Societies, Social Policies, and Political Representation: A Latin American Perspective

Fernando Filgueira and Juan Pablo Luna

International Political Science Review 2009 30: 471
DOI: 10.1177/0192512109352291

International Political Science Review (2009), Vol. 30, No. 5, 471–485

Societies, Social Policies, and Political Representation: A Latin American Perspective

Fernando Filgueira and Juan Pablo Luna

Books Reviewed

Cavarozzi, Marcelo and Abal Medina, Juan (2003). *El asedio a la política: Los partidos latinoamericanos en la era neoliberal* [Politics under Siege: Latin American Parties in the Neoliberal Era]. Rosario, Argentina: Homo Sapiens Ediciones-Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

Dagnino, Evelina, Olvera, Alberto J., and Panfichi, Aldo (2006). *La disputa por la construcción democrática en América Latina* [The Battle for Building Democracy in Latin America]. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica-CIESAS-Universidad Veracruzana.

Grompone, Romeo (2005). *La escisión inevitable: Partidos y movimientos en el Perú actual* [The Inevitable Schism: Parties and Movements in Contemporary Peru]. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Katzman, Rubén and Wormald, Guillermo, eds (2002). *Trabajo y ciudadanía: Los cambiantes rostros de la integración y exclusión social en cuatro áreas metropolitanas de América Latina* [Jobs and Citizenship: The Changing Faces of Social Integration and Exclusion in Four Latin American Metropolitan Areas]. Montevideo: Ford Foundation and Universidad Catolica del Uruguay.

Martínez, Juliana (2008). *Domesticar la incertidumbre en América Latina: Mercado laboral, política social y familias* [Taming Uncertainty in Latin America: Labor Markets, Social Policies, and Families]. San José de Costa Rica: Ediciones UCR.

Keywords: • Political parties • Social policy • Political economy • Latin America • Democracy • Inequality

Introduction: Our Selection Biases

Karl Polanyi's classic work *The Great Transformation* (1944) still resonates after some 20 years, following the demise of authoritarian regimes and the end of Import

DOI: 10.1177/0192512109352291
Sage Publications (Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington DC)

Substitution Industrialization (ISI) in Latin America. For many scholars this transformation has been eminently political, while for others basically economic. Here, we will take a broader view, utilizing two different but complementary approaches or subareas – (1) societal transformations and social policy and (2) party systems and political representation – both of which we believe offer fresh perspectives on a number of significant sociopolitical dynamics currently shaping Latin America. In this introduction we will touch upon how the Latin American and the northern academies have been further divided in recent years, before going on to review a few works in each of the subareas just mentioned that might be helpful in bridging the current divide.

Socioeconomic inequalities, market failures, and the frailty of the institutional channels consolidated after democratic transitions underpin the present-day crisis of representation in Latin America. The most recent expression of this crisis is known today as the regional "shift to the left" (Luna and Filgueira, 2009). Two temptations should be avoided in analyzing this shift to the left. The first is to see it as a purely political development that has no roots in social structure and state policies; the second is to see no need for political analyses and to choose to explain away the left shift with the simple claim that it is the inevitable outcome of years of oppression and inequality in the region. These two conclusions neglect the interplay of politics and society in the context of weak states and in doing so give us comfortable but misleading answers. Both in northern and in Latin American academia, there are some authors who seek to avoid this simplistic answer, but the former are more read by an Anglo-Saxon audience than the latter. This review seeks to increase the exposure of US and European Latin Americanists as well as comparativists in general to relevant, but untranslated, works by Latin American scholars. In sum, this review seeks to offer a different narrative on the events over the last two decades through the prism of five Latin American works. We believe that this complementary narrative could be useful for those seeking to understand current events in the region in that it complements our "conventional wisdom" on the nature and causes of current regional events.

Shifting attention to Latin American publications is useful in pursuing that objective due to the widening schism we believe to be emerging between international sociopolitical narratives and more regional ones. Broadly put, mainstream analyses of the political economy of democracy and development in Latin America have become excessively narrowly focused on describing and explaining the workings of formal political institutions and on reconstructing the processes (usually top-down) that different leaders crafted to enable the implementation of more or less successful market reform attempts.

Particularly for those interested in policy implications, the analytical focus was centered on getting institutional norms "right" and getting reformist coalitions in place – the counterpart of getting prices "right" in the marketplace.[1] In this context, civil society was understood predominantly as "public opinion." There were also less prominent case studies of highly contextualized and local experiences of popular organization or, more frequently, clientelistic co-optation and disarticulation. Although these case studies illuminated some critical contradictions, including the coupling of formal democracy and market reforms, they were largely ignored in mainstream analyses of the political economy of development and democracy in Latin America. Likewise, interpretive narratives dealing with "big questions" and exploring those contradictions became marginalized in favor of very systematic analyses of "middle-range theories."

