RESHAPING THE POLITICAL ARENA IN LATIN AMERICA

From Resisting Neoliberalism *to the* Second Incorporation

EDITED BY EDUARDO SILVA AND FEDERICO M. ROSSI

University of Pittsburgh Press

Published by the University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15260

Manufactured in the United States of America
Printed on acid-free paper
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Cataloging-in-Publication data is available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 13: 978-0-8229-6512-1
ISBN 10: 0-8229-6512-6512-7

Cover art: *Mural* by David Hernández, licensed by CC BY-SA 2.0
Cover design by Melissa Dias-Mandoly

Chapter 2

INTRODUCTION TO PART I

Social Movements and the Second Wave of (Territorial) Incorporation in Latin America

FEDERICO M. ROSSI

It was through contentious political dynamics that the poor and excluded strata of society claimed to be recognized as members of society.[1] The disruption produced by social movements and their allies was an important component in the production of the conditions for the first and second waves of incorporation. Protests, marches, pickets, strikes, and–sometimes–more violent methods have been part of the relational process of building and rebuilding institutions that modified the relationship of the popular sectors with the state. These contentious dynamics, in some occasions, pushed the elites to define a new "social question," innovating in both social and repressive policies to deal with the claim of the popular sectors for being (re)incorporated in the sociopolitical arena.

The popular movement's repertoire of strategies for social change has been associated with different types of movements in each historical period. The labor and/or peasant movements, the main organizers of the popular sectors in their claim for well-being through reform or revolution, were in the liberal period (1870s–1930s) that preceded the first incorporation (1930s–1950s). In the second incorporation (2000s–2010s), a different type of movement emerged in the neoliberal period (1970s–2000s) as the central popular actor in the quest for stopping the exclusionary consequences of authoritarianism and neoliberalism while claiming for the incorporation (again) of the popular sectors as citizens and wage earners. The emergence of what I define as "reincorporation movements"–a type of movement that has built upon but simultaneously decentered labor-based actors–is the result of important transformations that occurred in the socio-political arena between the two waves of Latin American incorporation of the popular sectors.

THE TWO WAVES OF INCORPORATION

The first incorporation was a corporatist process that involved a combination of the mobilization of popular claims by labor and/or peasant movements and the policies for channeling those claims into corporatist institutions. In Brazil, this was done for demobilization purposes, while in Bolivia, Venezuela, and—mainly—in Argentina, incorporation implied the mobilization of the labor movement. In Bolivia and Venezuela, first incorporation also included peasants, and in Ecuador incorporation was done by a military reformist regime with a weak labor movement (Collier and Collier 1991; French 1992; Klein 2003; Gotkowitz 2007; Yashar 2005; Collier in this volume).

The second incorporation departed from the inherited institutions and actors of the first incorporation. In addition, the two waves of incorporation were partial and selective, redefining the relationship between the popular sectors and the state. However, in this second wave, the main actor mobilizing the claims of the popular sectors were social movements organizing the excluded or *dis*incorporated poor people at the territorial level. In addition, the second incorporation was not conducted through the old corporatist institutions but through new or reformulated institutions conceived in response to the territorialized nature of the claims that emerged with popular movements.

This second wave was "territorial" because the incorporation of the popular sectors was predominantly done through institutions created or reformulated for the articulation of actors that were *not* functionally differentiated. This was a result of the emergence of contentious claims for reincorporation outside the trade union system. Instead, urban and rural land occupations, neighborhoods and shantytowns became central spaces for claim making for the organized poor people (Merklen 2005) once neoliberal reforms and authoritarian regimes had weakened or dissolved neocorporatist arrangements for resolving socio-political conflicts. For this reason, the social policies to reincorporate the popular sectors were not based on function or class but on territory (i.e., defined by the physical location of the actors). This was an important shift from the functionalist logic of corporatism, which had articulated the popular sectors' claims through trade unions as their sole representative actor and through the Ministry of Labor or Peasant Affairs as their exclusive state department. To sum up, because they were not seen as serving a clear "function" for institutions with a corporatist logic, the disincorporated popular sectors were targeted by policies based on where they were located and the multiplicity of needs associated with their situation, not only as workers or peasants.

