

CHAPTER 21

LABOR MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

FEDERICO M. ROSSI

LABOR movements are crucial actors in Latin American politics. The history of the region cannot be understood without analyzing the role played by labor movements in organizing formal and informal workers across urban and rural contexts. Labor movements have been particularly relevant in democratic transitions, authoritarian breakdowns, revolutions, and waves of incorporation. In this chapter, I analyze the history of labor movements in Latin America since their initial formation in the nineteenth century and up until the twenty-first century. I preface this history by discussing two main issues: the transition of labor-based actors from the working class to the popular sectors and the distinction between labor movements and trade unions.

FROM WORKING CLASS TO POPULAR SECTORS?

There are at least two main conceptual issues regarding labor movements in Latin America. The first critical question is: Are “working class” and “popular sectors” synonyms for the same social segment of society? This is a much-debated issue with theoretical and political implications. Theoretically, answering one way or the other delimits our collective subject of study and focuses on different dynamics to explain labor movement struggles. Politically, the answer delimits those mobilized members of society whom labor movements represent.

In my view, the answer to the question is historical. The segments of society worst affected—or less benefited—by capitalism went through major transformations from the mid-nineteenth century until the early twenty-first century in Latin America. An urban labor minority in mostly rural societies was gradually constituted into a massive urban and proletarian portion of society due to the combined effects of urbanization, industrialization, population growth (through migration and increased birthrate), and

the political dynamics of the region. Thus, an increasingly homogenous working class with a distinctive identity was initially formed; this concentrated sector of workers later expanded to make up a large proportion of all Latin American societies. This new majority lost homogeneity as it spread across more diverse occupations, working environments, and formal and informal jobs to constitute the so-called popular sectors of society. Like the narrower working class from which it evolved, this broadened segment occupied a subaltern position in society. Therefore, the popular sectors, despite their differences, share a common societal experience (and set of grievances) that transcend the strictly functional definition of their lives (i.e., as workers).

LABOR MOVEMENTS ENCOMPASS MORE THAN TRADE UNIONS

Defining the labor movement requires a specific historical understanding if we are to grasp the complexities of labor-related political dynamics. The second crucial question thus becomes: Are “labor movements” synonymous with “trade unions”? Following Diani (1992), social movements can be defined as informal networks of conflict-oriented interactions composed of individuals, groups, and/or organizations that, based on shared solidarities, forge a collective political identity and use protest (among other means) to assert themselves in the public arena (Rossi, 2017, p. 21, n. 23). Following this definition of labor movements, two things become clear. First, it is difficult to affirm that there is *a* labor movement; rather, there are a plurality of labor movements. Second, we see that labor movements are wider collectivities that transcend trade unions, which are the most formally organized actors in the broader movement. This networked understanding of labor movements, viewed through historical lenses, allows us to study the differences between the most active periods of movement activism promoted by different kinds of labor-based actors and those phases of predominantly corporatist action dominated by unions. This, in turn, lets us observe the social, economic, and political construction of the “working classes” or “popular sectors” in certain periods of history.

With this approach in mind, the remainder of this chapter will very succinctly analyze the history of labor movements in Latin America. The empirical focus will be on Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico due to their relevance to the general history of labor movements in the region.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF LABOR MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

The history of labor movements in Latin America is as complex and multifaceted as the region itself. However, its history can broadly be considered through three interrelated macro-dynamics: redistributive conflicts (waves of incorporation/disincorporation),

regime changes (democratization and authoritarian breakdowns), and revolutions (anticolonial and socialist upheavals).

We should note that labor movements have not been determined by these macro-dynamics. Rather, because labor movements are networks of actors that display repertoires of strategies, they are involved—consciously and unconsciously—in relationally building these macro-dynamics. Thus, a constant strategic division of labor movements has been whether it should attempt a revolutionary transformation of capitalism or accept the system and concentrate its efforts in ameliorating working and living conditions through gradual reforms. This strategic discussion has happened as much inside as outside unions, has dominated the entire history of labor movements, and has involved all the main political groups: anarchists, socialists, communists, syndicalists, and national-populists.

