Social Movements in Latin America: Mapping the Liter ature The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Latin America

Chapter · June 2020

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190926557.013.20

1 author:

Nicolás Somma
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
97 PUBLICATIONS **1,332** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Social Movements in Latin America: Mapping the Literature

Nicolás M. Somma

The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Latin America
Edited by Xóchitl Bada and Liliana Rivera-Sánchez

Subject: Sociology, Political Sociology Online Publication Date: Jun 2020
DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190926557.013.20

Abstract and Keywords

The study of social movements is currently one of the most active research fields in Latin American sociology. This article maps the vast literature on Latin American social movements (LASMs) from the late 1980s to the present. After briefly discussing how scholars have conceptualized LASMs, it presents seven influential approaches: structuralism, political economy, political context, organizational fields, "new social movements," frames and emotions, and transnational activism. Then it discusses some works that zero in on the specificity of LASMs. It closes with a brief summary of the five coming chapters, each of which is devoted to a specific social movement "family": labor, women's, student, indigenous, and anti-globalization.

Keywords: social movements, democracy, neoliberalism, Latin America, transnational activism

Since becoming a politically independent region in the 1820s, Latin America has experienced a long history of insurgencies, contentious debates, and collective mobilization. Not surprisingly, therefore, the study of social movements is currently one of the most active research fields in Latin American sociology (Almeida & Cordero, 2015; Haber, 1996; Inclán, 2018a; Roberts, 1997, 2008; Strawn, 2009). The purpose of this chapter is to orient the reader to this growing area of research by mapping part of the literature on Latin American social movements (LASMs) since the late 1980s to date. I organize the review around seven theoretical approaches that emphasize different aspects of LASMs and the forces shaping them. I address influential and interesting works produced not only by sociologists but also by political scientists and, to a lesser extent, anthropologists. While there is no space here to refer to all of the influential and interesting works in the field, the following five chapters provide more detailed summaries of important movement families.

The chapter is structured as follows. First, I briefly discuss how scholars have conceptualized LASMs, then I devote most of the chapter to presenting the main approaches to LASMs. I close with a brief summary of the chapters ahead.

Conceptualizing Latin American Social Movements

It is difficult to find explicit definitions of social movements in studies about LASMs. One exception is Escobar and Alvarez (1992, p. 321), who define social movements as "organized collective actors who engage in sustained political or cultural contestation through recourse to institutional and extra-institutional forms of action." Likewise, Garretón (2002, p. 9) defines social movements as "collective actions with some stability over time and some level of organization, oriented to the change or conservation of society or some of its spheres." He further differentiates between a given society's *central social movement*, which is oriented to that society's "central conflict," and social movements in general, which involve various actors oriented to specific goals. In practice, scholars of LASMs refer to a continuum ranging from small, informal grassroots organizations at the local level to enduring movements of larger territorial scope and with recognizable leaders and structures, such as Brazil's Movement of Landless Rural Workers (Ondetti, 2010) or Mexico's *Zapatistas* (Inclán, 2018b). This wide scope can cause definitional problems. Disagreements about how to characterize LASMs often stem from diverging implicit notions about what to label as a social movement in the first place.

Some scholars, while not providing a general definition themselves, nonetheless identify specific types of movements. Since the 1980s, Fernando Calderón has been mapping the diversity of LASMs according to their "field of conflict" and main collective actors and claims (e.g., movements about labor, quality of life, urban services, peasantry, gender, youth, and so on; see Calderón, 1986, and more recently, Calderón, 2010). Recent works have examined those movements struggling against neoliberalism—a broad umbrella containing several groups, from workers and students to indigenous communities and environmentalists (see Almeida and Pérez Martín's chapter "Economic Globalization and Social Movements in Latin America" in this volume). Silva (2009) characterizes anti-neoliberal movements as reformist rather than revolutionary, politically anchored in the left and aiming to expand the role of the state vis-à-vis markets. Other recent conceptualizations include Rossi's (2015, 2017) "reincorporation movement," Álvarez-Rivadulla's (2017) "elusive collective action" (referring to squatter movements), and de Sousa Santos's (2001) view that Latin American movements are structured by the tensions between regulation and emancipation and between subjectivity and citizenship.

Moving beyond classification issues, several authors agree about two related changes within LASMs over the decades. One concerns the weakening of class-based movements (workers and peasants) that first solidified during the import substitution era (1930s–1960s) in the struggle to obtain state-guaranteed housing, land, and social insurance (Silva, 2009, p. 15; see Rossi's chapter "Labor movements in Latin America" in this volume). According to Calderón and Jelin (1987), these class-based movements are distinctive since their attempt to achieve broad societal transformations. Later, the crisis of the populist-developmentalist state during the 1970s and the spread of authoritarian governments provoked another change in LASMs, namely the emergence of a tapestry of frag-

mented movements advocating for specific causes, displaying non-class identities and interests (ethnicity, gender, geography, urban services, human rights, etc.), and adopting more decentralized and pluralistic organizational forms (Calderón, 1986; Rice, 2012; Roberts, 2008). Despite the scholarly consensus around these two shifts, systematic supporting evidence (e.g., from protest event datasets) is scarce. Almeida and Cordero (2015) and Johnston and Almeida (2006) have conducted studies for a few countries in the region, but more comprehensive studies are needed.

One of the most important debates about the nature of LASMs revolves around their general orientation. While advocates of the "new social movements" (NSM) approach (reviewed later) suggest that LASMs seek to redefine meanings and identity while maintaining their autonomy from institutional politics, other scholars believe that it is more fruitful to view LASMs as pursuing political-institutional goals and trying to gain access to state resources (Wickham-Crowley & Eckstein, 2015). For instance, labor unions typically voice material grievances requiring concrete state actions (Foweraker, 1995; Haber, 1996). Even movements focused on advocating for particular identities (e.g., ethnic or sexual) rely on the protections afforded by laws to secure recognition and respect for their group. In a region marked by poverty and inequality, the state is often the only dispenser of the resources, services, and rights that people need to survive (Davis, 1999; Rossi, 2017).

In the next section, I present the main approaches scholars have taken to understand the causes and dynamics of LASMs. Such a mapping cannot be carried out without simplifications as there is, of course, some intermingling among the various theories; not all studies, let alone authors, fall neatly within a single approach.

