


# Building from heterogeneity: the decomposition and recomposition of the working class viewed from the “popular economy” in Argentina

María Inés Fernández-Álvarez<sup>1</sup> 

© Springer Nature B.V. 2018

**Abstract** In this statement, I draw on the results of ongoing ethnographical research in Argentina with cooperatives of street vendors that are part of the Confederation of Workers of the Popular Economy (CTEP), an organization formed in 2011. The CTEP defines itself as a trade union whose aim is to represent the heterogeneous universe of wageless workers engaged in a diversity of socio-economic activities. These activities include, for example, waste-pickers, subcontracted textile workers, street vendors, farmers, artisans and car-keepers, and state-driven cooperative workers who perform tasks of maintenance of urban public infrastructure (squares, streets, and sidewalks) self-construction and maintenance of housing and other cooperatives derived from initially self-managed processes. It is a population, where very dissimilar trajectories, experiences, and characteristics prevail. I examine the efforts made by the CTEP to forge a unity from this diversity by using the notion of “popular economy” and how this notion came to be constructed as a political claim category that collectively encompasses heterogeneous work experiences and trajectories. Taking this idea as the starting point, I will discuss the way in which the process of political organization that the CTEP embodies can contribute to anthropological debates about the notion of class in the contemporary capitalism. I contend that this organization develops a process of collective construction that makes this heterogeneity a strength and a subject in its own right, rather than a means to the end of transforming workers in the popular economy to fully waged workers.

**Keywords** Working class · Popular economy · Argentina · Trade union · Social movements · Politics

---

✉ María Inés Fernández-Álvarez  
miferandezalvarez@gmail.com; mfernandezalvarez@conicet.gov.ar

<sup>1</sup> CONICET - Instituto de Ciencias Antropológicas, Fac. de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Puán 480 4to piso of. 409, Buenos Aires, Argentina

---

## **Building from heterogeneity: the decomposition and recomposition of the working class viewed from the “popular economy” in Argentina**

In this statement, I draw on the results of ongoing ethnographical research in Argentina with cooperatives of street vendors that are part of the Confederation of Workers of the Popular Economy (CTEP), an organization formed in 2011. The CTEP defines itself as a trade union whose aim is to represent the heterogeneous universe of wageless workers engaged in a diversity of socio-economic activities. These activities include, for example, waste-pickers, subcontracted textile workers, street vendors, farmers, artisans and car-keepers, and state-driven cooperative workers who perform tasks of maintenance of urban public infrastructure (squares, streets, and sidewalks) self-construction and maintenance of housing and other cooperatives derived from initially self-managed processes. It is a population, where very dissimilar trajectories, experiences, and characteristics prevail.

In the following pages, I examine the efforts made by the CTEP to forge a unity from this diversity by using the notion of “popular economy.” I will examine how popular economy came to be constructed as a political claim category that collectively encompasses heterogeneous work experiences and trajectories. I argue that heterogeneity is an expression of the way in which “the proletariat multiplies” to guarantee the reproduction process of capital accumulation, by “making, unmaking and remaking the working class” (Carbonella and Kasmir 2015). Taking this idea as the starting point, I will discuss the way in which the process of political organization that the CTEP embodies can contribute to anthropological debates about the notion of class in the contemporary capitalism. In the first part, I briefly present the social, economic, and political transformations produced in Argentina over the last three decades and their impact on the composition of the working class. It is essential to consider this process of transformation in order to understand the formation process of the CTEP in recent years. In the second part, I consider the relationship between the organizational forms that the CTEP uses and the population it intends to represent. I contend that this organization develops a process of collective construction that makes this heterogeneity a strength and a subject in its own right, rather than a means to the end of transforming workers in the popular economy to fully waged workers.

### **Background: the working class in light of the social, economic, and political transformations in Argentina’s recent history**

As I have already indicated, the CTEP is a relatively new organization. Its founding act took place in May 2011, when a group of social and political organizations that emerged at the height of the implementation of so-called neoliberal policies in Argentina in the 1990s arranged to meet at the Verdi theater in Buenos Aires with the objective of forming the Confederation of Workers of the Popular Economy (CTEP). Notable among the group of organizations participating in the meeting was the Movement of Excluded Workers (MTE) and also the Evita Movement. While the first was created in 2002 with the purpose of organizing the “cartoneros” (waste-pickers) and establishing their rights, the second was created in 2005 from the Movement of Unemployed Workers (MTD). The MTD was a grassroots organization that emerged from the southern area of Greater Buenos Aires that sought to organize and mobilize the “unemployed.”