Formative Period: Liberal Globalization (1850–1880)

In the formative period of labor movements, an independent Latin America joined the world capitalist economy, leading to the formation and gradual organization of the first urban workers in the region's most dynamic ports, such as Buenos Aires and Valparaíso (Romero & Sábato, 1992). In this period, oligarchic regimes inserted Latin American economies into the first globalization, which expanded their links beyond the metropolis. Calling this a formative period for a modern social movement composed of workers does not imply that subaltern groups had never been organized before. There are many examples of popular revolts and organized collective action since the revolutions for independence (e.g., Di Meglio, 2014). However, the migration of people and ideas brought to Latin America European ideological traditions emphasizing the importance of class-based political identities, and these traditions were crucial in the formation of modern labor movements (Godio, 1987).

The Struggle for Incorporation: The “Social Question” and the Great Depression (1880–1929)

The poor and excluded strata of society struggled for incorporation in the socio-political arena as wage earners and citizens. This struggle was characterized by increasing class-based contentiousness and the elites' reaction to the implementation of innovative social policies and more complex repressive techniques. The labor movements' fight for the dignity of its constituents, calling for reforms and even revolution, and the state reaction to it was called the “social question” (Collier & Collier, 1991, pp. 93–94; Rossi, 2017, pp. 11–13).

The Mexican (1910) and Russian (1917) revolutions accentuated the already escalating clash between liberal-conservative “modernizing” elites and the poor workers of the main urban and dynamic cities (in Latin America, these included Buenos Aires, Valparaíso, and the port of São Paulo, Santos; Brennan, 2010). Anarchists and socialists

competed for the control of emerging trade unions during this period. In Argentina, for instance, groups of workers organized the main anarchist labor movement outside of Spain (Suriano, 2001).

In 1929, the collapse of the United States stock market caused an economic crisis that spread across Europe and had major consequences in Latin America, too (Drinot & Knight, 2014). The first Great Depression of global capitalism hit each country differently. For example, Argentina recovered more quickly than Chile, which suffered a particularly strong crash (Hora, 2014; Vergara, 2014). This combination of an intense economic crisis that raised doubts about the liberal model of development with the increased organization of a (still small) labor movement facilitated a stronger working class identity among the subaltern segments of society.

First Incorporation: Corporatist Unionism (1929–1945)

The poor and excluded were first incorporated into the socio-political arena through trade unions in a mostly corporatist fashion. In Brazil, this incorporation occurred under the governments of Getúlio Vargas (1930–1945), who demobilized labor while introducing the first corporatist arrangements to articulate workers' demands in the country's weak and divided labor movement (Collier & Collier, 1991, pp. 169–195). In Mexico, workers founded the Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL) in 1938 to reorganize unions after the collapse of unionism during the 1920s (Roxborough, 1998, pp. 317–318). The Great Depression in Chile led to the short-lived Socialist Republic (1932) and the subsequent domination of unions by socialists (Godio, 1987; Vergara, 2014).

During this period, anarchists were in decline and communists were increasingly assuming union leadership roles. The dominant strategy employed by unions—a strategy encouraged by the Soviet Union—involved forming popular fronts, antifascist coalitions that coordinated among multiple actors. Confronting these communist alliances, syndicalism grew as a reformist approach that sought to procure welfare benefits and social rights. In addition to this conflict, there was a crucial strategic division in terms of organizational format. While socialists and syndicalists were organizing through factory- or profession-based unions, communists opted for industry-wide federations, creating larger unions stronger than their competitors (Hora, 2014; Tamarin, 1985).

During this period, a combination of dynamics led to the decline of strictly class-based ideologies in the labor movement (Brennan, 2010). First, the destabilizing effect of the Great Depression—which ended the huge wave of European immigration and caused new internal migration to the main cities—combined with rapid import substitution industrialization (ISI) worked to create a massive increase in the previously tiny labor movement. Second, both the communists' popular front strategy and the increased domination of syndicalists modified the labor movement's approach: from creating class-consciousness in its workers to forging massive multisectorial fronts with political power. Third, the subaltern poor workers were first incorporated through a

corporatist interest intermediation regime that promoted strong unions representing wider sectors of the laborers (Collier & Collier, 1991). A crucial example is Juan Domingo Perón's governments (1945–1955) in Argentina, which developed an alternative ideology to the Marxist class-based identity of workers (James, 1988; Rossi, 2013). Thus, during the first incorporation, national-populist incorporation dominated and, with it, corporatist unionism and a wider understanding of the subaltern segments of society as the “popular sectors” emerged.