Structuralist Approaches

Mid-twentieth-century sociological approaches to Latin America did not treat social movements as significant actors. Structuralist approaches conceived LASMs as the result of enduring tensions, contradictions, and inequalities in Latin American societies. Influenced by American structural-functionalism, Gino Germani studied the asynchronies among socioeconomic structures, political regimes, and cultural values during modernization processes (Mera & Rebón, 2010). Populist and labor movements, therefore, were seen as mere reactions to these tensions. Dependency theory (Cardoso & Faletto, 1969) focused on how Latin America's dependent status in the world system shaped social classes, states, and group alliances. In this conceptual framework, social movements were seen as too feeble to merit attention beyond their participation in sociopolitical coalitions.

However, structuralist Marxist approaches to social movements became popular during the 1970s. Marxist scholars understood LASMs and revolutionary movements as the consequence of class oppression in a context of international domination by imperialist powers (Haber, 1996). This tradition, and its renewed focus on LASMs, persisted. More recently, using the language of class conflict, objective conditions, and imperialism, Petras

and Veltmeyer (2005) asked why Latin American anti-systemic movements failed even in countries with leftist governments. Other works also turned to socioeconomic structures —in combination with shifting political and ideological factors—to explain the emergence and fate of revolutionary movements during the Cold War, yet in combination with shifting political and ideological factors (Paige, 1998; Wickham-Crowley, 1992).

Eckstein and Wickham-Crowley (Eckstein, 1989; Wickham-Crowley & Eckstein, 2015) provide an excellent example of the structuralist approach. They argue that structural inequalities in the distribution of wealth, power, and prestige led to relations of domination and subordination among groups: those at the top want to preserve the status quo, while those at the bottom want to subvert it. This explains why movements emerge in certain places but not others or why they adopt either violent or peaceful tactics. While emphasizing economic conflicts, Eckstein (1989) moves beyond class analysis and notes the relevance of consumption markets in the region, focusing on protests against cuts in governmental subsidies, high prices in housing markets, and deficiencies in water and electricity services. Eckstein also considers gender, racial, ethnic, and religious inequalities and how they combine to create a contentious atmosphere. For instance, while the Bolivian Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS) originally reacted against unequal land distribution disfavoring peasants, it soon expanded to encompass indigenous rights (Wickham-Crowley & Eckstein, 2015; see Rice's chapter "Indigenous movements in Latin America: tensions, contradictions, possibilities" in this volume).

Despite their consideration of identity-based protests, Wickham-Crowley and Eckstein (2015) highlight the primarily material nature of LASM grievances (also Foweraker, 1995, p. 38). Workers protest for wages and job conditions, consumers protest due to inflation, and debtors protest unfair debts. Even movements without a clear class definition—such as indigenous, women's, or student movements—mobilize for material grievances such as land and food scarcity or high educational fees. Contrary to the NSM approach (see later discussion), "injustices rooted in class and market relations are the main sources of contemporary conflict in Latin America" (Eckstein, 1989, p. 23).

Structuralist approaches are obviously good at capturing the enduring tensions among groups and classes in a very unequal region such as Latin America. They are less useful, though, for understanding movements not driven by material grievances (e.g., sexual diversity movements) and tend to ignore the processes by which activists transform structural conditions into collective action, making it difficult to explain sudden changes in the intensity of social movement activity.

Political Economy Approach

Since the 1990s, a growing number of scholars (Almeida, 2007; Roberts, 2008; Silva, 2009; Walton & Shefner, 1994) have been exploring how economic globalization and the implementation of neoliberal policies in the region shape LASMs (Almeida and Pérez Martín's chapter "Economic Globalization and Social Movements in Latin America" in this volume; Calderón, 1986 for an incipient statement; Svampa, 2008, 2010). This can be

termed a “political economy” approach since it emphasizes how political actors craft economic institutions that create grievances, which in turn foster protests—what some have termed “Polanyian” countermovements against commodification (Silva, 2012). While acknowledging that economic changes play a major role in sparking protest, scholars of the political economy approach, unlike those of the structuralist approach, do not emphasize class contradictions.

The main argument of the political economy approach runs as follows. As a result of the debt crisis of the 1980s, many Latin American countries faced strong international pressures from financial lenders to replace import-substitution policies and open their economies to global markets. They were also compelled to implement structural adjustment policies that reduced social expenditures, cut subsidies to subsistence goods and basic services, and privatized public companies. These policies damaged the popular classes by raising the cost of living and increasing poverty, unemployment, and labor informality, spurring into action previously unengaged social groups like unemployed workers, housewives, youth, retired people, and consumers (Bellinger & Arce, 2011). One of the earliest manifestations of resistance was the survival networks created by women struggling during economic crises under authoritarian regimes (see Fernández Anderson’s chapter “Latin American women’s movements: A Historical Overview” in this volume) and food riots across the region (Walton & Shefner, 1994). Protests soon began to be directed against the privatization of basic services (transport, electricity, water, housing) and encompassed peasants, indigenous groups, and women. Around the turn of the century, organized groups coalesced around the so-called global justice movement, which obviously extends beyond Latin America.

Still, there are divergent views about the effects of neoliberal globalization on collective action. Calderón has argued that economic and technological globalization affected LASMs not by reinvigorating them but by fragmenting collective action and creating particularistic and decentralized forms of coordination (Calderón, 1986). Other scholars advanced the “atomization thesis,” which states that neoliberalism actually disarticulates civil society and creates a culture of individualism and consumerism that is detrimental to collective action (Kurtz, 2004; Moulián, 1997; Posner, 2004; a criticism in Bellinger & Arce, 2011). Rice (2012) provides a more nuanced claim—that neoliberal reforms debilitate class-based actions but activate other forms of resistance (e.g., indigenous movements). Rossi (2017), while not strictly following a political economy approach, explains the rise of the Piquetero movement in Argentina after President Menem’s neoliberal reforms disincorporated popular sectors. Svampa (2010) notes how the expansion of the extractive and exports-based economic model in the region endangers local indigenous and peasant communities as well as their natural environment, motivating them to resist under a territorial logic. Interestingly, this extractive expansion can happen even under leftist governments supposedly committed to the well-being of those very same indigenous and peasant communities.