That the second incorporation was defined by territory-based logics did not mean that corporatist arrangements were abandoned altogether. The most important sources of cross-national variance on the degree of territorialization seem to be four. First is the profundity of the reformulation of the locus of politics conducted by the last authoritarian military regime in each country, whereby democratization proceeded from the local to the national level. Second is the effect wrought by neoliberalism on the mainstream parties claiming to represent popular sectors (see Roberts in this volume). Third is the ways that the trade union system was modeled by the corporatist period and remodeled by neoliberalism. Fourth is how the first incorporation of the popular sectors (urban or rural) was produced and how its achievements have been eroded by the military regimes and neoliberalism.

As part of the recursive dynamics of incorporation, both waves shared some elements in the sequencing of incorporation. Both incorporation periods were preceded by a (neo)liberal phase that created a new "social question." This "social question" in both cases evolved into a political question with a contentious actor that was gradually recognized and legitimated. In the period from the 1990s to the 2000s, the emergence of recommodification and marginalization (i.e., unemployment, impoverishment, exclusion, etc.) as a new "social question," the modification of policing techniques, and the creation of massive social programs can be seen as a process equivalent to that of the preincorporation dynamics. Between the 1870s and the 1950s, anarchists, communists, syndicalists, and socialists posing the "social question" pushed the liberal elites to create anti-immigration and security laws and increase control and repression in the countryside and indigenous communities (Isuani 1985; Suriano 1988; French 1992; Gotkowitz 2007). This gradually led to populist or leftist leaderships that emerged to recognize the claim to social rights and later the actors behind this new claim, the labor and peasant movements (Collier and Collier 1991; Welch 1999; Suriano 2000; Becker 2008). Concerning social policies, in the first wave this process led, ultimately, to the creation of the first Ministries of Labor or Peasant Affairs, the application of agrarian reforms (except for Argentina), the production of comprehensive social rights policies, and constitutional reforms. In the second wave, it also led to constitutional reforms in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, the creation of new ministries such as the Ministry of Agrarian Development in Brazil and the Ministry of Social Development in Argentina, and the production of wide-ranging cash-transfer policies and universal citizenship income-rights policies in all these countries.

Equally significant has been the introduction of the "indigenous social question" by indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador (Yashar 2005;

Lucero 2008). Even though indigenous movements in Latin America achieved "first" incorporation during their struggles against neoliberal policies, in national terms and as part of the popular sectors (as broadly defined), indigenous peoples had already been incorporated as "peasants" during the period of corporatist first incorporation. The emergence of a social question involving stronger ethnic and territorial identifications than those raised during the first incorporation is a trend common to the second incorporation period. Since the 1990s, the struggles for recognition of indigenous peoples as part of the polity in the Andean region have evolved into reincorporation struggles. In Ecuador, the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE) even created its own party, Pachakutik, while in Bolivia some indigenous groups reached office as allies or members of the Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS) party-movement (Van Cott 2005; Lucero 2008; Becker 2011; Pearce 2011; Fontana 2013; Conaghan in this volume).

A pattern of interaction between government and movement was thus established through new institutions or the redefinition of roles of existing institutions. The struggle against disincorporation was a contentious one, which included a reincorporation movement: the unemployed in Argentina, the indigenous and coca growers in Bolivia, the indigenous in Ecuador, landless peasants in Brazil, and—with less strength—urban movements in Venezuela. Generally, these movements coordinated campaigns with trade unions and left-wing parties (see Silva 2009). Later on, reincorporation was conducted in territorial terms, with institutions such as the *territórios da cidadanía* in Brazil (Delgado and Leite 2011), the *misiones* and *círculos bolivarianos* in Venezuela (Ellner 2008; García-Guadilla in this volume), and the partly formalized articulation of movement claims through the General Secretariat of the Presidency in Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil. Also, new institutions such as social councils were created to deal with multiple noncorporatist claims in Brazil (Doctor 2007; Rossi in this volume), and even constitutional reforms in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela were promoted to deal with the new "social question" (Lupien 2011; García-Guadilla in this volume; Silva in this volume).

These transformations did not imply that the relationship between popular movements and the elites have been harmonious. First incorporation divided movements, some supporting governments while others becoming critical or even suffering persecution and repression. In the first wave, the labor movement kept a conflictive relationship with Perón's governments in Argentina (James 1988). In Brazil, rural incorporation was also conflictive (Welch 1999), while trade unions resisted some of the control mechanisms associated to urban incorporation (French 1992). In Bolivia, Gotkowitz (2007) argues that peasants and indigenous movements were very important in building the

conditions for first incorporation and, later, the main losers of incorporation policies during the revolution of 1952.