Cold War: Between Corporatist Union Acquiescence and Insurrectional Labor Mobilization (1945–1982)

Though first incorporation occurred at different times in each country, between 1945 and 1950 its aftermath could be felt across the entire region. There was widespread industrial mobilization and a systematic state attack on communist-led unions as the Cold War began. In Argentina, labor populist incorporation led to the mobilization of workers adopting a Peronist non-classist identity. In Brazil, a massive wave of strikes was linked to the rise of the communists, while Vargas's Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro promoted unions as a potential base of political support (French, 1992). In Mexico, the CTAL began to decline as a result of the Cold War divisions between communists and syndicalists (who enjoyed United States support) and finally dissolved in 1959. In Chile, the communists gained increasing power in the labor movement at the expense of the socialists, and communist leaders were even included in the Gabriel González Videla government (1946–1952) as part of the popular front strategy (Roxborough, 1998).

The next period, 1950–1969, saw the predominance of authoritarian regimes cultivating labor quiescence or tutelage. The combination of rapid economic growth and a variety of corporatist arrangements produced a popular interest regime that articulated the popular sectors exclusively through trade unions and worker-based identities. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico developed highly articulated corporatist interest regimes, but these regimes had different effects on the mobilization capacity of trade unions. In Argentina, unions were very active even after the 1955 coup that expelled Perón from power and proscribed Peronism. In Brazil, unions were mostly demobilized from 1947 to 1952. It was only during João Goulart's government (1961–1964) that unionism became active again, a rebirth curtailed by the 1964 military coup that ousted him (French, 1992). Mexico has proclaimed labor rights ever since drafting its 1917 constitution, but a system that organized these rights was not approved until 1936 with the corporatist organization of unions. Chile, by contrast, has built a more liberal system of industrial relations, and the cooperation among socialists and communists in that country led to the creation of the Central Única de los Trabajadores in 1953 (Collier & Collier, 1991).

In 1969–1982, the labor movement reemerged in a more contentious form and expanded beyond trade unions. What it was called the “new unionism” refers to the

growing interconnectedness between trade unions and the broader struggle of urban and student movements demanding socioeconomic well-being and redemocratization. The grassroots upsurge of insurgency was a result of restrictive corporatist arrangements, the persecution of generally moderate movement leaders, and the intervention and reorganization of unions by the military dictatorships. These factors created a social space for labor movements to fill beyond the narrow confines of unionism and encouraged the rise of a younger generation inspired by the ideals of the Cuban revolution (1959).¹ This was also a period of increased territorialization of labor movements; that is, collective action became imbricated in the daily lives of the popular sectors beyond the factory (Rossi, 2019).

As mentioned earlier, the “new unionism” was more contentious than previous labor movements. The increase in industrial and political conflict was initiated with the Cordobazo uprising (1969) in Argentina against the military dictatorship (Brennan, 1994). In Brazil, the core of “new unionism” was located in São Paulo’s ABC region, where a wave of strikes in 1978–1979 led to the formation of the Central Única dos Trabalhadores (CUT) and kick-started the country’s long process of democratization (Keck, 1992). Democratization struggles also emerged in Mexico with the rise of independent unions in the mid-1970s. In Chile, labor’s insurgency was embraced more strongly, in combination with the efforts of Salvador Allende’s (1970–1973) democratic revolutionary path to socialism. However, this insurgency was hampered by the acceleration of local conflicts, inflation, and the 1973 coup and mass executions that decimated the entire labor movement. Subsequent legislation decentralized and depoliticized this burgeoning popular interest regime (Etchemendy, 2011; Faúndez, 1988; Zapata, 1976).

The Territorialization of Labor Movements Under the Double Transition: Neoliberalization and Democratization (1982–1991)

The authoritarian wave of the 1970s–1980s initiated the massive disincorporation of the popular sectors from the socio-political arena as citizens as well as laborers. Persecutions of active sectors of the labor movement (sometimes even with the support of corporatists union leadership) quickly and violently demobilized the movement. Clandestine resistance networks emerged to confront the military dictators or juntas throughout the territory, mostly using grassroots-style strategies (Rossi & della Porta, 2015). Strikes were another crucial form of resistance to the authoritarian regimes (Sandoval, 1998). In Brazil, for instance, a wave of strikes (1974–1979) was followed by a cycle of protest (1978–1982), mainly mobilized by urban movements (Mainwaring, 1986).