The creation of both of these organizations can be understood in the context of an employers' offensive action involving economic, social and political restructuring which began in the mid-1970s and became more acute in the 1990s. The most dramatic consequences of this restructuring has been the deterioration of employment and income levels and a significant deepening of social inequalities and rising poverty levels (Beccaria and López 1996; Rofman 1997; Minujin 1997; Alatamir and Becarria 1999). The unemployment rate was 2.6% at the beginning of the 1980s, 7.5% 10 years later, and 17.5% in 1995 and peaked at 21.5% in 2002. Poverty levels show similar increases, rising from 29.8% in the 1980s to 57.8% in 2002 (INDEC-EPH 2002).

The military dictatorship of 1976–1983 that systematically repressed dissent and disappeared anybody who was thought to be its opponent produced a drastic modification of the Argentine social structure. As it has been pointed out by the local literature (Villareal 1985; Basualdo 2011; Schorr 2004), this modification is not explained strictly in economic terms; rather, it is necessary to weigh its effects of power on the working classes. In particular, it should be noted that, according to the *Never Again (Nunca Más)* report, the working class constituted the vast majority of those disappeared. Recent studies (Basualdo and et al. 2016) document the presence of clandestine detention centers in workplaces, particularly in large industrial companies such as Ford, Acindar, and Ingenio Ledesma.<sup>1</sup> This repression was accompanied by a decimation of the working class through a process of deindustrialization that involved closing more than 20 thousand factories (Schorr 2004). This resulted in a transfer of resources to other sectors of the economy, mainly the financial sector (Basualdo 2001), with the consequent deterioration of the income level and living conditions of the working class. As a whole, these studies highlight how the planned and systematic use of terror sought to silence the practices of confrontation and political activism and, in a broader sense, to discipline the working class that during the previous decades had managed to achieve a consolidated power through the trade union organizations historically linked to Peronism.

As Martín Schorr (2004) points out, the process of deindustrialization initiated by the military dictatorship was not homogenous. Some commercial and industrial sectors were successfully positioned to thrive, while small- and medium-sized companies as well as companies linked to the model of import substitution (such as metalworking and automotive production) were the retrenched. This process was accelerated through the merger of companies and the fact that firms were purchased by foreign capital. This benefited a set of local economic groups and foreign conglomerates as well as some transnational companies strongly linked to the financial sector. As Schorr further notes, the privatization process that developed in the 1990s deepened this trend, to which we must add that among the beneficiaries were the foreign banks who capitalized external debt securities. This process accelerated between 1998 and 2001, when the industry's participation in the Argentine economy was reduced to 15.4%, compared to the 30% it represented in the mid-1990s.

In sum, the restructuring process that took place between 1976 and 2001 follows the usual neoliberal package described by the Washington Consensus: financialization, denationalization, privatization, deregulation of the public sector, and a growing and accelerated process of economic concentration of wealth and deindustrialization (Basualdo 2001; Azpiazu 1998, 2003; Azpiazu et al. 2000; Schorr 2004; Thwaytes Rey 1999). Labor laws were drastically “reformed” to reduce costs and attract foreign capital. A key element of this transformation

<sup>1</sup> Acindar is the biggest steel factory, while Ingenio Ledesma is one of the most important sugar mills within the country.

process involved the casualization of labor and the promotion of flexible and deregulated forms of employment. Traditional Argentine labor legislation had been implemented in 1940s during the government of Peron in the context of import substitution industrialization. In effect, between 1944 and 1953, a series of laws as well as a social security system was introduced to regulate the relations of work for the individual and the collective. These reforms were the result of historical demands of the union organizations. At the level of individual work relations, the minimum wage and fixed-term contracts were regulated, annual paid vacations were established, the law of compensation for dismissal was sanctioned for all sectors of activity, and an annual complementary salary as well as a pension and retirement scheme were created. At the level of national labor relations, a collective bargaining system was extended to all branches of activity. This law mandated the centralization of bargaining and the intervention of the state; two elements that contributed to strengthening trade union organizations in Argentina. Finally, social security coverage was guaranteed by the state, establishing a retirement and pension system as well as family allowances.

The modifications introduced in the 1990s, however, drastically modified both individual and collective labor relations as well as the social security system (Marshall 1994, 1996). Among the most significant changes was the introduction of flexible modalities (in the forms of payment, schedules, periods, etc.). The government instituted a decentralization of collective bargaining at the company level and the limitation of the right to strike which was sanctioned by decree. Finally, the pension, retirement, and worker disability insurance system was privatized. The decade of the 1990s therefore represents a turning point in the history of the Argentine union movement leaving all worker organizations and trade unions broken or significantly weakened (Martucceli and Svampa 1997; Farinetti 1999; Palomino 2000).