This holds also true for the second wave of incorporation. How to deal with the Néstor Kirchner and Cristina Fernández de Kirchner administrations divided the *piquetero* movement, with one sector supportive and another that was critical (Rossi 2015b). In Ecuador, the CONAIE had a very conflictive relationship with Rafael Correa's government (Becker 2008; Silva in this volume). And the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST) suffered a delusion with the modest advances of agrarian reform during Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff presidencies (Rossi in this volume). However, this is just half of the story. Cooperation and participation in the coalition in government have been very important, with the inclusion in office of thousands of middle- and lower-rank members of social movements, most of them in state departments related to social policies (Abers and Tatagiba 2015; Rossi in this volume). As García-Guadilla (in this volume) points out for urban movements in Venezuela, the issue faced by many social movements is that of the autonomy of grassroots popular organizations from the consequences (or intentionality) of incorporation policies. This concern seems to be common to all the other countries and movements analyzed in this section.

While these parallels allow us to talk about two waves of incorporation, they do not mean that history has repeated itself. There are elements of iteration and innovation in a process that is, as such, like a collage. It is also important to bear in mind that incorporation waves should *not* be equated with the constitution of a more equal society or the creation of a welfare state but with the reshaping of the socio-political arena by redefining and expanding the number of legitimate political actors. In some countries, the urban and rural poor were first incorporated into very unequal societies, as in Brazil under Getúlio Vargas (Cardoso 2010), while in other countries, a more equal society and some welfare policies emerged as a result of incorporation, as in Argentina under Juan Domingo Perón (Torre and Pastoriza 2002).

Affecting all these cross-nationally is the timing of each particular process. Reincorporation may be a relatively quick process, as it was in Argentina after 2002 and Venezuela since 1998, or long processes brought on by several regime breakdowns, as in Bolivia and Ecuador; or even the result of gradual change over the course of a protracted struggle, as in Brazil. Moreover, reincorporation processes involve the remobilization of popular sectors in more than defensive struggles, but this does not necessarily imply the ideological transformation of the popular sectors' political culture. For instance, in Argentina, Peronism has continued to supply the main political ethos of the pop-

ular sectors, while Katarism has emerged as relevant for Bolivian indigenous and coca growers' movements (Yashar 2005; Albó 2007; Lucero 2008).

FROM RECOGNITION TO (RE)INCORPORATION STRUGGLES

It is because of the transformations produced by neoliberalism and authoritarianism that Latin America experienced a change in the focus of protest, now mainly occurring in the quest for recognition by the state (Delamata 2002; Auyero 2003). This quest for recognition is part of what I call the "struggle for (re)incorporation."[2] I use this term because although most actors in this quest present discourses of radical societal transformation, those discourses have actually unfolded as types of collective action that can be deemed "bridging with the state" (apart from the unintended transformations produced by the incorporation of the actors). By "bridging with the state," I mean types of collective action that aim to (re)connect excluded segments of society with state institutions to recover—or for the first time, gain—access to rights and benefits that the state had failed or ceased to secure or provide. Examples of this "bridging" collective action are the claims for land of the indigenous in Bolivia and Ecuador and the landless peasants in Brazil, the *piqueteros*' claim to unemployment subsidies and jobs in Argentina, and the long-standing struggle of urban movements in Venezuela for water, housing and health services. All these claims aim to reconnect the popular sectors with the state as a provider of some benefits and rights.

Protest is thus a substantial and moral tool for popular sectors to form a bridge between the state as it actually is and the state as it should be. In other words, what the popular movements analyzed in this section struggle for is the presence of the state as more than a merely repressive institution. In this sense, reincorporation struggles are historically linked to the heritage of the incorporation of the first laborers and peasants into the socio-political arena. The consequences of the neoliberal reforms explain the demand for a return of the state presence as an articulator of social relationships.

Therefore, what differentiates recognition struggles from those for (re)incorporation? I argue that the two are intimately related. The pursuit of recognition might be defined as the initial quest linked to the popular sectors' disruptive emergence in protest. After some degree of recognition has been achieved (i.e., unemployment subsidies, media attention, etc.), the claim organized as a movement will usually lead to socioeconomic conflicts and the quest for incorporation. In societal terms, a struggle for recognition might lead to a struggle for incorporation—or reincorporation—as a subject and member of society who merits esteem and is entitled to some of the rights that

the (neoliberal) context has (abruptly) altered. In this sense, it is both a moral economy issue and a specific process attached to the constitution of the polity through its expansion or contraction.