Economic factors further added to the turmoil around labor movements. The 1982 debt crisis put an end to the post-World War II period of economic growth in Latin America, casting doubt on the ISI model of development and increasing the political influence of neoliberal reformers. Wages and employment declined while informality

increased. Within this complicated context, most of South America went through a double transition to neoliberalism and democracy throughout the 1980s and up until 1991. According to Drake (1996), labor movements played a crucial role in the first phase of regime opening, but they were less relevant in the transition to democracy. Instead, political parties, human rights movements, and urban movements were the most active in the transition (Eckstein, 1989). Collier (1999), by contrast, finds that the role of labor movements changed depending on the pattern of democratization. In the case of Argentina, the labor movement was crucial in destabilizing the authoritarian regime as well as in the negotiations during the transition. In Brazil, though, the democratic transition was mostly controlled by the upper classes, while in Chile—even though Augusto Pinochet was planning a wholly controlled transition—organized labor contributed to building the Concertación pro- democracy coalition and enforcing the democratization process.

Turning to the transition to neoliberalism, in Chile and Mexico, this process was conducted by authoritarian regimes and in Argentina and Brazil by the democratic governments of the 1980s–1990s. Following Etchemendy (2011), we can identify four models of liberalizing previously ISI economies. The type of previous economic regime, coupled with the degree of power held by the prior ISI actors (for labor: corporatist unions) produced different policy processes, winners, and compensatory measures for the losers. In each model, unions played a different role and suffered to different degrees the recommodification of labor relations promoted by the neoliberalization of the economy. In Brazil and Chile, weak unions were either partially compensated (in the former case) or repressed (in the latter). In Argentina and Mexico, however, their strong unions were offered market-share compensations. Regardless, across the four countries, the corporatist popular interest regime that had dominated the ISI economies was transformed into a neopluralist model that changed the previous political cleavages (Oxhorn, 1998; Roberts, 2008).

By and large, unions came out of the process weaker, which led to the continued territorialization of the labor movement in a context of increased pluralism in the trade union system (Rossi, 2019). In Argentina, for example, a segmented neocorporatist regime emerged in a pluralized system that had space for both the traditional corporatist Confederación General del Trabajo (CGT) and the new social movement unionism of the Central de Trabajadores de la Argentina (CTA) (Etchemendy & Collier, 2007). The CGT kept its traditional (first incorporation) approach to the labor movement, organizing the popular sectors in a functionalist logic of workers by industry sector. The CTA, in contrast, redefined the neighborhood as the new factory and thus adopted a territorialized understanding of the labor movement. In Brazil, however, the whole union system was reformed, and the emergence of the CUT was followed by other unions, most notably the syndicalist Força Sindical (Collier, 2018). In both countries, the coalition with territorially based movements introduced a different dynamic to the quest for reincorporation (Rossi, 2017).

The immediate consequences for the labor movement of the double transition were the expansion of civil and political rights with the recovery of freedom and a reduction

of social rights as a result of the recommodification of labor relations. Concomitantly, strike rates declined while the region experienced an expansion in the repertoire of protests (Almeida, 2007; Pereyra, Pérez, & Schuster, 2015; see Almeida “Economic Globalization and Social Movements in Latin America” in this volume).

The Struggle for Reincorporation: Between Neoliberal Globalization and the Second Great Depression (1991–2018)

This period can be divided in two phases: first, between 1991 and 2008 (i.e., from the end of the Soviet Union and the beginning of the second globalization to the second wave of incorporation of the popular sectors) and, second, from 2008 until 2018, which saw the second Great Depression, the end of the second incorporation, and the temporary return of plutocratic politics with exhausted neoliberal models.

In 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed and, with it, an alternative to capitalism and liberal democracy. This was a shock for most of the left and many labor movements, which experienced a deep crisis (Carr & Ellner, 1993; Roberts, 1998).² Simultaneously, because many movement leaders had been assassinated or exiled during the dictatorships, neoliberal state reformers were well-positioned to pass their favored policies with less resistance than in the past.