The structural effects of these policies and their impact on Argentine working class organizations created a void in which categories like “excluded” and “unemployed” came to be important as productive spaces for the organization and rearticulation of the interests of sectors of the Argentine working class that were left out of the employment market. These were led by the so-called piqueteros movement. “Piqueteros” comes from “piquete” an expression that refers to a road block of streets or highways and is used to describe those who participate in movement of the unemployed. Those in the movement were particularly effective in raising the stakes on claims to the right to employment, housing, and other basic working class consumption areas that had been repressed by structural adjustment (Auyero 2003; Svampa and Pereyra 2003; Merklen 2005; Dinerstein 2010; Quirós 2011; Manzano 2013).

Ten years later, in an extremely different context marked by the implementation of a series of policies designed to promote the internal market, industrial reactivation, and redistribution of income, there was a significant social and economic recovery. Between 2001 and 2010, 4 million jobs were created, a fact that is extremely significant, taking into account that in the previous decade (1991–2001), this number only reached a total of 200,000 (Basualdo 2012). This recovery was accompanied by a reactivation of collective bargaining—paralyzed in the 1990s—and union action (Palomino 2011; Senén González 2011; Basualdo 2012; Abal Medina 2016). Union action nonetheless was limited due to the extensive dismantling of worker organizations under the dictatorship as well as the growing precariousness of labor and the internationalization of the economy which consolidated the presence of multinational companies (Basualdo 2012; Abal Medina 2016).

However, a significant percentage of the working class, far from being reabsorbed as part of the labor market through waged work, either swelled the ranks of the sector of the economy

defined as “informal” or went into outsourcing circuits accessing precarious jobs. To illustrate, it is worth mentioning that by the beginning of this decade, one in three waged workers was unregistered (Basualdo 2012). Also, some went on to be integrated into work cooperatives driven by social policies such as Argentina Trabaja (Argentine Works) with the goal of enhancing “social inclusion” by the promotion of employment creation (Hintze 2007; Grassi 2012). In effect, in many of my informants’ households, income from street vending is combined with income from the employment that resulted from these policies, as well as from waste-picking and precarious contracts (in particular, it is the case of some trades such as construction or textile). Other researchers have also noted the coexistence of many income sources in households (Manzano 2013; Quirós 2011; Cross 2015; Carenzo 2016).

The economic heterogeneity and social complexity of this population exposes the limits of the heuristic value of the notions of “unemployed,” “excluded,” or “informal.” It misses the way in which the life experiences of those who took part in these organizations challenged the limitations of categories which inevitably referred to the centrality of waged or formal work. In effect, those who formed part of these organizations as “unemployed” or “excluded” were part of a sector of the working class for whom formal work was not necessarily the norm, and the experience of precarity—as a way of life—has been a structural condition. This structural precarity is the case of the vast majority of populations in the so-called global south (de L’Estoile 2014; Munck 2013; Ferguson 2015). This did not mean that the tradition of industrial labor linked to forms of trade union organization of Peronist roots did not have a vital presence in the daily lives of people within these households (Svampa 2005).

## **Discussion: heterogenization as a challenge and drive for collective organization**

The idea of “popular economy,” then, was mobilized by the CTEP to design a trade union drawing on the working class condition of this population. In effect, for the CTEP, “popular economy” defines a political claim category which seeks to unify a heterogeneous population that has been described as “wageless lives” (Denning 2010) whose labor participation has been defined as “informal,” “precarious,” “externalized,” and “subsistence.” Rather than getting lost in an unsuccessful attempt to define the (dis)continuity of these populations with reference to the model of formal or waged work, the CTEP asserts the importance of its organization as an integral part of the working class, in need of permanent forms of political representation.

In fact, for the CTEP, the “popular economy” constitutes a sector of the working class “without labor rights or employers.” Having been left out of the labor market, these workers have had to “invent jobs to survive.” As such, popular economy implies practices of self-organization or self-management of labor—that, far from existing in “another economy”, are manifestations of a global market economy with which it has multiple touchpoints (Persico and Grabois 2015). This implies a differentiated positioning within a field that was shared with other grassroots organizations which act as a nucleus for cooperatives and associations where the idea of social economy or self-management becomes central. This is a positioning that must be understood within a context where the social economy and cooperative work have developed significantly in Argentina during Kirchner’s government (2003–2015) in that this population has become one of the main focuses of the state in its policy of job creation. From this point of view, “popular economy” can be conceptualized as an expression of the way in

which “the proletariat multiplies” to guarantee the reproduction process of capital accumulation “by making, unmaking and remaking the working class” (Carbonella and Kasmir 2015).