Another reason for defining recognition and reincorporation as intimately linked struggles is that no quest for reincorporation can emerge without a prior claim for recognition; it is that first claim that constitutes a new "social question." However, the quest for recognition does *not* necessarily evolve into one for reincorporation, as it can be a goal in itself (e.g., claims for a multilingual society). In other words, when popular sector movements are discussed, struggles for recognition should be considered as the first stage of the legitimation of both the claim and the actor. If organized into a movement, this process will generally evolve toward the dynamics of incorporation.

REINCORPORATION MOVEMENTS

Reincorporation movements share many of the long-standing characteristics of the popular sector movements' quest for social transformation through inclusion, by revolution or reform. At the same time, they have specific attributes that mark them as particular expressions of the historical process of struggle for incorporation that emerged with neoliberalism in Latin America. As such, reincorporation movements use the repertoire of strategies and legacies accumulated in the initial incorporation period while pushing for the reestablishment of the tie between the popular sectors and the socio-political arena in the quest for reintegration into the polity. The reconstruction of these ties was executed through the intertwining of preexisting practices in a new scenario with somewhat different actors: a social movement (albeit heavily influenced by trade unionist strategies in Argentina and Brazil and by indigenous and peasants' practices in Bolivia and Ecuador) and a state prepared to deal only with already established neocorporatist actors. This new context for the inherited repertoire led to the recycling of strategies with new claims; for example, trade union–style negotiations for food or housing provision, the use of indigenous organizational practices, and rhetoric for water access or redistributive claims.

Therefore, "reincorporation movements" can be defined as a gestalt composed of six categories.[3] Two of these are central and universal, with four subcategories that logically depend on the first two and must be adapted to each cluster of cases studied to explain more specific national or regional patterns.

The central categories in this definition of reincorporation movements are two. First, the period of emergence: these movements are by-products of the disincorporation process that started in the 1970s and a result of the crisis

of party communities[4] and mass-based labor parties set up in the 1980s and 1990s. The second is the characteristics of their demands: claims for inclusion predominate, even though these could be framed by the leaders as "revolutionary" in their long-term goals.[5]

Reincorporation movements are also defined by four noncentral categories, which can be seen to have some common attributes. The first is the method and locus of protest: radical methods of protest, such as insurrectional direct actions, tend to be used, while the movements are contemporaneously open to negotiation with government. Their locus of protest is generally the territory. The second concerns the leadership: leaders come mainly from trade unions, Christian-based communities, and former guerrilla organizations. A third subcategory is the organizational format: these movements are loose territorialized networks of highly vertical organizations. Finally, it is their perception of democracy: reincorporation movements make a positive reevaluation of the value of democracy as a political regime, insofar as it is perceived as necessary and reforms are, in some cases, achieved by electoral means.

To summarize, the basic assumption underlying the historicist definition proposed here is that the second wave of incorporation is attached to the emergence of a specific type of political actor. Therefore, many contemporary movements are not of the reincorporation type because even though they may share some of the noncentral categories, they are not explained by at least one of the central categories. Examples of this are cultural or counterculturral movements, environmental movements, anti-immigration or xenophobic movements, and separatist or pro-independence movements.

CONCLUSION

Latin America went through a cycle of continental mobilization against neoliberal disincorporation from the mid-1990s to the first decade of the 2000s (Schefner, Pasdirtz, and Blad 2006; Almeida 2007; Silva 2009). As the chapters in this section show, these mobilizations were not limited to resistance struggles, reshaping the socio-political arenas of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, and Venezuela following the partial and selective reincorporation of urban and/or rural popular sectors. The second incorporation of the popular sectors was the result of a dynamic of pressure from below of the popular sectors organized in social movements and trade unions and the political and economic elites attempts to co-opt, demobilize, repress, and—eventually—incorporate the popular sectors in the socio-political arena. This was mostly done through established relationships with political parties and unmediated—and sometimes informal—links with state departments (Rossi 2015b).