This phase also witnessed a second globalization, which shared elements of the first with the introduction of a neoliberal economic model and plutocratic politics. A new “social question” emerged, as it did in the liberal period of the nineteenth century, this time concerning the victims of neoliberalism and their quest to be part of (capitalist) society. However, there was an important difference with the late nineteenth century: the popular sectors had mostly recovered their procedural and civic rights during the 1980s; thus, the main goal of their reincorporation struggle during the 1990s–2000s was to reconnect the lives of the popular sectors—as wage-earners entitled to dignity—with the socio-political arena (Rossi, 2017, pp. 17–19).

The territorialization of the popular sectors increased as corporatist arrangements were debilitated or dissolved (Rossi, 2017, 2019). At the same time, the social structure of Latin America changed with the visible increase in income inequality and labor informality (Portes & Hoffmann, 2003). As a result, the experiences of (and conditions faced by) families in the poor neighborhoods and shantytowns took on an unprecedented centrality in the definition of poor people’s political strategies (Merklen, 2005).³ The functionalist logics of welfare provision changed: as formal male labor opportunities decreased, so did the centrality of patriarchal family structures. In some cases, these dynamics favored the emergence of women as providers and as crucial grassroots actors in the labor movements—mainly in the more informal sectors. For instance, in Argentina, the Piquetero movement (of unemployed workers) comprises mostly women, and, in Mexico, the domestic workers’ movement is almost totally composed of women. Strategically, the new unionism adapted to this novel context by emulating territorial movements in their organizational and protest practices—what is called “social movement unionism.” In Argentina, the struggle for reincorporation

was sustained through the coordinated efforts of the CTA, some dissident sectors of the CGT, and the Piquetero movement. In Brazil, the CUT, the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST), and other landless peasant organizations, as well as the Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura (CONTAG), fought to reincorporate the popular sectors using a mix of urban and rural strategies (Rossi, 2018b).

At the international level, trade unions developed a continental coalition with social movements called the Hemispheric Social Alliance (HSA). For a decade, the HSA successfully coordinated resistance to the Free Trade Area of the Americas and other neoliberal projects that would have reduced labor, social, and environmental rights (von Bülow, 2010). This constituted a unique cooperation among trade unions sectors as the main independent unions of Latin America—such as the CUT, CTA, and the Plenario Intersindical de Trabajadores–Convención Nacional de Trabajadores (PIT-CNT) of Uruguay—set aside their historical divisions and became members of the historically US-controlled Organización Regional Interamericana de Trabajadores (ORIT) to coordinate with HSA (Wachendorfer, 2007). In addition, similar cooperation and dialogue, such as in the World Social Forum and the People's Summits, brought new movements into the HSA fold and strengthened resistance to neoliberal projects from Canada to Argentina (Bidaseca & Rossi, 2008; von Bülow, 2010, 2013). In sum, the continental projects to expand neoliberal globalization in Latin America pushed trade unions to work in multiscale actions with several other movements, resulting in a continental coordination unprecedented in the history of Latin American labor movements.

Having gradually achieved recognition, legitimation, and partial reincorporation in the socio-political arena, the organized popular sectors and trade unions finally generated the conditions for leftist or populist governments to take power (Rossi, 2018a). With the 1998 elections in Venezuela that brought Hugo Chávez to power (1999–2013), governments linked to the second wave of incorporation initiated a reshaping of the socio-political arena in South America. In Argentina, left-wing Peronists won the 2003 elections after a massive national revolt. In Brazil, the PT came to power that same year after a protracted struggle. Later, Bolivia and Ecuador followed the trend. During this period, unions secured relatively important positions in government. In Argentina, the CGT and CTA were most active inside the Ministry of Labor. In Brazil, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003–2010), the leader of the PT, was also the leader of CUT, linking trade unions with the presidency. In both countries, however, the fragmentation of the labor movements continued (Gindin & Cardoso, 2018).

Chile and Mexico had different labor organizing experiences. Because of Chile's weak and atomized labor movement, the neoliberal orthodoxy continued—with only mild reforms to give a human character to Pinochet's plutocratic society. In Mexico, the democratization process began in the early 1990s, and it was not until the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) lost its first elections that changes to the corporatist interest regime were promoted. In addition, the increasing relevance of *maquiladoras* (assembly factories) differentiated labor organizing in Mexico from the South American cases (e.g., Nolan García, 2013).