Political Context Approaches

Several scholars have explored how political context shapes LASM. Only part of this literature explicitly adheres to the influential political opportunity theory, which argues that political openings favor movement activities (Meyer, 2004, for a general review; Somma, 2020, for its application in Latin America). However, many studies are implicitly consistent with it. Here, I review studies focusing on how LASMs relate to three dimensions of the political context: the type of political regime, political parties, and the openness of institutional actors.

An important theme in the literature is the relation between the national political regime and social movement activity. One claim is that the authoritarian regimes of the 1970s and 1980s weakened social movements by repressing or intervening in political parties, unions, and other organizations (Roberts, 1997), sometimes replacing their leaders with others loyal to dictators. This weakening explains why collective action during the democratic transitions was fragmentary rather than unified (Calderón & Jelin, 1987). Beyond right-wing military dictatorships, repression also inhibited collective action in Peru during Fujimori's term (Silva, 2009) and in Cuba for decades (Eckstein, 1989). Yet other scholars suggest that, under some conditions, authoritarianism can boost cohesive collective action. In Goodwin's (2001) "state constructionist" account of revolutionary movements in Central America during the Cold War, brutal state repression against the masses fueled the grievances that lent support to revolutionary movements, which resulted not from "political openings" but from extreme situations in which people had "no other way out" (see also Brockett, 2005).

Scholars also debate the impact of democratic transitions on LASMs. It seems clear that the new democratic climate of the 1990s and 2000s facilitated the reorganization of civil society and the emergence of collective claims that could not develop under authoritarianism (Almeida & Cordero, 2015; Silva, 2009; Strawn, 2009). For instance, Uruguay's redemocratization in the mid-1980s increasingly permitted popular dissent, partially explaining the spread of land takeovers and the organization of the squatter movement (Álvarez-Rivadulla, 2017). Additionally, scholars have argued that the region's "low-intensity democracies" politically exclude vast numbers of people through the concentration of power in the executive and technocracy (O'Donnell, 1994). According to Silva (2009), this creates grievances that foster mobilization.

However, democratization may also depress collective action. Studies on the Chilean transition suggest that when the military retains institutional power after a democratic transition, political elites may demobilize the labor, student, and squatter movements to minimize the risk of an authoritarian reversal (Garretón, 2004; Moulián, 1997; Roberts, 1998), which goes against political opportunity theory's prediction that liberalization boosts social movements. Johnston and Almeida (2006) have reconciled both claims about democratization's effect on collective action by suggesting a nonlinear pattern. In the first years after democratization, movement activity decreases; however, it then intensi-

fies as movements learn the new rules of the game, strengthen their organizational infrastructure, develop new claims, and find new antagonists.

Almeida (2008) provides one of the most comprehensive studies on how changing political regimes shape collective protest. By tracing protest waves in El Salvador during the twentieth century, he shows the complex ways in which the political environment affects protest movements over time. While authoritarianism generally decreases social movement activity, El Salvador's political liberalization gave rise to new civic organizations that mounted nonviolent protests and advocated for moderate policy reforms. However, Almeida also shows that when the state committed to repressing movements and restricting civil liberties, holdover civic organizations from pre-authoritarian regimes tended to promote more radical, violent protests. In a similar country-specific and innovative study of the Zapatista movement in México, Inclán (2018b) uses the metaphor of sliding doors to show how protracted democratic transitions may open opportunities for mobilization yet restrict opportunities for political victories. The parallel creation of transnational solidarity networks, however, allowed the Zapatista movement to survive over the decades despite not achieving its political goals.

A second theme in the literature is the relation between political parties and movements. Parties can boost social movements. For instance, after Uruguay's democratic transition, intense electoral competition forced various parties to seek the vote of the poor, thus increasing the strength of the squatter movement (Alvarez-Rivadulla, 2017). Yet parties can also weaken movements. Roberts (1998) explains how dwindling popular mobilization in Chile and Peru after democratization resulted from internal divisions within leftist parties between a moderate wing (electorally successful but unwilling to deepen grassroots democracy) and a more radical wing (with a stronger grassroots presence but unable to grow electorally). In general, however, parties do tend to join collective protests when conditions seem ripe for increasing their electoral share (Somma, 2018).

Other authors focus on the ways parties affect democratic representation and therefore shape movements. In a multivariate analysis of protests against resource extraction at the subnational level in Peru, Arce (2014) finds that political fragmentation (indicated by a higher number of parties) increases protest. Because in Peru political parties tend to be volatile, regional, and heavily dependent on the personality of their leaders, they are less effective at representing broad popular interests; as a result, people seek to redress grievances through protest campaigns (also Machado, Scartascini, & Tommasi, 2011). Moreover, Arce finds that these protests are more dependent on political variables than are resource-based grievances (also Arce, 2010). Likewise, Rice's (2012) comparative study of indigenous movements in four Latin American countries shows that institutionalized party systems can better represent the popular sectors and therefore depress radical protest, while inchoate party systems lead to greater radicalization (see Rice's chapter "Indigenous movements in Latin America: tensions, contradictions, possibilities" in this volume).

A third theme of the political context approach is the openness of institutional actors to social movement demands—a classic dimension of political opportunity theory (Inclán, 2018b). Explicitly working from this theory, Ondetti (2010) finds that the ebb and flow of Brazil's Movement of Landless Rural Workers between the late 1970s and 2006 was heavily determined by the national government's responsiveness to the movement. More progressive and urban-based governing coalitions favored the movement's growth, while conservative coalitions (such as in President Cardoso's second term) weakened it. In turn, the mass media and public opinion affected the government's responsiveness. Two episodes of brutal police repression toward movement activists in 1995 and 1996 shocked the public, forcing the government to allow the movement's land occupations and to redistribute land (Ondetti, 2010). Adopting a similar approach to a social issue, Díez's (2015) study of the politics of gay marriage in Argentina, Chile, and Mexico shows that the structure of political alliances partially explains why gay marriage was adopted in Argentina and Mexico but not in Chile. While Argentina's and Mexico's leftist parties channeled activist demands into the legislative domain, their Chilean counterparts were allied with a confessional centrist party—the Christian Democracy—which opposed gay rights. Additionally, in Chile, a powerful sociopolitical conservative bloc successfully obstructed activists' efforts.