Because the context has changed since first incorporation ended in the 1950s, the popular sector's movements that emerged since then share many of the long-standing characteristics of the demands made by popular sectors for social transformation through inclusion by way of revolution or reform. However, these reincorporation movements also have specific attributes that define them as particular expressions of the historical process of struggle for a second incorporation that emerged due to authoritarianism and neoliberal reforms. The movements analyzed by the chapters in this section can be deemed as examples of this type of struggle and actor.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: RESHAPING THE POLITICAL ARENA IN LATIN AMERICA

1. Traditionally, popular sectors referred to urban, lower-class, predominantly mestizo peoples and social groups with distinctive cultural traits and folklore. Politically, they were generally the electoral base of leftist, frequently populist, parties; but they could also support conservative populist parties. Popular sectors are also associated with urban self-help movements for housing, land titling, and services such as water, electricity, and transportation. In this volume, we extend the term to include all social groups that are not from the upper and middle classes. We do so largely for the sake of narrative shorthand to cover the heterogeneity of social groups involved in anti-neoliberal struggles that became the subjects of the second incorporation in the cases in this collection. However, when analysis involves specific social groups, we identify them specifically.

2. We thank Ken Roberts for this insight.

3. We are indebted to one of our anonymous reviewers for this insight.

4. As previously mentioned, during the neoliberal period governments also promoted the recognition and organization of nonunion popular actors in identity politics, environmentalism, and urban self-help—often in collaboration with NGOs. However, the spaces for their participation excluded socioeconomic policy.

5. Of course, despite the fact of institutional continuity in the two cases, there were considerable differences in the degree of political and economic crisis and levels of mass mobilization.

6. On a continuum, Brazil probably is the least "statist" and Venezuela is unquestionably the most "statist" (Flores-Macías 2012).

CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION TO PART I: SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE SECOND WAVE OF (TERRITORIAL) INCORPORATION IN LATIN AMERICA

1. This chapter reproduces paragraphs of my book *The Poor's Struggle for Political Incorporation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017) and my article "The Sec-

ond Wave of Incorporation in Latin America: A Conceptualization of the Quest for Inclusion Applied to Argentina" (*Latin American Politics and Society* 57, no. 1 [Spring 2015]: 1–28).

2. For a discussion of the relative role of collective feelings versus materialistic struggles, see Honneth (1995) and Hobson (2003).

3. For this conceptual proposal, I have followed the approach of Collier and Mahon (1993) for the formation of radial categories.

4. Manin (1992) defines the "crisis of party communities" as the metamorphosis of political representation. Representation changed from a form based on programmatic parties reflecting the concerns of social classes or communities to a more personality-based form of politics, in which a multidimensional society is represented through governing elites that attempt to interpret public opinion. See also Roberts (in this volume).

5. This means that reincorporation movements can follow multiple goals simultaneously, but incorporation must be the main medium-term focus. The use of "revolutionary" (or other) rhetoric by movements struggling for the second incorporation of the popular sectors does not mean that movement leaders are confused or uncertain about movement goals. Instead, it means that a movement can be defined as a "reincorporation movement" by its relation to a macrohistorical process of (dis/re) incorporation, even though the main long-term goal for some organizations might be something else. Thus, following this definition, all movements that have struggled for the popular sectors' incorporation since neoliberal state reforms were applied can be defined as reincorporation movements, be this a short-, medium-, or long-term goal within "revolutionary," "reformist," or "conservative" rhetorical forms.

CHAPTER 3. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE SECOND INCORPORATION IN BOLIVIA AND ECUADOR

1. Emily Achtenberg, NACLA Report on the America, Rebel Currents, June 15, 2015. http://nacla.org/blog/2015/06/15/morales-greenlights-tipnis-road-oil-and-gas-extraction-bolivia%E2%80%99s-national-parks.

2. These policy choices have prompted heated, vituperative accusations that the government has lost its way, is insufficiently revolutionary, and too neoliberal (Manifiesto 2011).

3. Source: database of government officials compiled by the author.

4. See "Indigenous People Converge on Capital to Protest Government Mining Projects." http://dgrnewsservice.org/2012/03/24/indigenous-people-converge-on-ecuadors-capital-to-protest-government-mining-projects/.

5. "Barrio Politics and Government Politics in Guayaquil and Quito." August 2012. Interviews with barrio political leaders and residents. Centro de Documentación e Información de los Movimientos Sociales del Ecuador (CEDIME).