A series of interrelated factors underpinned these developments. First, non-mainstream analyses of the contradictions between market reforms and democracy became either too "de-centered" due to the same social segmentation and localization which disabled and fragmented collective action in the region, analyzing locally contextualized experiences that were difficult to generalize elsewhere, or were too general and abstract, without being able to provide systematic evidence to support their critical theorizing. In short, both approaches became less able than mainstream analyses to satisfy the requisites of elegant theorizing and methodologically sound sample-selection, testing, and generalization potential.

Second, mainstream scholarship's "selective attention" was further displaced from these types of approaches in the context of a redefinition of disciplinary boundaries that increasingly relegated theoretical essays and case studies to the domains of other "less scientific" disciplines (e.g. anthropology, cultural studies, history). Third, engaging in non-mainstream types of research became, especially for Latin American intellectuals trained in classical political sociology, a way to resist, though usually implicitly, North American methodological (and normative) dominance.

The result of these differences would ultimately reinforce further isolation on both sides of the divide. To give an example, the Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), drawing on European funding sources, implemented an ambitious program of regional fellowships and became a very significant producer of counter-hegemonic narratives on Latin America. However, this has contributed to further decreasing instances of critical dialogue between the Latin American academic community and its North American counterpart.

At least regarding the two subareas – society and political representation – that we analyze in the pages that follow, we believe Latin American academia can provide useful hints for complementing and nurturing our understanding of the region's perennial struggle to structure legitimate and durable political representation while implementing public policies that are effective in bringing about socioeconomic welfare. In the first section, we review two recent texts, one by Rubén Katzman and Guillermo Wormald (as editors) and the other by Juliana Martínez, who look at recent societal transformations, social policy, and "varieties of capitalism" in Latin America. In the second section, we review three texts: one edited by Marcelo Cavarozzi and Juan Abal Medina, another edited by Evelina Dagnino, Alberto J. Olvera, and Aldo Panfichi, and, finally, the text by Romeo Grompone. These three works deal with the nature of political representation and its differences within the region.

Both subfields, we argue, are very relevant to understanding current socio-political change in our region and different nations. Our belief is that an eventual re-leveling of the "playing field" between Latin American epistemological and research traditions and comparative politics' mainstream tradition might eventually yield opportunities on both sides for a better understanding of the region's experience with democracy and social welfare.

To close this introduction, let us make our selection biases explicit. Along with our thematic focus, we also selected works according to the following criteria. First, in accordance with the *IPSR*'s editorial norms, we only considered works that were uniquely published in Spanish and by Latin American presses. This criterion restricts the scope of the review and leaves out both relevant works published in Spanish elsewhere[2] and those works originally published in Spanish

which are now available in other languages.[3] Second, motivated by our view of the epistemological schism described above, we selected works that could provide a middle ground between international, especially American, methodological or theoretical approaches and Latin American critical narratives. In a way, all the works we selected adhere to a neopositivist epistemology, but they either ask different or broader questions or provide different answers than mainstream international analysis on the region. Obviously, this criterion also restricts the scope of our review, excluding works approaching each epistemological extreme: overcritical works that locate themselves outside a neopositivist epistemology and works published in Spanish but based on epistemological and methodological options that bring them too close to international mainstream analyses.[4]

Latin American Societies and Social Policies

Lipset's seminal work arguing that richer societies tend to be less prone to democratic breakdown is usually taken in its most simplistic form. His claim is actually rather more complex and requires, for the previous statement to be true, some intervening variables to operate: namely, educational achievements, expansion of the middle classes, and overall social welfare improvement. The idea that very unequal developing societies have a hard time entering into and sustaining democratic contracts is sound not only in theoretical terms but also on empirical grounds. Nonetheless, the last 20 years suggest that in Latin America the previous empirical regularities might no longer apply. Still, the degree to which a society and a polity can tolerate extreme levels of inequality, poverty, and exclusion from basic systems of social protection remains a legitimate academic question, a necessary topic on the social development agenda, and a relevant issue for the policy and political arena.

In this section, we review two books that deal with both inequality and welfare; they do this in a way that combines rigorous scholarly work and at the same time a desire to affect the policy and political agenda in Latin America. Rubén Katzman and Guillermo Wormald's edited book *Trabajo y Ciudadanía*, which is squarely set in the tradition of economic sociology and stratification studies, seeks to unravel the processes of the social fragmentation of urban centers and its impact on basic forms of citizenship in four large Latin American cities during the age of neoliberal transformation. Katzman's opening comparative and theoretical chapter is followed by four chapters on Argentina, Mexico, Chile, and Uruguay that analyze social structures and the welfare responses to the neoliberal experiment in the region. There are four very important, and also rare, attributes that would make this book a wonderful addition for Latin Americanists otherwise unfamiliar with it because of its publication in Spanish only.

The first attribute is that this is a book with a guiding theory. Katzman and others have for some time now been working on a combination of Moser's asset vulnerability approach and Esping Andersen's welfare regime framework.[5] They combine the micro-perspective of families, assets, and strategies with the macro-perspectives of states, markets, and communities. The physical, human, and social capital of individuals and families is taken seriously, but this, Katzman claims, is only part of the story. How markets, states, and communities both distribute these assets and grant returns to individuals' and families' investments of these assets is also taken seriously. The AVEO approach (asset vulnerability and opportunity structure) will

be attractive to those searching for a combination of political economy of welfare and inequality and textured analyses of social structure, family, and stratification. It is also worth noting that the theory outlined in the introduction does not have a sheer aesthetic function; rather, it plays a central role in the rest of the text.

