca del rol de los movimientos sociales, sindicatos y redes de activistas en Los procesos de democratización", *Desarrollo Económico*, Vol. 50: 200 (January-March), pp. 521-545.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyn H. Stephens and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- Ruiz, Carlos. 2012. "New social conflicts under Bachelet". *Latin American Perspectives* 39(4):71-84.
- Schneider, Cathy Lisa. 1995. *Shantytown protest in Pinochet's Chile*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Silva, Eduardo. 1991. "The political economy of Chile's regime transition: From radical to "pragmatic" neo-liberal policies" in *The struggle for democracy in Chile 1982-1990*, edited by Paul W. Drake and Ivan Jaksic. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, pp. 98-127.
- . 2009. *Challenging neoliberalism in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2012. "Exchange rising? Karl Polanyi and contentious politics in Contemporary Latin America". *Latin American Politics and Society* 54(3):1-32.
- Stahler-Sholk, Richard, Harry E. Vanden, and Glen David Kuecker. 2007. "Globalizing resistance: The new politics of social movements in Latin America". *Latin American Perspectives* 34(5):5-16.
- Svampa, Maristella. 2005. *Sociedad excluyente. La Argentina bajo el signo del neoliberalismo*. Buenos Aires: Taurus.
- Svampa, Maristella, and Sebastián Pereyra. 2003. *Entre la ruta y el barrio: La experiencia de las organizaciones piqueteras*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.
- Valenzuela, J. Samuel. 1989. "Labor movements in transitions to democracy: A framework for analysis". *Comparative Politics* 21(4):445-72.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee 2005. *From movements to parties in Latin America. The evolution of ethnic politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanden, Harry E. 2003. "Globalization in a time of neoliberalism: Politicized social movements and the Latin American response". *Journal of Developing Societies* 19(2-3):308-33.
- Wampler, Brian, and Leonardo Avritzer. 2004. "Participatory publics: Civil society and new Institutions in democratic Brazil". *Comparative Politics* 36(3):291-312.
- Weyland, Kurt. 1996. "Obstacles to social reform in Brazil's new democracy". *Comparative Politics* 29(1):1-22.

- . 2004. "Neoliberalism and democracy in Latin America: A mixed record". *Latin American Politics and Society* 46(1):135-57.
- Weyland, Kurt, Raúl L. Madrid, and Wendy Hunter (Eds.). 2010. *Leftist governments in Latin America: Successes and shortcomings* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, John. 1990. "What Washington means by policy reform" in *Latin American adjustment: How much has happened?*, edited by John Williamson. Washington D.C.: Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- Yashar, Deborah J. 1999. "Democracy, indigenous movements, and the postliberal challenge". *World Politics* 52(1):23-42.
- . 2005. *Contesting citizenship in Latin America: The rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.