As this section has demonstrated, ample research has been carried out on the connection between politics and social movements. However, little work has been done on "institutional activism" among LASMs—that is, movement activists reaching public positions inside state agencies and promoting the causes they previously fought for in the streets (but see Abers & Tatagiba, 2015, about the Workers Party administration in Brazil). This imbalance needs to be redressed.

Organizational Fields

While less abundant than the literature focused on political contexts, several studies have emphasized the relevance of civil society organizations for LASMs. Of these, few refer explicitly to resource mobilization theory (McCarthy & Zald, 2001), which addresses this dimension in the social movements literature. Foweraker's claim that "resource mobilization theory has been almost entirely ignored" (1995, p. 1) in LASMs studies is not as tenable now as it was two decades ago, but it still retains some truth. A central debate in resource mobilization theory (as it developed in the United States) concerned whether resources come from sources internal or external to the movement. This debate has not as of yet gained traction within the LASM literature, which has focused on organizations more than on the role of different types of resources.

Some studies have shown the relevance of religious organizations—especially ecclesial base communities—for sustaining resistance networks under authoritarian regimes (Mainwaring & Viola, 1984). Military regimes decimated leftist parties and labor unions but were more hesitant to repress religious organizations given the historical affinity between the military and the Catholic Church in the region. As for nonreligious organiza-

tions, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) also supported urban movements during authoritarian times. Scholars have also noted the role played by student organizations, political parties, and labor unions in more benign political contexts (Eckstein, 1989; Foweraker, 1995).

Several studies show the multifaceted ways in which organizations contributed to LASMs in democratic eras. In an important comparative study of anti-neoliberal contention during the 1990s and 2000s, Silva (2009) differentiates between "associational power"—stemming from organizations promoting class, identity, or ethnic interests—and "collective power," which involves brokers creating linkages among organizations representing different interests (e.g., indigenous peoples, workers, and students). Brokerage occurs through summit meetings, overlapping memberships of elders, and communal forms of organization. Collective power is crucial to meeting enduring challenges: insurrections incapable of forging ties across groups (such as Shining Path in Peru) have a hard time succeeding.

On a different scale, Donoso's (2013) account of the 2006 high school student protests in Chile emphasizes the relevance of internal democracy mechanisms (such as assemblies and having spokespersons instead of presidents) for strengthening movement organizations, maintaining autonomy from parties, and creating links with non-student groups (see Bidegain and von Bülow's chapter "Student movements in Latin America" in this volume for the dilemmas that student movements face). Using protest event data for Chile between 2000 and 2012, Somma and Medel (2019) show that street demonstrations coordinated by a large number of organizations—especially umbrella organizations—convoke more participants than those without organizational support.

Álvarez-Rivadulla (2017) suggests that the type of organizations that are able to further poor people's movements depends on the political environment. For example, NGOs and churches were crucial in the emergence of the squatter movement in Uruguay during authoritarianism as no other organizations could effectively channel the demands of the poor. After democratization, however, political parties reemerged and displaced these organizations. Party brokers helped the movement access international funding to avoid land evictions, obtain water, and access public transportation. They also connected disarticulated squatter neighborhoods. By this point, NGOs and churches had taken a more supporting role.

Moving to international contexts, Gurza Lavalle and von Bülow (2015) explore how "institutionalized brokers" connected organizations in different nations to combat free trade agreements in the Americas. Regarding local riots, Auyero (2007) unveils the clandestine connections between routine political life and collective violence in a fascinating ethnography of Argentina's 2001 food riots. By showing how authorities promote looting and are intermingled with looters themselves, Auyero argues that common analytical distinctions between "insiders" and "outsiders" are inadequate in certain contexts.

Several studies have explored the role of past organizational legacies of protest on future mobilization. In her comparative study of indigenous movements, Rice (2012) shows that countries like Chile and Peru that experienced a strong mobilization of indigenous groups during the 1960s and 1970s along Marxist or socialist lines (what she calls “agrarian radicalism”) left little room for autonomous indigenous mobilization to flourish after democratic transitions. However, countries like Ecuador and Bolivia, with a tradition of indigenous mobilization around multiclass, populist parties (what she labels “agrarian conservatism”), allowed for the emergence of indigenous mobilization after the waning of class-based collective action. In these countries, autonomous organizations launched protests based on ethnic appeals. Likewise, Schneider (1995) shows that during Pinochet’s dictatorship in Chile, popular protests were more intense in those districts of Santiago with a strong tradition of Communist party political culture, suggesting how the legacy of human and political resources distributed unevenly across the territory determined future protest movements.

Other studies have explored how organizations shape movements’ impact. In Peru, for example, the success of several protest campaigns against the extraction of natural resources depended on agriculture-based organizations and NGOs (Arce, 2014). According to Díez (2015), gay marriage was approved in Mexico and Argentina because domestic gay organizations managed to create strong networks linking a wide variety of state and non-state actors. In Uruguay, social movement organizations were also key in the 2013 campaign to approve same-sex marriage (Arocena & Aguiar, 2017). As we have seen, the political situation in Chile blocked organizational efforts, and gay marriage has not yet been legalized there.

Finally, and in consonance with the international literature on social movements, a growing number of studies highlight the relevance of information and communication technologies (ICTs) for forming networks and coordinating collective actions. For instance, in the mid-1990s, the Mexican Zapatistas were among the first movements to use ICTs to gain international support. The internet allowed Mexican peasants to transmit their experiences and accounts of the state repression they faced all over the globe, providing empirical credibility to their claims (Olesen, 2006). Presently, however, it is unclear whether the new digital tools strengthen, weaken, or merely transform traditional organizational formats (von Bülow, 2018).

“New Social Movements” Perspective

The 1980s saw the emergence of the influential NSM perspective for LASMs. It combined European NSM theory (Pichardo, 1997) with postmodern approaches to culture. It emphasized the importance of language, discourse, and identities. Crucial to this perspective were two anthologies—Escobar and Alvarez (1992) and Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar (1998)—that gathered case studies on LASMs by anthropologists, sociologists, and political scientists working in both Latin America and the United States (Garretón, 2002, for a sociological approach).