Secondly, this is a book with a central hypothesis and a broad descriptive concern. The authors ask themselves how the urban populations of Latin America have adapted and fared in the new market-based economies. Are Latin American urban centers converging in their patterns of social development toward a more fragile and less inclusive mode of development due to the process of globalization and market-oriented reforms, or do countries' historical legacies in terms of social structures and welfare regimes mark divergent paths and differential capacities to resist and adapt? The answer is less clear cut than one might desire. The different contributions and Katzman's introductory chapter suggest that Latin American countries are less capable than industrialized countries of resisting the pressures toward more fragmented and exclusionary labor markets. Those pressures are the result of globalization, technological change, and the massive flow of workers into the world economy brought about by the triple whammy of India, China, and the Eastern European economies joining the global marketplace. As argued in most of the chapters, the welfare matrixes and their levels of development have been unable to counteract these deteriorating labor markets through basic protection, investment in human capital, and redistribution. But then, at different points in the introductory chapter and in some of the others, path dependency seems to be present and convergence only apparent.

Thirdly, this book reads as a cohesive text and not as a dismembered set of essays with loose thematic ties. The chapters that follow the introduction share a similar structure, hypothesis, and data treatment. This provides both a sense of continuity and common purpose, a comparative perspective, and a very rich set of comparable tables, data, and analyses. For the sake of space, we will select some common denominators among the chapters, [6] as each one has the advantage of looking at the impact of a transformed structure of opportunity from the viewpoint of states, markets, and families. We see how parts of the increased vulnerability of popular urban sectors in the region respond not just to labor market transformation (fragmentation, informality, and unemployment on the rise) but also to concrete changes in the social policies of the analyzed countries (privatization, targeting, and decay of social services). Even more, we find that all four cases share a relatively untapped and understudied source of vulnerability: family change and urban segregation.

Additionally, the case studies look not just at the poor, but also at the middle classes. In doing so, they are able to show a transformed landscape in terms of vulnerability both for the middle classes and the poor. Some of the most important differences that we find between countries relate precisely to the interplay of employment dynamics and welfare protection and the differential effect of this interplay on the middle classes and on the popular urban sectors of society.

The final attribute points to the fact that all the cases under study show increased vulnerability of the popular sectors and fragmentation of the middle classes. In Chile and Mexico there is a clear set of winners among a small sector of the middle classes and an important increase in income capacity in some poorer sectors. Argentina shows an even clearer set of winners but at the expense of most of the middle classes and an even more dramatic downturn in welfare and well-being

when we look at how the popular sectors fared in the 1990s. Uruguay, finally, shows a slow decay into a more segmented and especially less affluent society. While it is the country that most strongly resists market-driven inequality in the early 1990s, it shows clear signs of losing the battle in the later part of the decade in that the poor suffer (although less than in other countries) while the middle classes are increasingly unable to cope with market shocks. In all the cases studied, the social policy reforms of the 1990s carry a large part of the burden of these increasingly fragmented and unequal societies.

After Katzman, the second text that met our criteria is Juliana Martínez's *Domesticar la incertidumbre en América Latina*, which is an outstanding achievement that addresses the issues of social protection and welfare in Latin America. It combines the literature dealing with welfare regimes and their political economy, varieties of capitalism, and social stratification studies. It does this not by breaking down the analyses into two or three unrelated fields, but rather, by building conceptual, methodological, and analytical bridges, Martínez's work shows us how welfare regimes, capitalist formation and shapes, and social structures in Latin America are inextricably linked. Her book sets out first to pose both the policy and political question it wants to tackle and the academic question it seeks to answer. A post-Washington consensus era begs the question of what the new legitimate, feasible, and desirable menu of options is regarding economic and social policy. Academically, she claims we are poorly equipped to provide answers because the literature in the region has been looking at states, markets, and families separately. Accordingly, she states there has been no attempt to understand how these entities interact through time, creating certain historical patterns, and thus give us a better understanding of the determinants of welfare and inequality at any given time.

The book comprises three large sections. First, she presents a conceptual framework and a very good review of the literature on welfare states and welfare regimes, for both the industrialized countries and Latin America. Her most important argument in this literature review is her claim that markets, families, and states have to be taken together if we want to understand welfare change and continuity. Following Polanyi's classic work and Esping Andersen's more recent texts, she distinguishes between family, market, and public allocation of resources and protection and sets out a task that goes beyond what other authors have attempted in the region; she establishes a typology not of welfare states, but of welfare regimes. She also highlights with these analytical tools the importance of gender studies not only in order to understand the place of family in welfare regimes, but also as a way to reinterpret markets, states, and their reinforcing effect on overall patters of inequality from a gender perspective.