From this perspective, the CTEP puts two attributes of this population in the foreground, which forms the basis of how they build their demands and do politics. These attributes are, first, the recognition of this population as workers. The second is that, for this population, there is the absence of guarantees of rights to health insurance, pension contributions, sick-leave, work accidents, family allowances, etc. that characterize employment which is “formal” or “full-time, for a company.” Hence, taking “popular economy” as a category for making political claims, the CTEP’s transversal objective is to equate the rights of this sector with those of the rest of the working class and its main statement is therefore synthesized in the phrase “we are what is missing.” Therefore, the CTEP created a claim for rights in the sense that is given to this idea by the Lygia Sigaud (2005), who suggests that it is a demand that did not pre-exist as such when the organization was created.

This process of constructing rights for workers in the popular economy that is being carried out by the CTEP can be approached using the analysis proposed by James Ferguson (2015) for the case of South Africa. Ferguson suggests that such rights claims involve disputes for the “just” or “rightful share” of black and poor South Africans in the distribution of wealth. These redistributive demands are based on the conviction that (poor) citizens are the legitimate owners of a vast national wealth from which they have been deprived through historic processes of racialized dispossession. Following the author, this idea implies a significant change with respect to the ways of understanding and contesting monetary transfer policies, generally trapped in a conceptual opposition between the gift—social assistance seen as a kind of generosity—and the market—salary as exchange in the labor market.

In line with Ferguson’s perspective, in the case of the CTEP, this dispute over the forms of redistribution of wealth is based on an idea of participation whose principle of legitimacy is in turn based on the fact that those who are part of the popular economy are those who were forced to “invent a job to survive” as a consequence of a growing process of dispossession discussed earlier that has left them outside of the possibilities of waged employment. Moreover, in the case of street vendors, the growing process of gentrification of the cities<sup>2</sup> entails a threat to their ability to use public space for making a living. In this sense, it is a process of construction of rights that stresses the idea of exclusion but also surpasses it, noting that it is a population that has been systematically dispossessed of goods, resources, and rights.

Based on Alexandre Roig (2017) analysis of the importance of debt in understanding the dynamics of the popular economy, I argue that rather than excluded, the workers of the popular economy have become creditors in a situation where there is a historical debt that is owed to them. We can, from this perspective, interpret the demand that the CTEP makes for the implementation of a “Social Emergency, Food, and Popular Economy Organizations Law.” Among its proposals, the law considers the creation of a supplementary social wage, a “state allowance” for “informal” workers or those whose income is below the minimum wage (the equivalent to 510 USD). This direct cash transfer is considered as a “supplement” in addition

<sup>2</sup> This is especially relevant in the Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires, where a policy of transforming public space in places of order is aggressively applied. The key idea in these policies is to ensure “cleanliness” (Pacecca et al. 2017). This policy of cleanliness must be understood as part of the strong growth of the real estate market linked to “gentrification,” a phenomenon whose global reach extends to large Latin American cities. In the case of Buenos Aires, since the 1990s, this process of transformation has increased, beginning in its historical quarters, involves the growing displacement of people in working class neighborhoods, and proceeds in parallel with a process of concentration and expansion of the real estate market (Carman 2006; Girola 2006).

to the income derived from carrying out their activity, and it is defined as a “wage,” hence emphasizing the condition of workers of those who are part of the popular economy.<sup>3</sup>

The conceptualization of the “popular economy” that the CTEP elaborates involves collectively validating the heterogeneous life trajectories of people for whom waged work constitutes a recent past experience, who must coexist with those for whom it has never been one of the ways of making a living. This last idea is consistent with the observation made by Susana Narotzky and Niko Besnier (2014) that making a living includes forms of exchange or caring that are usually considered “non-economical” and involve collective systems to support life. The latter marks the experiences of street vendors, for example, whose life trajectories have a temporal depth that goes back at least two or three generations. In my fieldwork undertaken among vendors within a cooperative that carries out this activity in an intercity railway line of Buenos Aires, I show how such trajectories typically begin with work as a vendor at very young ages (6 or 7 years old) is characterized by a childhood of poverty, forcing them into child labor. These reconstructions of life trajectories marked by precarious living conditions also include recurrent references to situations of systematic violence that they had to face as children or young adults in order to work. In these cases, we can talk of trajectories marked by an experience of precarity that continues through generations (Fernández Alvarez 2017).

In contrast, the trajectories of a significant segment of those who are integrated into the CTEP trajectories have experienced precarity only recently in the one generation. This experience is embodied in the lives of workers who belong to a generation that, unlike their parents or grandparents, did not know salaried work, that “were left out of the system generationally” as CTEP activists often emphasize. This emphasis acknowledges precarious life experiences that contrast with a past in which their parents and grandparents had access to rights granted by formal employment. From this point of view, being left out of the system means being displaced from the formal labor market but inserted in the dynamics of indirect exploitation, more vulnerable living conditions, and a lack of rights.