This approach has five recurrent themes. First, it conceives of LASMs as engaging in cultural-political struggles, which involve transforming collective identities, gaining social recognition, fighting against cultural stigmas, and challenging dominant interpretations. The focus, therefore, is not on political goals and instrumental benefits, as in resource mobilization and political opportunity theories. Second, movements try to obtain as much autonomy as possible from parties and the state to avoid cooptation and instrumentalization. By gaining autonomy, LASMs develop internal practices of self-organization based on participatory democracy, respect for diversity, and egalitarianism. Third, organizational and political autonomy leads to a multiplicity of loosely articulated and fragmented social actors pursuing their own specific struggles (Calderón, 1986, for a similar diagnostic). Fourth, as harbingers of new values and cultures, LASMs have the potential to change social relations. How is this is accomplished? Not by storming the Bastille but rather in a Gramscian way: by constantly deploying novel practices, discourses, and conceptions of democracy, participation, development, rights, and citizenship. Finally, rather than trying to explain variance across specific times and spaces in movement activity, NSM scholars explore the "implications" and "potentials" of LASMs for society at large.

The rich case studies and conceptual elaborations produced by this perspective provide "important antidotes to the structural rigidity" (Haber, 1996, p. 172) of the 1970s scholarship, yet NSM has also prompted several criticisms. First, by praising autonomy, it overlooks the importance of parties and political institutions for advancing movement claims. Many of the changes sought by movements can only be enacted with the cooperation of official authorities and formal institutions (Foweraker, 1995). Second, little systematic evidence has been provided for the presumed cultural impact of these movements—both for participants and for society at large. Looking at the contemporary democracies in the region, it seems that the spread of egalitarian and participatory values was not as massive as suggested (Haber, 1996; Roberts, 1997). Third, this perspective ignores the fact that many LASMs are primarily motivated by material grievances (Wickham-Crowley & Eckstein, 2015). As Foweraker notes, "New Social movements theory … has often been applied to Latin America in a rather cavalier fashion, as if the continent has suddenly become postmodern and postmaterial" (Foweraker, 1995, p. 35).

Slater's anthology (1985) is another important contribution to the NSM perspective. It gathers the works of (mostly) Western European scholars presented in a 1983 conference about "new social movements" in Latin America (see also Slater, 1991). Slater uses Gramscian categories (hegemony, war of positions, war of movements, etc.) to ask how LASMs could potentially transcend authoritarian regimes and promote democracy. He differentiates among countries with varying levels of civil society development (e.g., Argentina and Brazil vs. Nicaragua) to determine which national movements should adopt various revolutionary strategies. It should be noted that other approaches were making similar claims. For example, around the same time that Slater was compiling his anthology, Calderón's early studies (Calderón, 1986; Calderón & Jelin, 1987), while firmly anchored in sociology rather than post-modernism or cultural studies, also characterized LASMs as

increasingly fragmented, heterogeneous, and spontaneous; engaged in new ways of doing politics; and seeking autonomy from political parties and enlightened vanguards.

Culture, Frames, and Emotions

A number of recent studies have paid serious attention to the cultural dimensions of LASMs without necessarily adhering to the NSM perspective. Some of these have demonstrated the usefulness beyond the United States of *framing theory*, which argues that collective action depends on the ways that activists frame and attribute meanings to social and political events (Benford & Snow, 2000). For instance, Olesen (2006) uses framing theory to puzzle out how the indigenous, Third World Zapatista movement in Southern Mexico created a powerful international support network. His answer emphasizes how activists created and spread a collective action frame that promoted radical democracy and a set of universal values such as dignity, justice, and respect for diversity. In a context marked by the left's decline after the collapse of the USSR, the Zapatista frame provided a channel for voicing grievances well beyond Chiapas and evoking solidarity from Northern organizations and international celebrities.

Frames can also determine the success of a movement. For instance, Díez (2015) argues that resonant framing was one of the factors behind gay marriage gaining approval in Mexico and Argentina but not in Chile. Framing gay rights in terms of broader human rights increased the resonance of gay grievances among the public and the political class at large. Yet this resonant framing also depended on the political context. It worked in Mexico and Argentina because, in these countries, human rights was a central issue during their democratic transitions. It did not work in Chile, however, because political elites stifled debates over human rights during the transition to prevent an authoritarian backlash (Díez, 2015). Similarly, the success of organizations fighting extractive projects in Peru depended in part on their ability to craft frames conducive to broad, inclusive coalitions (Arce, 2014).

Other scholars noted the relevance of "master frames" (Snow & Benford, 1992) for LASMs. Foweraker (1995) identifies the emergence of various "rights" frames—around land rights, labor rights, educational rights, and human rights—in the 1970s and 1980s. An anti-globalization master frame has driven many campaigns against local problems, which activists construe as reflecting the threats of globalization (Johnston & Almeida, 2006; also Almeida and San Martín chapter "Economic Globalization and Social Movements in Latin America" in this volume). Finally, Borland (2006) shows that the Madres de Plaza de Mayo in Argentina transformed their collective action frame once Argentina transitioned to democracy and neoliberal reforms changed the economy.

Simmons's (2016) study of the mobilizations around water privatization in Bolivia and rising corn prices in Mexico is an interesting recent work emphasizing the cultural dimensions of LASMs. Simmons argues that certain resources, specifically water in Bolivia and corn in Mexico, are inextricably linked to long-standing practices, myths, and rituals. Restricting their availability not only endangers basic subsistence but also threatens the dai-

ly life of communities and their symbolic orders. Thus, the grievances that drove two important protest campaigns—the Bolivian "water wars" and Mexico's "*tortillazo*" protests—had not only a material but also an ideational, context-dependent component. Otherwise put, rising corn prices might spur protests in Mexico but not necessarily in Japan. Simmons argues that this ideational component of grievances helps explain why both campaigns managed to gather together coalitions that were heterogeneous in terms of class, ethnic identity, and location.