Second, she tackles the challenge of identifying relevant empirical and theoretically grounded types of welfare regimes in Latin America. Through cluster analyses, she ends with a typology that distinguishes between a state-productivist, a state-protectionist, and a familistic welfare regime. The former is geared toward the expansion of human capital and commodification of the labor force and is best exemplified in her view in the cases of Chile and Argentina, while the state-protectionist regime includes a heterogeneous array of countries that go from the relatively egalitarian Costa Rica and Uruguay to the very unequal Mexico or Brazil. What distinguishes one cluster from the other is not how much they protect and grant welfare to their people, but rather how they go about doing it. While

the former does so by attempting to create adequate commodities out of people and less so by protecting them from the risks that arise from market exposure, the latter chooses to protect people through the heavy hand of the state within market dynamics. Finally, familistic regimes (of which she finds two subgroups) have little in the way of market incorporation and state protection, and depend to a larger degree on families' capacities to provide welfare. Ecuador, Peru, and others represent the least purely familistic types (they have some incorporation through markets and states); Guatemala and Nicaragua among others represent the extreme of family-dependent welfare and protection regimes.

Subsequently, Martínez selects four case studies and looks at the historical trajectories of each case. Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Nicaragua (these last two representing the high and low end of the familistic type) are analyzed through three complementary historically grounded tools or perspectives: their original genotype, the critical junctures they faced, and the historical legacies produced by the resolution of their different critical junctures. Space does not allow us to do justice to the textured analyses, but the four cases offer a convincing explanation of how and why these countries stand where they stand today. Especially interesting is how she understands the reshaping of Chile's welfare regime and the limits to and aborted attempts at developing a larger role for states and markets in Nicaragua and to a lesser extent Ecuador. Still, for all the merits of this section, one is left with the impression that there is never a good enough fit between her take on elites, classes, and power struggles and her overall perspective on welfare regimes and how markets, states, and families shape and are shaped by them. Many times it looks as if these processes and outcomes happened to these countries rather than happened within them.

The third part of Martínez's work is quite unique in making a major contribution to the welfare regime literature in the region and elsewhere. What she does is use the typological criteria she worked with to find countries' welfare regimes inside the countries' social structures. In other words, she develops a framework that is able to map different worlds of welfare within countries. She selects the same cases and does an impressive job of analyzing via household surveys and other sources how each country presents its different worlds of welfare. Chapter 5 is indeed a tour de force, a theoretical and methodological one, and in many cases it pays off; but in other respects her analysis needs further work, as it adds unexplained layers of complexity. The first central finding is that in all the countries under scrutiny we can see groupings of families that combine reliance on markets with reliance on states and on families, which are very different things. This should not be placed, as the author does, in a continuum of "relative dependence upon the welfare regime." That is not the relevant question, and it somehow misleads both the author and the reader. The important breakthrough is that, in any given country, we can usually identify clusters of families that rely on markets, others that rely on state and families, and still others that rely mostly on families and informal subsistence-based activities. As would be expected, the layer of people dependent on state action and protection is larger in Costa Rica, smaller in Chile, and almost irrelevant in Nicaragua. Despite the flaws in these conclusions, this chapter is ambitious in its scope and it is one that pushes forward the research agenda in Latin America by taking risks and embracing rigorous and detailed methodological challenges.

Neither of the texts by Katzman/Wormald and Martínez poses explicit political questions regarding party systems, regimes, and political dynamics. However, in looking at inequality, welfare, and social policies, and doing so in such a way that families, markets, and states are all brought to the forefront of analyses, both authors provide a much needed ingredient to political science approaches that consider it sufficient to analyze political dynamics as separate and autonomous from other underlying social and state realities of the region. As recently claimed by Mainwaring (2006), representation crises in the (Andean) region cannot be understood without considering state failures (and the underprovision of social welfare). We now turn to three works that explicitly tackle different dimensions of Latin America's crisis of representation.

Latin American Party Systems and Political Representation

If Schattschneider's famous claim that "modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of political parties" is close to a truth, contemporary Latin American democracies are in great trouble. Political parties are relatively weak in the region and suffer from illegitimacy and chronic instability. Indeed, according to Coppedge's (1998) calculations, around 80 percent of the 1200 parties created in the region during the 20th century vanished after competing in only one election. In spite of all this, electoral democracy has generally survived in the region since the most recent wave of democratization in the 1980s. One important answer to this apparent contradiction can be provided by means of the analysis of political representation in the region. The three volumes we now review in this section – one by Marcelo Cavarozzi and Juan Abal Medina, another by Evelina Dagnino, Alberto J. Olvera, and Aldo Panfichi, and the last by Romeo Grompone – all speak to this contemporary conundrum, although from different angles and departing from normatively distinct positions.