More broadly, though, the Bolivarian Revolution had introduced—similar to the Mexican and Cuban revolutions—a crucial model to follow or reject, as well as a new strategic discussion in the labor movement. Chávez proposed the model of a democratic path to what was called “Twenty-First Century Socialism” (Ellner, 2018; Hellinger, 2018). As a result, leftists, and the labor movement in general, again debated the merits of constructing a socialist democracy (first explored by Allende).

The second wave of incorporation that precipitated these political changes was—like the first—a regional process that involved several countries, each at a different pace and intensity. Common characteristics included recognizing the claims of poor people’s movements, as well as reformulating rules (formal or informal) and regulations that govern their participation in politics and their connection with the policy process (Rossi, 2017, p. xi). Concerning trade unions specifically, the second wave involved changes in the relationships between unions and political parties, as well as with social movements (Rossi, 2018a; Roberts, 2018). In most countries, union density declined from the first incorporation period, even if the state regulatory approach partially reversed the deregulatory liberalization policies of the 1970s–1990s (Collier, 2018). Altogether, the second wave of incorporation led to a change in the popular interest regime: from the intercorporatist pattern of relations based on a functionalist logic to a territorially based approach centered on the multidimensional experience of being poor or impoverished (Collier and Handlin, 2009; Rossi, 2017, pp. 13–15).

The second Great Depression of 2008 prevented many countries from adopting more inclusionary policies because of the abrupt reduction in commodity prices. In historical terms, it signaled the end of the second wave of incorporation in Argentina, Brazil, and Ecuador, although not in Bolivia (ending later, in 2019, as a result of a civic-military coup d’état) and Venezuela (which entered into a spiral of polarized radicalization). In most countries, this new major crisis of capitalism led to an increased mobilization of trade unions in the quest to keep pace with inflation or to avoid becoming the victims of austerity policies. In Argentina and Chile, right-wing governments returned to power through democratic elections, while in Brazil a soft coup d’état, followed by elections, gave state control to traditional elites and the military.⁴ The declared goal of these governments is to reintroduce different degrees of neoliberal orthodoxy that include new projects to demobilize and weaken trade unions. The difference now, however, is that labor movements are very active and well connected to other social movements in a setting where—though under serious risk—civic liberties are still enforced.

CONCLUSION

A key lesson of the relational analysis of labor movements beyond a trade unions–centric approach is that economic determinism cannot explain the whole set of macro-dynamics that are involved in labor-based struggles. The massification and diversification of the labor force produced the most significant subaltern populations of Latin

America. Concomitantly, these popular sectors went through a process of urban social homogenization. Nevertheless, the organized popular sectors preserved the multiplicity of nationally defined, labor-based dynamics with intervals of higher or lower transnational interconnectedness.

The general history of labor movements in Latin America is marked by the struggle of the poor and excluded to achieve both freedom (i.e., civic rights) and dignity (i.e., welfare). These two goals were not always equally weighted. Because of the trauma produced by the 1970s' dictatorships, however, labor and left-wing actors have, since the redemocratization of the region in the 1980s, sought to redefine the struggle to encompass both freedom and dignity (Ollier, 2009; Roberts, 1998). Since then, in my opinion, the key strategic dilemma for the labor movement has become how to reform or substitute capitalism without resorting to autocratic projects. Presently, the record is mixed.

NOTES

1. However important the Cuban revolution was for Latin American politics, the effect it produced on the labor movement and on trade unions in particular is not straightforward. While some—mostly grassroots—sectors of the labor movement increased their insurrectional actions and coordination with other movements with revolutionary goals, many unions were less interested in this path and merely gave lip service to the revolutionary rhetoric or even rejected it. In this sense, this period maintained the historical strategic tension between revolutionary and reformist approaches to social transformation in a radicalized version.
2. Within labor movements, Trotskyists actually benefited from the end of the Soviet Union due to their historical rejection of the Stalinist direction taken by the revolution.
3. In some countries, such as Argentina, the deindustrialization process was also resisted through factory occupations that have evolved into a movement of worker-managed cooperatives (Itzigsohn & Rebón, 2015; Rossi, 2015).
4. The Mexican case is different and has indeed diverged from the regional pattern. The election of center-left Andrés Manuel López Obrador responds to the slow domestic process of democratization.