As the leaders of the CTEP argue these mechanisms of indirect exploitation in the popular economy produce a surplus that is re-appropriated by the capital without a wage relationship (Persico and Grabois 2015). In the case of street vendors with whom I have been carrying out my field work, this form of indirect exploitation is materialized in the way that large national and multinational companies obtain profits from the massive sale of goods that otherwise would have to be discarded. This is the case, for example, of food products which will soon expire and cannot be sold in retail stores and can instead be sold more quickly in public transport. The same is true for goods that have been discontinued due being replaced by newer products: they can no longer be sold in shops but they find potential consumers on the street.

Here, my notion of indirect exploitation follows Verónica Gago and Sandro Mezzadra (2017), who propose expanding the idea of exploitation to incorporate areas that are concerned with the reproduction of life as well as the ways in which work is multiplied under forms defined as “informal” or “illegal.” This expanded notion takes into consideration other forms of exploitation which are exercised in parallel with the processes of accumulation through dispossession affecting a population which finds itself increasingly displaced from waged work. This perspective points the way toward understanding how capitalism violently progresses through the dynamics of dispossession that go beyond the sphere of production. In

---

<sup>3</sup> The law was passed on 14 Dec 2016; the final text can be found on: <http://www.senado.gov.ar/parlamentario/comisiones/verExp/3612.16/S/PL>. With the aim of applying this measure, the law includes the creation of a registry of popular economy workers.

particular, following these authors, the growing process of financialization of the economy implies an intensive penetration of finances in social life, in the ways of work and consumption—for example, through the increase of pay day loans. Moreover, by stating that the workers of the popular economy have been excluded but reintegrated under conditions of greater vulnerability and lack of rights, the leaders of the CTEP highlight that their work contributes to increasing the ways of accumulation of capital through these forms of indirect exploitation. In contrast, the notion of informal work, exclusion, and unemployment makes these processes of exploitation invisible. Coming back to the case of street vendors, it is a population which participates in commercial circuits that some authors have called “globalization from below” (Lins-Riberiro 2006) whose work contributes to increasing the profits of large transnational companies as I mentioned above.

In sum, this conceptualization of popular economy as a political claim category is grounded in the idea of a sector of the working class that has been dispossessed of a set of rights that is related to work. In Argentina, the relationship between rights and work is the foundation of what Daniel James (1990) calls “social citizenship” which developed under the period of Peronism (1944–1955). According to James, this overlap between work and citizenship is emphasized in Peronist political rhetoric so that “citizenship could no longer be defined simply in terms of individual rights and relations within the political society, but rather redefined within the economic and social sphere of civil society” (James 1990: p. 30). Since the 1940s, therefore, the expansion of social security and social rights became the elements that legitimized the accumulation model in Argentina (Grassi et al. 1994; Barbieto et al. 1998; Neffa 1998). This implied incorporating of a set of protections related to waged work such as stability, retirement, and a series of rights related to the status of “worker” (health, education, fair salary, etc.). In this context, the category of formal worker became the key subject of rights conceived as universal (Grassi et al. 1994).

In terms of the life experience of the so-called popular sectors, this process shaped the ways of making a living and the expectations for the future not only in material terms but also in emotional, affective, and moral terms. Thus, work as a basis for a dignified life (including the access to rights) has been constituting a language that questions the ways of projecting into the future and ways of political construction. In the process of collective construction that the CTEP formulates, waged labor acts as a horizon from which subjectivities are projected less as a something to be transformed (from being workers in the popular economy to becoming waged workers) and more as a basis for the production and struggle for collective rights. In other words, if the creation of a demand for rights for the workers of the “popular economy” takes on board an idea of waged labor, at the same time, it challenges this construction by asserting its exceptional character. From this point of view, the CTEP initiates a process of political experimentation that, in keeping with a principle of multiplicity of the working class in the sense indicated by Kasmir and Carbonella (2008), rests on the necessarily heterogeneous character of the popular economy accepting the challenge of acting within the diversity that lies within it, and declaring the urgency of a trade union representation.