The paradox of stable (though faulty) democratic governance and weak parties and party systems is what motivates our first text under review here, entitled *El asedio a la política: Los partidos latinoamericanos en la era neoliberal*. This book, edited by Marcelo Cavarozzi and Juan Abal Medina (h), is organized around a series of theoretical and comparative chapters, and a series of case studies of different party systems in South America and Mexico. The volume also includes a postscript by Abal Medina (h) and Suárez Cao, along with an electoral data appendix. For the sake of space, and also because the quality of the contributions is uneven across the volume, we will focus on a few important parts of the book that complement and challenge the conventional views on Latin American party systems.[7]

Cavarozzi and Cassullo's chapter provides a historical overview of the region's party systems, identifying three types of system consolidated around the state-centric sociopolitical matrix (Garretón et al., 2003): a) party systems which have stable roots in society and routinized patterns of legitimate interaction among members (Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica); b) parties without system, which are characterized by the presence of one-party hegemons emerging from political "big bangs" and frequently combining a personalist leader and mass mobilization (Argentina, Mexico, Bolivia, and Paraguay); and c) politicians without parties, where parties have been extremely weak and the military frequently acted as "guarantors of last resort," displacing reformist leaders (Brazil and Peru). These three sets of party systems in the 1990s confronted the "need" to

introduce market reforms under the Washington Consensus, thus reforming the state-centered matrix in which these party systems were developed. According to Cavarozzi and Cassullo, their "party systems" type corresponds to gradual and moderate market reforms (with Chile as an exceptional case). Meanwhile, and coinciding with Roberts' analysis, reforms were carried out more drastically in the other two types. One interesting exception to this pattern is Brazil, where, according to Meneguello's argument, parties were able to penetrate state and society, developing linkages that provided structure to the party system. In Peru, in turn, the party system collapsed.

Although illuminating, this historical characterization, and in particular its implications for analyzing current events, could be problematic. Recent cases of collapse (i.e. Venezuela and Bolivia) and significant party system change (i.e. Costa Rica, Paraguay, and even Uruguay) are possible warning signs. While at first more resistant to the challenges of implementing reforms in the context of uninterrupted electoral contestation, historically more "virtuous" configurations might also be dramatically disrupted with the accumulation of electoral iterations amidst increasing popular discontent with parties and political institutions.[8] These transformations are partially addressed in the postscript by Abal Medina (h) and Suárez Cao, who identify three paths of party system change in the 1990s which do not closely coincide with the three historical configurations identified by Cavarozzi and Cassullo: stabilization (Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay), weakening (Colombia, Mexico, and Argentina), and collapse (Peru, Venezuela, and Bolivia).

Cavarozzi and Cassullo's chapter also contributes new insights by identifying four deficits in the political structure of Latin American societies: a) uneven and socially stratified citizenship rights, b) a conflict between parties' representative and governing functions,[9] c) a lack of stateness, and d) low levels of party system institutionalization. The authors concentrate on the latter deficit and provide a welcome review of Mainwaring and Scully's (1995) notion, arguing that Latin American party systems have not only weakly institutionalized party systems but also too highly institutionalized ones, which are stable at the elite level but lack rootedness in society. They convey this view by identifying two types of risks ("risk by default" and "risk by excess") in each of the four dimensions proposed by Mainwaring and Scully's seminal work. This is perhaps the most important theoretical contribution of the chapter.

The chapter by Mujal-León and Langenbacher provides a useful comparative parameter by analyzing the nature of European party-states. The authors claim that the stability of European party systems in the post-World War II period results from their penetration of the state apparatus (and, especially, the development of the welfare state) and their articulation of neocorporatist modes of political representation, which provide these parties with the capacity to represent specific social groups. In other words, this work shows how political parties in Europe remained institutionalized by solving Cavarozzi and Cassullo's deficits "a," "b," and "c" through the development of the welfare state and neocorporatist representation. The sharp contrast between European and Latin American social and state structures that this article conveys is also fundamental for understanding party system deficiencies in the Latin American region. This important difference should scare us away from de-contextualized applications of the West European party system parameter to the analysis of party systems elsewhere in the developing world.

In terms of the national case studies, which are all interesting and original, a number of the chapters are especially handy for their broader theoretical or comparative implications. Tanaka's account of the collapse of the Peruvian party system and the rise of Fujimori, and Moulian's description of Chile's institutionalized but increasingly illegitimate and non-ideological party system, deserve serious consideration. In a nutshell, a joint consideration of both chapters suggests that party systems at both extremes of the institutionalization ladder confront similar challenges and share some common deficits. In turn, Meneguello's chapter on Brazil provides an interesting narrative on a case that seems to defy the regional trend toward increasing de-institutionalization. While it is the paradox of stable governments with weak parties which drives our first text, it is the search for alternative ways of political representation which motivates our second book.

The book edited by Evelina Dagnino, Alberto J. Olvera, and Aldo Panfichi, entitled *La disputa por la construcción democrática en América Latina*, brings together 10 different case studies to address the failure of representation in Latin America. This book covers participatory experiments in Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Mexico, and Chile. Interestingly, the case studies cover not only successful participatory democracy experiences, but also failed ones. The inclusion of failed democratic experiences is precisely what makes this long volume required reading for those interested in the relationship between civil society, political institutions, and the state in contemporary Latin America. Some empirical chapters are rich in terms of conceptual innovation (for example that by Isunza) and all of them cover a broad range of empirical instances, from participatory budgeting, community-based social policy design and mechanisms for enhancing governmental accountability,[10] to ethnic mobilization initiatives (de la Peña), multi-group coordination instances, and other single-issue groups.[11] Apart from a comparative chapter which analyzes the institutionalization (legalization) of participatory democratic practices in the region (Hevia de la Jara), three case studies analyze more generally the relationship between civil and political society in Brazil (Santis Feltran), Chile (Delamaza and Ochsenius), and Mexico (de la Peña). The breadth of the volume merits serious consideration.