Finally, Auyero's (2006) comparison of two local protests in Argentina during the 1990s shows how contentious events are intermingled with participants' emotions and moral politics—that is, their beliefs about what political practices are right and wrong. Both protests were motivated and eventually shaped by popular perceptions of local politicians' wrongdoings and the ensuing threats to survival (see also Auyero, 2003).

Transnational Activism

Cutting across many of the approaches just reviewed, some studies have focused on the transnational character of LASMs. They reflect notable recent changes in the region, from infrastructural advances like the spread of ICTs and the lowering of airplane fares to the growth of transnational advocacy networks and the intensification of South-North and South-South activist communications. Early examples of transnational activism include the international conferences supporting the Zapatista movement in the mid-1990s and the World Social Forum, celebrated annually since 2001 and with the first three meetings taking place in Brazil (Johnston & Almeida, 2006).

Keck and Sikkink (1998) adopt this approach in their groundbreaking study. It explores transnational advocacy networks advocating for human rights, the environment, and women's rights. While multiregional in scope, some of its cases are Latin American, including human rights networks in Argentina and Mexico in the 1970s and 1980s and environmental networks defending the Brazilian Amazonia rainforest. Although Keck and Sikkink do not focus explicitly on social movements, the transnational networks they study—often rooted in Northern organizations—exchange information and resources and coordinate actions with domestic LASMs. They reveal a "boomerang pattern": domestic movements force their governments to be responsive to their demands by stirring up international pressure from foreign governments and international organizations.

Following this lead, von Bülow (2010) explores how dozens of civil society organizations and movements manage to find common ground to challenge free trade agreements crafted among national governments in the Americas. Through a careful empirical reconstruction of interorganizational ties and collective actions since the 1990s (from street protests to lobbying at different levels), she traces the changing nature of coalitions linking national and international arenas through relational mechanisms such as extension, suppression, diffusion, and brokerage. Silva's (2013) important anthology takes a similar ap-

proach, showing the diverse ways in which national and transnational activism unfolds across the region.

The transnational approach can be combined with the political economy one. For instance, Chase-Dunn, Morosin, & Alvarez (2015) argue that LASMs resisting neoliberalism are part of both broader transnational efforts involving other contentious waves in the semi-periphery (e.g., the Arab Spring) and regional political efforts involving the leftist governments that have come to power over the past two decades. Chase-Dunn calls this international force "the world revolution of 20xx."

A Truly Latin American Theory of Social Movements?

The seven perspectives on LASMs just outlined have clear linkages with theories developed in the advanced North, which is not surprising given the globalization of academic life in recent decades. Yet there have been important developments toward a truly Latin American theory of social movements, one specifically tailored to our reality. Such a theory becomes necessary in light of evident contextual differences. Most Northern movements take for granted political democracy, the rule of law, civil liberties, a dense civil society, an autonomous legal system, and relatively well-off populations. In contrast, LASMs have considerable experience dealing with authoritarian regimes and arbitrary state repression in contexts of underdevelopment, destitution, and high inequality (Davis, 1999; Eckstein, 1989; Foweraker, 1995; Slater, 1985; Strawn, 2009). Even in their analyses of liberal democratic regimes, scholars such as Svampa (2010) speak of an increasing "criminalization of social conflict." Additionally, as de Sousa Santos (2001, p. 177) puts it, the naturalization of market hegemony in Latin America has developed without a strong cultural loyalty to markets, rendering it possible to live within market societies while at the same time fiercely opposing them. It is difficult to gloss over these contrasts and ignore how they might shape the resources, composition, and strategies of social movements.

Some of the most influential examples of the Latin America–specific theory are Svampa's (2010) conceptualization of the four political matrices within LASMs and her work on territorial movements; Garretón's (2001, 2002) thesis about the transition from the "National-Popular" movement (expressed in the labor movement and sometimes the student and peasant movements), which was typical of the import-substitution period, to the "Democratic Movement," which arose following the double transition to democracy and neoliberalism; and Zibechi's notion of "societies in movement" as an attempt to capture the specificity of collective actions resisting capitalism in Latin America (Zibechi, 2007). Another explicit attempt to theorize LASMs is Davis's (1999) power distance model. Reacting to NSM applications and their emphasis on autonomy, Davis sees LASMs as trying to "bridge the distance between citizens and the state" rather than distancing themselves from it. A movement's formation, objectives, and strategies depend on its "distance" from the state, which she conceptualizes along four dimensions—geographic, institutional, cultural, and class. Movements more distant from the state have greater difficulties in ac-

cessing or communicating with the state and therefore will be more violent in their tactics, radical in their claims, and revolutionary in their goals than movements closer to the state.

A more recent perspective emphasizing Latin America's particular political history appears in the works of Rossi (2017), Roberts (2008), and Silva and Rossi (2018). For instance, Rossi (2017) views the Argentinean Piquetero movement as the main actor of a "second wave of incorporation." While the first wave incorporated workers and peasants through large, centralized, national-level associations (Collier & Collier, 1991), the second wave incorporates a heterogeneous mass of poor people organized territorially rather than along class lines. The political incorporation of the Piqueteros was associated with the emergence of a new "social question"—that of unemployed workers and immiserated masses—and the rise to power of a left-wing populist coalition. Rossi's innovative study combines social movement theories with historical institutionalism and relational perspectives, revealing the emergence of new territorial cleavages expressed in neighborhood and shantytown organizations.

Summary of the Section's Chapters

I have briefly presented some influential theoretical approaches and debates in the study of LASMs. The following chapters of this section zoom in on five specific families of movements (labor, women, student, indigenous, and anti-globalization movements) in the region that have proved most consequential in terms of social change.

Federico Rossi chapter ("Labor movements in Latin America") divides the history of regional labor movements into six periods ranging from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. Focusing on four countries—Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico—he traces the strategic, organizational, and political changes of these movements as the region went through different models of economic and political organization. Rossi emphasizes the workers' current struggles with neoliberal globalization, the "second great depression" of 2008, and the changing fortunes of leftist governments.

Cora Fernández Anderson chapter ("Latin American women's movements: A Historical Overview") traces the metamorphosis of the women's movement in the region, from reacting to political and economic circumstances to forcefully advancing its own agenda on issues such as the legalization of abortion and the fight against femicide. Fernández Anderson explores the political impact of women's activism, including the creation of women's ministries, equal parenting and marriage rights, gender quotas, and sexual and reproductive rights programs. The chapter also surveys the internal tension between the "grassroots" and the "institutional" wings of the movement, as well as its recent trend toward transnationalization and the development of "multiple feminisms" including poor, indigenous, and Afro-descendant women as well as lesbians.