Stating the need to go beyond inherited class maps associated with the image of the white and male fordist industrial worker (Kasmir and Carbonella 2008; Kalb 2015), many researchers are engaged in the ethnographic studies which conceptualize the heterogeneous transformations of contemporary capitalism and its changing social, moral, and spatial articulations. Consequently, they emphasize the need to generate analytical categories that reflect their dynamism, incorporating for example spatial articulations (Morell 2015; Mollona 2009) or aspects of consumption and social reproduction (Narotzky 2015; Collins 2012). These



studies highlight the need to propose an approach to the notion of class as a relational category and the ways in which it is organized by weighing the multiplicities of work (Kasmir and Carbonella 2008; Denning 2010; Collins 2012; Barchiesi 2012; Kalb 2014, 2015; Lazar 2017). In line with these studies, my reflection here proposes an alternative reading of the way in which the process of heterogenization of the working class is usually understood as an obstacle to collective organization. I suggest that this multiplicity can instead be thought of as a potentiality. I suggest that the process of political construction carried out by the CTEP can be understood in these terms, as a process which takes into account how the multiplicity of the working class takes shape in contemporary capitalism, to make it less of an obstacle and more into an attribute for collective organization, challenging the old dichotomies of “the south/global north,” “formal/informal,” but also—and would say above all—“the stable working class/poor” “union/social movement”.

The scope of this process depends on a multiplicity of elements, some closely linked to political circumstances and others to more structural determinants such as to the composition and social relations of production of the working class in contemporary capitalism. In relation to the former, it is worth highlighting the growing exacerbation of repressive practices against social protest since Mauricio Macri took office as president in December 2015. These practices must be read in the context of the implementation of a drastic adjustment policy that included increases in utility rates, the dismantling of diverse areas of government, and massive job-cuts and cuts on social programs intended for vulnerable populations. Given this situation, the daily challenges faced by organizations such as the CTEP grow, since they face not only the increase in unemployment but also the deterioration of the living conditions of this population in issues related to housing, health, education, security, etc. and the increase of social inequality.

As for the latter, it is important to take into account the challenges involved in politically organizing a sector that has traditionally been defined as outside of spaces of union representation. This involves creating forms of organization that seek to be (a) *massive*, through including workers that are difficult to fit in the waged system; (b) *institutional*, creating continuity and durability as a tool of negotiation with the State; and (c) *integrated*, seeking to work jointly with the “organized labor movement.” The structure of the CTEP as a union involves continuity and rupture. Continuity, because it is part of an organizational tradition with centralized unionism linked to the Peronist national-popular tradition. Expressions such as “the CGT of the excluded” which are used to define the CTEP by some of its leaders can be read as a synthesis of this idea.<sup>4</sup> Rupture, in the sense of discontinuity, because it is stressed in daily practice where the territorial logics—linked in a broad sense to the reproduction of life, the improvement of neighborhoods, the support of soup kitchens, etc.—take on centrality as new foundations in the construction of a union organization. In its rhetoric to refer to the fragmentation of the working class, the CTEP appeals to three metaphors that would represent those goods which each fragment can consume according to their income, distinguishing between “the cream,” “the milk,” and “the water.” This idea brings us back to the starting point of this statement, inviting us to open a question about the possibilities and limits of articulation between these sectors, the forms of solidarity that can be built and the challenges in terms that this implies.

<sup>4</sup> Source: <http://www.resumenlatinoamericano.org/2015/02/08/argentina-que-es-la-ctep/>

**Acknowledgements** I thank Winnie Lem and Anthony Marcus for their careful review and valuable suggestions based on the original version of my text.