For the sake of space, we now concentrate on the theoretical insights highlighted in the introduction, even though some will find a wealth of empirical evidence and conceptual nuances throughout this well-edited volume. Paradoxically, in our view, a balanced account of the empirical evidence presented in the substantive chapters challenges some of the theoretical claims presented in the introduction.

The editors (Dagnino, Olvera, and Panfichi) should be commended for putting together such an array of empirical studies on participatory democracy experiences, and for not including only examples favorable to their views. The introduction is also interesting in terms of its theoretical scope and the description of civil society as extremely heterogeneous. This explains the emergence of strong civil associations that are nonetheless separated from the civil society at large. While less original, the heterogeneity of the Latin American state, both regarding stateness and its relationship to civil society, is another important point worth taking away from this volume.

We should now elaborate some criticisms that could be useful in providing a different reading of the evidence collected in the empirical chapters. The

editors identify three political projects in Latin America: an authoritarian project implanted in the 1970s, a neoliberal and contemporary one, and a participatory democratic one. While exposing the negative traits of the former two, they endorse the latter by providing evidence throughout the rest of the book based on different experiments in participatory democracy.

The relationship between formal and participatory democracy merits discussion, and in our opinion more consensus and consistency throughout the book. It is here in the book that formal democracy is viewed with ambiguity. Sometimes it is seen as a baseline model that should be complemented by participatory practices in order to improve the quality of democracy and representation in the region. In other instances, formal democracy is coupled with the neoliberal project, and therefore conflated with one of the alternatives to participatory democracy that is rapidly dismissed in the introduction. On the same lines, the introduction also seems to conflate ends (institutionalizing a regime that provides plain respect for human rights) with means (having a radical participatory democracy *per se*).

A distinction between ends and means is in order we believe. Simply stated, participatory democracy might be a different type of project than the other two – authoritarian and neoliberal – which the authors criticize (on reasonable grounds). In spite of their many failures, both the authoritarian and the neoliberal projects are macro-systemic and do not face a trade-off between their micro and macro logic. Can the participatory democratic project avoid those trade-offs? In general, the successful case studies depicted in the book relate to those where opposition movements have mobilized against unpopular incumbents or where associations have rallied around a few very specific issues. Can these successful experiences at the micro-level be aggregated into a macro-participatory democracy arrangement?

The answers to the former question and this latter question are relevant not only in the context of the book, but also in a regional context in which different constitutional innovations on the continent are trying to introduce radical participatory practices in their legal frameworks.[12] While the editors seem to endorse a positive view on the chances of aggregating successful participatory experiences into a full-blown participatory regime at the macro level, the book does present some evidence which partially challenges their view and argument in the text.

After rich and nuanced empirical evidence is presented in subsequent chapters, the book ends without putting forth a conclusion. This is unfortunate and surprising. In their introduction, the editors challenge the literature on democratic quality for not identifying the context in which formal democracy is capable of producing positive outcomes. The same critique can be made of this book, which could have ended by identifying the contexts in which participatory democracy might produce normatively satisfying outcomes.[13] After reading the evidence in this volume, we suspect that these contextual conditions are not very different than the ones that enable high-quality formal democratic procedures and outcomes. If this is correct, participatory and formal democracy should be seen as complementary and as facing a series of common challenges for consolidating into "higher quality" political regimes.

Our third book in this section, by Romeo Grompone, speaks to both political parties and participatory movements, looking at their (failed) interaction in the

case of Peru. For that reason, it provides a good way of bridging reflections on top-down and bottom-up processes of political representation in present-day Latin America. Indeed, Grompone's book *La escisión inevitable: Partidos y movimientos en el Perú actual* describes the inevitable schism currently separating political parties and social movements in Peru in the wake of the collapse of the party system, Fujimori's authoritarian interregnum, and the emergence of social movements. This book is also interesting because it provides a comparative framing, analyzing the relationship between social movements and political parties in two additional Andean cases: Bolivia and Ecuador.

In summary, although Grompone's book lacks a systematic testing of the multiple arguments presented, the text not only provides a novel reading of the Peruvian political landscape after Fujimori, but also presents multiple comparative insights. Regarding the latter, one lesson that resonates throughout the book is that of the limits of electoral and institutional engineering in the effort to solve the crisis of representation that the region faces.