REFERENCES

- Almeida, P. D. (2007). Defensive mobilization: Popular movements against economic adjustment policies in Latin America. *Latin American Perspectives*, 34(3), 123–139.
- Bidaseca, K. & Rossi, F. M. (2008). Coaliciones nacionales contra procesos continentales de liberalización comercial: la Autoconvocatoria No al ALCA. In A. Grimson & S. Pereyra (Eds.). *Conflictos globales, voces locales: movilización y activismo en clave transnacional* (pp. 51–89). Buenos Aires: UNRISD-Prometeo.
- Brennan, J. P. (1994). *The labor wars in Cordoba: Ideology, work, and labor politics in an Argentine Industrial City, 1955–1976*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brennan, J. P. (2010). Latin American labor history. In J. C. Moya (Ed.). *The Oxford handbook of Latin American history* (pp. 342–362). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Carr, B. & Ellner, S. (Eds.). (1993). *The Latin American left: From the fall of Allende to the Perestroika*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Collier, R. B. (1999). *Paths toward democracy: The working class and elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, R. B. (2018). Labor unions in Latin America: Incorporation and reincorporation under the New Left. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 115–128). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Collier, R. B. & Collier, D. (1991). *Shaping the political arena: Critical junctures, the labor movement, and regime dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Collier, R. B. & Handlin, S. (2009). Situating the analysis: Analytic approach, cases, and historical context. In R. B. Collier & S. Handlin (Eds.). *Reorganizing popular politics: Participation and the new interest Regime in Latin America* (pp. 32–60). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Di Meglio, G. (2014). *¡Viva el bajo pueblo! La plebe urbana de Buenos Aires y la política entre la Revolución de Mayo y el rosismo (1810–1829)* (4th ed.). Buenos Aires: Prometeo.
- Diani, M. (1992). The concept of social movements. *The Sociological Review*, 40, 1–25.
- Drake, P. W. (1996). *Labor movements and dictatorship: The Southern cone in comparative perspective*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Drinot, P., & Knight, A. (Eds.). (2014). *The great depression in Latin America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Eckstein, S. (Ed.). (1989). *Power and popular protest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ellner, S. (2018). Conflicting currents within the Pro-Chávez labor movement and the dynamics of decision making. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 157–178). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Etchemendy, S. (2011). *Models of economic liberalization: Business, workers, and compensation in Latin America, Spain, and Portugal*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Etchemendy, S. & Collier, R. B. (2007). Down but not out: Union resurgence and segmented neocorporatism in Argentina (2003–2007). *Politics and Society*, 35(3), 363–401.
- Faúndez, J. (1988). *Marxism and democracy in Chile: From 1932 to the fall of Allende*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- French, J. D. (1992). *The Brazilian workers' ABC: Class conflict and alliances in modern São Paulo*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Gindin, J. & Cardoso, A. (2018). The labor movement and the Erosion of neoliberal hegemony: Brazil and Argentina. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 179–207). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Godio, J. (1987). *Historia del movimiento obrero latinoamericano: anarquistas y socialistas, 1850–1918, Vol. 1* (4th ed.). Caracas: Nueva Sociedad.
- Hellinger, D. (2018). The second wave of incorporation and political parties in the Venezuelan Petrostate. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 251–274). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Hora, R. (2014). The impact of the depression on Argentine society. In P. Drinot & A. Knight (Eds.). *The great depression in Latin America* (pp. 22–50). Durham, SC: Duke University Press.