Germán Bidegain and Marisa von Bülow chapter (“Student movements in Latin America”) explore Latin American student movements. Using recent examples from Chile, Brazil, Venezuela, and Mexico, they present three dilemmas that student movements currently face: whether to focus on “internal” demands related to educational issues or “external” demands with wider social political implications, how to combine old repertoires of action —such as political rallies—with new methods deriving from ICTs, and whether to ally with established political actors or keep their distance from them.

With a focus on Bolivia, Ecuador, and Mexico, Roberta Rice chapter (“Indigenous movements in Latin America: tensions, contradictions, possibilities”) explores how indigenous movements conceive of collective rights, the environment, and development, as well as the ways they challenge existing governance and democratic structures. Rice also analyzes the historical dynamics of indigenous dispossession and resistance, the sudden rise of indigenous players since the 1990s, and the relations between national governments and indigenous mobilization, as well as their internal gender dynamics. She concludes by outlining an emerging research agenda with important policy implications.

Finally, Paul Almeida and Amalia Pérez Martín’s chapter on anti-globalization movements (“Economic Globalization and Social Movements in Latin America”) shows how market-driven liberalization has boosted some of the largest mass mobilizations in Latin America. By defining six levels of movement activity—from everyday forms of resistance to transnational social movements—and identifying three stages of neoliberal reforms since 1980, they discuss how reactive mobilization to globalization hinges on resource infrastructures, oppositional political parties, strategic experience, and economic threats. The chapter also considers how resource extraction and climate change drive current mobilizations.

Acknowledgments

This chapter was supported by the Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies (COES), located in Chile (CONICYT/FONDAP/grant 15130009); a CONICYT/FONDECYT Regular grant 1160308; and a CONICYT/PCI grant (REDES180048). I thank Julián Rebón for bibliographical references about Gino Germani.

References

Abers, R., & Tatagiba, L. (2015). Institutional activism: Mobilizing for women’s health from inside the Brazilian Bureaucracy. In F. Rossi & M. von Bülow (Eds.), *Social movement dynamics: New theoretical approaches from Latin America* (pp. 73–104). London/ New York, NY: Routledge.

Almeida, P., & Cordero, A. (eds.) (2015). *Handbook of social movements across Latin America*. New York, NY: Springer.

Almeida, P. D. (2007). Defensive mobilization: Popular movements against economic adjustment policies in Latin America. *Latin American Perspectives, 34*(3), 123–139.

Almeida, P. D. (2008). *Waves of protest: Popular struggle in El Salvador, 1925–2005*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Alvarez, S. E., Dagnino, E., & Escobar, A. (Eds.) (1998). *Cultures of politics/politics of cultures: Re-Visioning Latin American social movements*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Álvarez-Rivadulla, M. J. (2017). *Squatters and the politics of marginality in Uruguay*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arce, M. (2010). Parties and social protest in Latin America's Neoliberal Era. *Party Politics, 16*(5), 669–686.

Arce, M. (2014). *Resource extraction and protest in Peru*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Arocena, F., & Aguiar, S. (2017). Tres leyes innovadoras en Uruguay: Aborto, matrimonio homosexual y regulación de la marihuana. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 30*(40), 43–62.

Auyero, J. (2003). *Contentious lives: Two argentine women, two protests, and the quest for recognition*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Auyero, J. (2006). The moral politics of Argentine crowds. In H. Johnston & P. Almeida (Eds.), *Latin American social movements: Globalization, democratization, and transnational networks* (pp. 147–162). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Auyero, J. (2007). *Routine politics and violence in Argentina: The gray zone of state power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bellinger, P. T. Jr, & Arce, M. (2011). Protest and democracy in Latin America's market era. *Political Research Quarterly, 64*(3), 688–704.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*(1), 611–639.

Borland, E. (2006). The mature resistance of Argentina's Madres de Plaza de Mayo. In H. Johnston & P. Almeida (Eds.), *Latin American social movements: Globalization, democratization, and transnational networks* (pp. 115–130). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brockett, C. D. (2005). *Political movements and violence in Central America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calderón, F. (1986). *Los movimientos sociales ante la crisis*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Calderon, F. (ed.) (2010). La protesta social en America Latina. Cuaderno de Prospectiva Política 1, PAPEP-PNUD. Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores.

Calderón, F., & Jelin, E. (1987). *Clases y movimientos sociales en América Latina: perspectivas y realidades*. Buenos Aires: Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad.

Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1969). *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina: ensayo de interpretación sociológica*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Chase-Dunn, C., Morosin, A., & Alvarez, A. (2015). Social movements and progressive regimes in Latin America: World revolutions and semiperipheral development. In P. Almeida & A. C. Ulate (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Movements Across Latin America* (pp. 13–23). Dordrecht: Springer.

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.

Davis, D. E. (1999). The power of distance: Re-theorizing social movements in Latin America. *Theory and Society, 28*(4), 585–638.

De Sousa Santos, B. (2001). Los nuevos movimientos sociales. *OSAL: Observatorio Social de América Latina, 5*, 177–188.

Díez, J. (2015). *The politics of gay marriage in Latin America: Argentina, Chile, and Mexico*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Donoso, S. (2013). Dynamics of change in Chile: Explaining the emergence of the 2006 *Pingüino* movement. *Journal of Latin American Studies, 45*(1), 1–29.

Eckstein, S. (1989). Power and popular protest in Latin America. In S. Eckstein (Ed.), *Power and popular protest: Latin American Social Movements* (pp. 1–60). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Escobar, A., & Alvarez, S. (eds.) (1992). *The making of social movements in Latin America. Identity, Strategy, and Democracy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing Social Movements*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Garretón, M. A. (2001). *Cambios sociales, actores y acción colectiva en América Latina*. Mexico City: CEPAL.

Garretón, M. A. (2002). La transformación de la acción colectiva en América Latina. *Revista de la CEPAL, 76*, 7–24.