Beyond this comparative framing, the case study on Peru provides insights on the problematic relationship between representative and participatory democracy. According to Grompone, after the collapse of the party system and the ousting of Fujimori, the political arena was open for social movements – a few of which had experience as oppositional sectors – to fill the political vacuum. This might also have been facilitated, institutionally, by the constitutional reforms of 1993, which introduced decentralizing reforms and participatory mechanisms at the local level. Instead, the evidence the author alludes to depicts a political arena that becomes de-centered and fragmented due to the appearance of multiple local caudillismos, political independents, and a series of ethnic and regional movements without any efficient mechanisms for central coordination. From this perspective, Andean cases (but particularly that of Peru) seem trapped in two suboptimal solutions. Either they maintain a restrictive political arena and confront social movements that become more and more active in challenging the legitimacy and viability of the elite order, or they open up the system and lose the capacity to structure representation at the national level. In the latter scenario, national political leaders, heading organizationally and territorially weak parties, are faced with the need to negotiate multiple precarious alliances with a myriad of independent, regional, and ethnic movements.

In our view, this apt description not only captures the political situation of Peru, but also provides important insights for thinking about the challenges that Latin American countries face in institutionalizing effective representation and political participation in the context of their long-standing but poor-quality electoral democracies. We now conclude, attempting to bring both literatures together.

Conclusion: Toward a New Research Agenda?

The five books with origins in Latin America reviewed in this article have a complementary nature. This regional literature produces an aggregate value that is important to incorporate in the mainstream debates. While the first subfield considered, that of society and social policies, provides a nuanced description of the characteristics of Latin American social structures and welfare regimes, the second, focusing on parties and political representation, describes different

dimensions of the region's crises of representation. Beyond its own merits regarding the comparative analyses of welfare regimes, we believe the literature of the first subfield also provides a much needed socio-structural background to mainstream neoinstitutional analyses of Latin American politics. In other words, the depth of the crises of representation and the possible causes of the region's recent turn to the left are more clearly understood from this complementary literature. The works on political representation analyzed here also provide an interesting complement to the international literature. We think that together they convey a forceful lesson. The challenges of institutionalizing better-quality democracies in the region are great and cannot be easily addressed or simply lumped together. Neither electoral nor institutional engineering, nor renewed leadership, nor the opening up of participation to new movements and local interests, seems to provide adequate fixes.

In short, the region's democratic regimes seem to gravitate toward two suboptimal scenarios: "competitive oligarchies" in which traditional elites stabilize the system but by restricting popular participation (in the face of increasing legitimacy challenges), or "participatory regimes" in which institutions lack the ability to structure political conflict, and authority either decomposes into multiple segmented political realities (as in Grompone's description of Peru) or becomes centralized under instances of mobilization by a charismatic figure, approaching, in some cases, a "participatory autocracy." Of course, this brief characterization echoes Dahl's (1971) classic categorization of political regimes in two dimensions: contestation and participation, with polyarchies being regimes that combine high levels of contestation and participation. Our reading of the works reviewed here suggests that high levels of contestation and participation are not simultaneously obtained in today's Latin American electoral democracies and that in these countries trade-offs might exist between both dimensions.

In conclusion, we believe that both subfields and approaches speak directly to the problems of development and democracy in the region, and also that they might also need to speak to each other more frequently than they currently do in mainstream analyses. In this last regard, we also think there is "an elephant in the room" which might provide a bridge between both literatures, as well as a better understanding of the region's long-standing problems with democracy and sustained socioeconomic development.

As Guillermo O'Donnell has forcefully argued elsewhere, the lack of legitimate (democratic) order in Latin America is intrinsically related to a lack of stateness and to the incompleteness and unevenness of state institutions in the region. Weak stateness also feeds back into uneven and unequal social structures and the incapacity of Latin American states to provide encompassing and good-quality public goods to their citizens. The analysis of stateness and state institutions, conceptualized in a broad sense to include their uneven characteristics and their relations to civil society and political elites, could provide an opportunity for reconciling the neoinstitutional mainstream (which usually assumes stateness as a given or alternatively sees state institutions in isolation) and its diasporas (which tend to conceptualize state structures as unified agents representing dominant interests) in an emergent paradigm for better understanding the challenges of democracy and development in Latin America. At least in our review, this type of analysis is still lacking in the region.