## References

- Abal Medina, Paula. 2016. Los trabajadores y sus organizaciones durante los gobiernos kirchneristas. *Revista Nueva Sociedad* 264: 72–86.
- Alatamir, Oscar and Becarria, Luis. 1999. El mercado de trabajo bajo el nuevo régimen económico en Argentina. Serie Reformas económicas N° 28 CEPAL.
- Auyero, Javier. 2003. *Contentious lives: two Argentine women, two protests and the quest for recognition*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Azpiazu, Daniel. 1998. *La concentración de la industria Argentina a mediados de los años 90'*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Azpiazu, Daniel. 2003. *Las privatizaciones en la Argentina. Diagnóstico y propuestas para una mayor equidad social*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila/CIEPP/OSDE.
- Azpiazu, Daniel, Eduardo Basualdo, and Martin Schorr. 2000. *La reestructuración y el redimensionamiento de la producción industrial argentina durante las últimas décadas*. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Estudios y Formación de la Central de Trabajadores Argentinos.
- Barbieto, Alberto, Lo Vuolo, and Ruben. 1998. *La nueva oscuridad de la política social. Del Estado populista al neoconservador*. Barcelona: UNICEF/CIEPP/LOZADA.
- Barchiesi, Franco. 2012. Precarity as capture: a conceptual deconstruction of the worker-slave analogy. *UniNomade* October 10, 2012. <http://www.uninomade.org/precariyas-capture/> Accessed 26 January 2018.
- Basualdo, Eduardo. 2001. *Sistema político y modelo de acumulación en la Argentina. Notas sobre el transformismo argentino durante la valorización financiera (1976–2001)*. Buenos Aires: FLACSO/ Universidad Nacional de Quilmes/IDEP.
- Basualdo, Victoria. 2012. Avances y desafíos de la clase trabajadora en la Argentina de la posconvertibilidad. *Derechos Humanos en Argentina Informe 2012*, pp. 429–460.
- Basualdo, Victoria; et. al. 2016. Responsabilidad empresarial en delitos de lesa humanidad: represión a trabajadores en el terrorismo de estado Tomo I, Posadas: Editorial del Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos de la Nación.
- Beccaria, Luis, and Nestor López. 1996. *Sin Trabajo. Las características del empleo y sus efectos en la sociedad Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Unicef/Losada.
- Carbonella, August, and Sharryn Kasmir. 2015. Dispossession, disorganization and the anthropology of labor. In *Anthropologies of class: power, practice and inequality*, ed. James Carrier and Don Kalb, 41–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carenzo, Sebastián. 2016. Waste classification as a craft under construction: the worker's experience at Buenos Aires "social classification plants". *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 21: 276–293.
- Carman, María. 2006. *Las trampas de la Cultura. Los "intrusos" y los nuevos usos del barrio de Gardel*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Collins, Jane. 2012. Theorizing Wisconsin's 2011 protests: community-based unionism confronts accumulation by dispossession. *American Ethnologist* 39 (1): 6–20.
- Cross, Cross. 2015. Desmercantilizando el concepto de trabajo: experiencias laborales en una planta social de clasificación de residuos. *Runa. Archivo para las Ciencias del Hombre* 36 (2): 93–109.
- de L'Estoile, Benoît. 2014. Money is good, but a friend is better. Uncertainty, orientation to the future, and "the economy". *Current Anthropology* 55 (S9): 62–73.
- Denning, Michael. 2010. Vida sin salario. *New Left Review* 66: 77–94.
- Dinerstein, Cecilia. 2010. Autonomy in Latin America, between resistance and integration: echoes from the Piqueteros experience. *Community Development Journal* 45 (3): 356–366.
- Farinetti, Mariana. 1999. ¿Qué queda del 'movimiento obrero'? Las formas del reclamo laboral en la nueva democracia argentina. *Trabajo y Sociedad*. 1 (1), junio-septiembre <http://www.unse.edu.ar/trabajosociedad/Zmarina.htm> Accessed 15 January 2018.
- Ferguson, James. 2015. *Give a man a fish. Reflections on the new politics of distribution*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Fernández Álvarez, María Inés. 2017. "Having a name of one's own, being part of history": temporalities of precarity and political subjectivities of popular economy workers in Argentina. Paper Presented at the Labour Politics in an Age of Precarity Workshop, 21–22 April 2017, Cambridge.