- Itzigsohn, J. & Rebón, J. (2015). The recuperation of enterprises: Defending workers' lifeworld, creating new tools of contention. *Latin American Research Review*, 50(4), 178–196.
- James, D. (1988). *Resistance and integration: Peronism and the Argentine working class, 1946–1976*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keck, M. (1992). *The workers' party and democratization in Brazil*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mainwaring, S. (1986). *Grassroots popular movements, identity, and democratization in Brazil* (Working paper) (pp. 1–36). The Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame.
- Merklen, D. (2005). *Pobres Ciudadanos. Las clases populares en la era democrática (Argentina, 1983–2003)*. Buenos Aires: Gorla.
- Nolan García, K. A. (2013). Network dynamics and local labor rights movements in Puebla, Mexico. In E. Silva (Ed.). *Transnational activism and national movements in Latin America: Bridging the divide* (pp. 106–140). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ollier, M. M. (2009). *De la revolución a la democracia: cambios privados, públicos y políticos de la izquierda argentina*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Oxhorn, P. (1998). Is the century of corporatism over? Neoliberalism and the rise of neopluralism. In P. Oxhorn & G. Ducatenzeiler (Eds.). *What kind of democracy? What kind of market? Latin America in the age of neoliberalism* (pp. 195–217). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Pereyra, S., Pérez, G. J., & Schuster, F. L. (2015). Trends of social protest in Argentina: 1989–2007. In P. Almeida & A. Cordero Ulate (Eds.). *Handbook of social movements across Latin America* (pp. 335–360). New York, NY: Springer.
- Portes, A., & Hoffmann, K. (2003). Latin American class structures: Their composition and change during the neoliberal era. *Latin American Research Review*, 38(1), 41–82.
- Roberts, K. M. (1998). *Deepening democracy? The modern left and social movements in Chile and Peru*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Roberts, K. M. (2008). The mobilization of opposition to economic liberalization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1), 327–349.
- Roberts, K. M. (2018). Political parties in Latin America's second wave of incorporation. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 211–221). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Romero, L. A., & Sábato, H. (1992). *Los trabajadores de Buenos Aires: la experiencia del mercado, 1850–1880*. Buenos Aires: Sudamerican.
- Rossi, F. M. (2013). Peronism. In D. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans, & Doug McAdam (Eds.). *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (Vol. 3, pp. 925–928). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rossi, F. M. (2015). Building factories without bosses: The movement of worker-managed factories in Argentina. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(1), 98–107.
- Rossi, F. M. (2017). *The poor's struggle for political incorporation: The piquetero movement in Argentina*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rossi, F. M. (2018a). Social movements and the second wave of (territorial) incorporation in Latin America. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 23–31). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Rossi, F. M. (2018b). Social movements, the new 'social question,' and the second incorporation of the popular sectors in Argentina and Brazil. In E. Silva & F. M. Rossi (Eds.). *Reshaping*

- the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation* (pp. 78–112). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Rossi, F. M. (2019). Conceptualising and tracing the increased territorialisation of politics: Insights from Argentina. *Third World Quarterly*, 40(4), 815–837.
- Rossi, F. M., & della Porta, D. (2015). Mobilizing for democracy: Social movements in democratization processes. In B. Klandermans & C. van Stralen (Eds.). *Movements in times of democratic transition* (pp. 9–33). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Roxborough, I. (1998). The Urban working class and labour movement in Latin America since 1930. In L. Bethell (Ed.). *Latin America since 1930: Economy, society and politics* (Vol. VI, pp. 307–378). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandoval, S. A. M. (1998). Social movements and democratization: The case of Brazil and the Latin countries. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam, & C. Tilly (Eds.). *From contention to democracy* (pp. 169–201). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Suriano, J. (2001). *Anarquistas. Cultura y política libertaria en Buenos Aires, 1890–1910*. Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- Tamarin, D. (1985). *The Argentine labor movement, 1930–1945: A study in the origins of peronism*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Vergara, A. (2014). Chilean workers and the great depression, 1930–1938. In P. Drinot & A. Knight (Eds.). *The great depression in Latin America* (pp. 51–80). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- von Bülow, M. (2010). *Building transnational networks: Civil society and the politics of trade in the Americas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Bülow, M. (2013). The politics of scale shift and coalition building: The case of the Brazilian network for the integration of the peoples. In E. Silva (Ed.). *Transnational activism and national movements in Latin America: Bridging the divide* (pp. 56–79). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wachendorfer, A. (2007). ¿Hacia una nueva arquitectura sindical en América Latina? *Nueva Sociedad*, 211 (September/October), 32–49.
- Zapata S. F. (1976). The Chilean labor movement under Salvador Allende: 1970–1973. *Latin American Perspectives*, 3(1), 85–97.