Notes

1. See, for example, Payne et al. (2007) and IADB (2006). For examples that contravene this general portrait, see Roberts (2002) and Kurtz (2004).
2. For instance, the multiple and very relevant works published in Spain. In particular, we do not cover the works published by Manuel Alcántara and his colleagues at the Universidad de Salamanca, which could be considered milestones in the study of political parties in the region. Language restrictions also leave Brazilian publications (whose insight and quality regarding the two literatures we address are also worth noting) out of this review.
3. In this regard, the multiple and excellent works published by international agencies (for example ECLAC regarding social policy or International IDEA regarding political parties) are also excluded. See, for example, ECLAC (2006).
4. Whereas the works published by CLACSO are close to the first extreme, works such as that recently published by Chasquetti are close to the second. See Chasquetti (2008).
5. Caroline Moser's contributions can be seen in "The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies," *World Development* 26(1): 1–19. While Moser provides interesting categories and taxonomies for thinking about the resources available to poor families, it is Katzman and others who have added to that perspective the idea of macrostructures of asset distribution and redistribution produced by the interaction of states, markets, and families/communities. Carlos Filgueira, Gabriel Kessler, Luis Beccaria, and Fernando Filgueira have been part of the paradigmatic construction of the AVEO approach, together with Katzman. At present many scholars in Latin America, especially in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, and Argentina, have been framing part or much of their research on versions and adaptations of the AVEO approach. The most important work by Esping Andersen which converges on and then feeds into much of the ongoing theoretical framework developed by Katzman and others is Andersen (1999).
6. The chapters and their authors are respectively: Argentina, Cristina Bayón and Gonzalo Saraví; Chile, Guillermo Wormald, Luz Cereceda, and Pamela Ugalde; Mexico, Georgina Rojas García; Uruguay, Carlos Filgueira. There is a final chapter by Brian Roberts that provides both closure and a useful theoretical discussion on social policies and models of development.
7. Colomer's contribution on party primaries and Roberts' analysis of partisan change in labor-mobilizing vs. oligarchic party systems are available in English. Abal Medina (h), in turn, presents a literature review that might be very useful for a Spanish-only audience, but which does not provide original insights into the broader international literature.
8. This also applies to Roberts' conclusion on the apparent greater resistance of oligarchic party systems.
9. This translates electoral enthusiasm into rapid frustration once the parties reach office, inducing a spiral of alternation, deception, and decreasing party system legitimacy.
10. Chapters by Almeida, Tatagiba, Chaves Teixeira and Albiquerque, Panfichi and Dammert, and Isunza.
11. Chapters by Panfichi and Dammert, Rajher, Pogliaghi, and Lascano.
12. Interestingly, in the volume by Cavarozzi and Abal Medina (h), the chapters by Tanaka and Davila and Botero link party system disruptions in Peru and Colombia to the implementation of these types of reform.
13. For an exercise on these lines, regarding participatory budgeting, see Goldfrank (2006).

References

Andersen, Esping (1999). *The Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chasquetti, Daniel (2008). *Democracia, presidencialismo y partidos políticos en América Latina: Evaluando la "difícil combinación."* Montevideo: CAUCE.
Coppedge, M. (1998). "The Dynamic Diversity of Latin American Party Systems," *Party Politics* 4(4): 547–68.
Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
ECLAC (2006). *Shaping the Future of Social Protection: Access, Financing and Solidarity*. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC.
Garretón, Manuel Antonio, Cavarozzi, Marcelo, Cleaves, Peter, Gerreffi, Gary, and Hartlyn, Jonathan (2003). *Latin America in the Twenty-First Century: Toward a New Sociopolitical Matrix*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
Goldfrank, Benjamin (2006). "Los procesos de 'presupuesto participativo' en América Latina: éxito, fracaso y cambio," *Revista de Ciencia Política* 26(2): 3–28.
IADB (Inter-American Development Bank) (2006). "The Politics of Policies: Economic and Social Progress in Latin America." Report. Washington, DC: IADB.
Kurtz, M.J. (2004). "The Dilemmas of Democracy in the Open Economy: Lessons from Latin America," *World Politics* 56(2): 262–302.
Luna, Juan Pablo, and Filgueira, Fernando (2009). "The Left Turns as Multiple Paradigmatic Crises," *Third World Quarterly* 30(2): 371–95.
Mainwaring, Scott (2006). "State Deficiencies, Party Competition, and Confidence in Democratic Representation in the Andes," in Scott Mainwaring, Ana Maria Bejarano, and Eduardo Pizarro (eds), *The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Mainwaring, S. and Scully, T. (1995). "Introduction: Party Systems in Latin America," in S. Mainwaring and T. Scully (eds), *Building Democratic Institutions*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Payne, J.M., Zovatto, D., and Díaz, M.M. (2007). *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America*. Washington, DC: IADB.
Roberts, K. (2002). "Social Inequalities without Class Cleavages in Latin America's Neoliberal Era," *Studies in Comparative Development* 36(4): 3–33.

Biographical Notes

Fernando Filgueira is an officer of the Social Division of ECLAC in Santiago de Chile. His main research area is social policy in the developing world. Address: Av. Dag Hammarskjöld 3477, Vitacura, Santiago de Chile, Chile [email: ffilgueirap@gmail.com].

Juan Pablo Luna is a member of the Faculty of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile at the Instituto de Ciencia Politíca in Santiago de Chile. His main research area is the political economy of party systems. Address: Avda. Vicuña Mackena 4860, Macul, Santiago de Chile, Chile [email: jpluna@icp.puc.cl].

Dedication: We dedicate this article to the memory of Pablo Alegre, a young Uruguayan scholar, a former student and colleague, and a close personal friend to both of us. Despite his premature death, Pablo's intellectual insight, personal kindness, and persistent commitment to the collective project of improving our societies by pursuing rigorous but also socially and politically relevant research will continue to inspire us.

Acknowledgments: Funding for this paper has been generously provided by FONDECYT Project 1090605.