- Gago, Verónica, and Sandro Mezzadra. 2017. A critique of the extractive operations of capital: toward an expanded concept of extractivism. *Rethinking Marxism*. 29 (4): 574–591.
- Girola, María Florencia. 2006. Procesos de transformación urbana en la Región Metropolitana de Buenos Aires: una mirada sobre el avance de la ciudad-negocio. *Intersecciones Antropológicas*. 7: 361–374.
- Grassi, Estela. 2012. Política sociolaboral en la Argentina contemporánea. Alcances, novedades y salvedades. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*. 135-136: 185–198.
- Grassi, Estela, Susana Hintze, and María Rosa Neufeld. 1994. *Políticas sociales, crisis y ajuste estructural*. Buenos Aires: Espacio.
- Hintze, Susana. 2007. *Políticas sociales argentinas en el cambio de siglo. Conjeturas sobre lo posible*. Buenos Aires: Espacio Editorial.
- James, Daniel. 1990. *Resistencia e integración. El peronismo y la clase trabajadora argentina 1946–1976*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.
- Kalb, Don. 2014. Class. In *A companion to urban anthropology*, ed. Donald Nonini, 157–176. Chichester: Wiley & Sons.
- Kalb, Don. 2015. Introduction: class and the new anthropological holism. In *Anthropologies of class: power, practice and inequality*, ed. James Carrier and Don Kalb, 1–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasmir, Sharrin, and Agust Carbonella. 2008. Dispossession and the anthropology of labor. *Critique of Anthropology* 28 (5): 5–25.
- Lazar, Sian. 2017. *The social life of politics: ethics, kinship and union activism in Argentina*. Sandford: Standford Univesity Press.
- Lins-Ribeiro, Gustavo. 2006. Economic globalization from bellow. *Etnográfica* X (2): 233–249.
- Manzano, Virginia. 2013. *La política en movimiento. Movilizaciones colectivas y políticas estatales en la vida del Gran Buenos Aires*. Rosario: Prohistoria Ed.
- Marshall, Adriana. 1994. Les conséquences économiques de la protection juridique des travailleurs en Amérique Latine. *Revue Internationale du Travail* 133 (1): 59–57.
- Marshall, Adriana. 1996. Protección del empleo en América Latina: las reformas de los años 1990 y sus efectos en el mercado de trabajo. *Estudios del Trabajo* 11: 3–28.
- Martucceli, Danilo, and Maristela Svampa. 1997. *La plaza vacía. Las transformaciones del peronismo*. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Merklen, Denis. 2005. *Pobres Ciudadanos: Las clases populares en la era democrática 1983–2003*. Buenos Aires: Gorla.
- Minujin, Alberto. 1997. *Cuesta abajo. Los nuevos pobres: efectos de la crisis en la sociedad Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Mollona, Massimiliano. 2009. General introduction. In *Industrial work and life. An anthropological reader*, ed. Massimiliano Mollona, Geert De Neve, and Jonathan Parry, 11–28. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Morell, Marc. 2015. When space draws the line on class. In *Anthropologies of class: power, practice and inequality*, ed. James Carrier and Don Kalb, 102–117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munck, Rolando. 2013. The precariat: a view from the south. *Third World Quarterly* 34 (5): 747–762.
- Narotzky, Susana. 2015. The organic intellectual and the production of class in Spain. In *Anthropologies of class: power, practice and inequality*, ed. James Carrier and Don Kalb, 53–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narotzky, Susana, and Niko Besnier. 2014. Crisis, value, and hope: rethinking the economy. *Current Anthropology* 55 (S9): 4–16.
- Neffa, Julio. 1998. *Modos de regulación, regímenes de acumulación y sus crisis en Argentina (1880–1996)*. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.
- Pacecca, María Inés, Brenda Canelo, and Sofía Belcic. 2017. Culpar a los negros y a los pobres. Los “manteros” senegaleses ante los allanamientos en el barrio de Once. In *Territorios de control policial. Gestión de ilegalismos en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires*, eds. María Victoria Pita and María Inés Pacecca, 199–220. Buenos Aires: Ed. Fac. de Filosofía y Letras, UBA.
- Palomino, Héctor. 2000. Los sindicatos en la Argentina contemporánea. *Revista Nueva Sociedad* 169: 121–134.
- Palomino, Héctor. 2011. El sindicalismo frente a los cambios en el escenario regional. Tendencias de cambio de los sindicatos en Argentina. In *Todo aquel fulgor. La política argentina después del neoliberalismo*, coord. ed. Germán Pérez, Oscar Aelo, and Gustavo Salerno. Buenos Aires: Nueva Trilce.
- Persico, Emilio, and Juan Grabois. 2015. *Trabajo y organización en la economía popular*. Buenos Aires: CTEP-Asociación Civil de los Trabajadores de la Economía Popular.
- Quirós, Julieta. 2011. *El porqué de los que van. Peronistas y piqueteros en el Gran Buenos Aires (una antropología de la política vivida)*. Buenos Aires: Antropofagia.
- Rofman, Alejandro. 1997. *Convertibilidad y desocupación en la Argentina de los noventa. Análisis de una relación inseparable*. Buenos Aires: CEUR-UBA.

- 
- Roig, Alexandre. 2017. Financiarización y derechos de los trabajadores de la economía popular. In *Economía popular. Los desafíos del trabajo sin patron*, ed. Emilio Persico, Fernando Navarro, Ariel Geandet, Alexandre Roig, and Pablo Chena, 87–102. Buenos Aires: Colihue.
- Schorr, Martón. 2004. *Industria y nación. Poder económico, neoliberalismo y alternativas de reindustrialización en la Argentina contemporánea*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa.
- Senén González, C. 2011. La revitalización sindical en Argentina durante los Kirchner. *Trabajo y Sindicatos Durante los Gobiernos de Izquierda en América Latina* 5 (8): 39–64.
- Sigaud, Lygia. 2005. As condições de possibilidade das ocupações de terra. *Tempo Social* 17 (1): 255–280.
- Svampa, Maristella. 2005. *La sociedad excluyente. La Argentina bajo el signo del neoliberalismo*. Buenos Aires: Taurus.
- Svampa, Maristella, and Sebastián Pereyra. 2003. *Entre la ruta y el barrio. La experiencia de las organizaciones piqueteras*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Thwaytes Rey, Mabel. 1999. Estado y sociedad. Ajuste estructural y reforma del estado en la Argentina de los '90. *Revista Realidad Económica* 160: 76–109.
- Villareal, Juan. 1985. Los hilos sociales del poder. In *Crisis de la dictadura argentina : política económica y cambio social, 1976–1883*, ed. Eduardo Jozami. Mexico: Siglo XXI.