Garretón, M. A. (2004). *Incomplete democracy: Political democratization in Chile and Latin America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Goodwin, J. (2001). *No other way out: States and revolutionary movements, 1945–1991*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Haber, P. L. (1996). Identity and political process: Recent trends in the study of Latin American social movements. *Latin American Research Review, 31*(1), 171–188.

Inclán, M. (2018a). Latin America, a continent in movement, but where to? A review of social movement studies in the region. *Annual Review of Sociology, 44*, 515–534.

Inclán, M. (2018b). *The Zapatista movement and Mexico's democratic transition: Mobilization, success, and survival*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Johnston, H., & Almeida, P. (Eds.) (2006). *Latin American social movements: Globalization, democratization, and transnational networks*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kurtz, M. J. (2004). The dilemmas of democracy in the open economy: Lessons from Latin America. *World Politics, 56*(2), 262–302.

Lavalle, A. G., & von Bülow, M. (2015). Institutionalized brokers and collective actors: Different types, similar challenges. In F. Rossi & M. von Bülow (Eds.), *Social movement dynamics: New theoretical approaches from Latin America* (pp. 180–225). London/New York, NY: Routledge.

Machado, F., Scartascini, C., & Tommasi, M. (2011). Political institutions and street protests in Latin America. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 55*(3), 340–365.

Mainwaring, S., & Viola, E. (1984). New social movements, political culture, and democracy: Brazil and Argentina in the 1980s. *Telos, 61*, 17–52.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (2001). The enduring vitality of the resource mobilization theory of social movements. In J. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 533–565). Boston: Springer.

Mera, C., & Rebón (Coord), J. (2010). *Gino Germani. La sociedad en cuestión. Antología comentada*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Meyer, D. S. (2004). Protest and political opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30*, 125–145.

Moulián, T. (1997). *Chile actual: Anatomía de un mito*. Santiago, Chile: LOM Ediciones.

O'Donnell, G. A. (1994). Delegative democracy. *Journal of Democracy, 5*(1), 55–69.

Olesen, T. (2006). The zapatistas and transnational framing. In H. Johnston & P. Almeida (Eds.), *Latin American social movements: Globalization, democratization, and transnational networks* (pp. 179–196). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ondetti, G. (2010). *Land, protest, and politics: The landless movement and the struggle for Agrarian reform in Brazil*. University Park: Penn State Press.

Paige, J. M. (1998). *Coffee and power: Revolution and the rise of democracy in Central America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Petras, J. F., & Veltmeyer, H. (2005). *Social movements and state power: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador*. London, UK: Pluto Press.

Pichardo, N. A. (1997). New social movements: A critical review. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*(1), 411–430.

Posner, P. W. (2004). Local democracy and the transformation of popular participation in Chile. *Latin American Politics and Society, 46*(3), 55–81.

Rice, R. (2012). *The new politics of protest: Indigenous mobilization in Latin America's Neoliberal Era*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Roberts, K. M. (1997). Beyond romanticism: Social movements and the study of political change in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review, 32*(2), 137–151.

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*, 327–349.

Rossi, F. M. (2015). The second wave of incorporation in Latin America: A conceptualization of the quest for inclusion applied to Argentina. *Latin American Politics and Society, 57*(1), 1–28.

Rossi, F. M. (2017). *The poor's struggle for political incorporation: The Piquetero movement in Argentina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, C. (1995). *Shantytown protest in Pinochet's Chile*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Silva, E. (2009). *Challenging neoliberalism in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, E. (2012). Exchange rising? Karl Polanyi and contentious politics in contemporary Latin America. *Latin American Politics and Society, 54*(3), 1–32.

Silva, E. (ed.) (2013). *Transnational activism and national movements in Latin America: Bridging the divide*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Silva, E., & Rossi, F. (eds.) (2018). *Reshaping the political arena in Latin America: From resisting neoliberalism to the second incorporation*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Simmons, E. S. (2016). *Meaningful resistance: Market reforms and the roots of social protest in Latin America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Slater, D. (1985). *New Social Movements and the State in Latin America, Vol. 29*. Amsterdam: CEDLA.

Slater, D. (1991). New social movements and old political questions: Rethinking state–society relations in Latin American development. *International Journal of Political Economy, 21*(1), 32–65.

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Somma, N. M. (2018). When do political parties move to the streets? Party protest in Chile. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, 42*, 63–85.

Somma, N. M. (2020). Resource mobilization and political process approaches in Latin America. In Federico Rossi (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Latin American social movements*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Somma, N. M., & Medel, R. M. (2019). What makes a big demonstration? Exploring the impact of mobilization strategies on the size of demonstrations. *Social Movement Studies, 18*(2), 233–251.

Strawn, K. D. (2009). Contemporary research on social movements and protest in Latin America: Promoting democracy, resisting neoliberalism, and many themes in between. *Sociology Compass, 3*(4), 644–657.

Svampa, M. (2008). *Cambio de época. Movimientos sociales y poder político*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores y CLACSO.

Svampa, M. (2010). Movimientos Sociales, Matrices socio-políticas y nuevos escenarios políticos en América Latina. OneWorld Perspectives, Working Papers 01/2010.

von Bülow, M. (2010). *Building transnational networks: Civil society and the politics of trade in the Americas*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

von Bülow, M. (2018). The survival of leaders and organizations in the digital age: Lessons from the Chilean student movement. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly, 23*(1), 45–64.

Walton, J., & Shefner, J. (1994). Latin America: Popular protest and the state. In J. Walton & D. Seddon (Eds.), *Free markets & food riots: The politics of global adjustment* (pp. 97–134). Cambridge: Blackwell.

Wickham-Crowley, T. P. (1992). *Guerrillas and revolution in Latin America: A comparative study of insurgents and regimes since 1956*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wickham-Crowley, T. P., & Eckstein, S. E. (2015). There and back again': Latin American social movements and reasserting the powers of structural theories. In P. Almeida & A. C.

Ulate (eds.), *Handbook of social movements across Latin America* (pp. 25–42). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zibechi, R. (2007). *Autonomías y emancipaciones. América Latina en movimiento*. Lima, Peru: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.

Nicolás M. Somma

Institute of Sociology, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile