

Transnational labor action in Latin America: from the struggle against the Free Trade Area of the Americas to the return of labor relations

Bruno Dobrusin,

CEIL-CONICET,

Saavedra 15, oficina 502

CP C1083ACA

Buenos Aires, Argentina

Phone: [+54 11 4952-7440](tel:+541149527440)

bdobrusin@gmail.com

Abstract

Neoliberalism was the hegemonic political and economic model in Latin America during the 1990s. The promotion of a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) was a fundamental policy to extend neoliberal policies and foreign influence throughout the region. In a momentum built throughout that decade and into the 2000s, the trade union movement joined forces with social movements to create a counterhegemonic force using traditional and novel power resources. This alliance managed to defeat the FTAA and was a central force in supporting new center-left administrations throughout the region. The developments since that historic event have shown the relevance of political contexts and strategic outlooks for the long-term success in maintaining, or failing to maintain, such kinds of alliances.

Keywords: Labor, Latin America, Transnational, Solidarity

Introduction

The rapid advancement of neoliberalism is a driving force behind the restructuring of labor relations. The conventional trade union practices based on industrial relations that included predominantly national actors (union, business, and governments) have been significantly altered by the transnationalization of capital and profound changes in the configuration of labor markets. In response to this situation, or as a consequence of it, labor movements have taken two broadly different roads: defending the few unionized jobs while negotiating with capital, or extending the organizing capacities of unions beyond traditional economic sectors and forming broader alliances in society. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the actions of trade unions in Latin America during the struggle against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). Specifically, the analysis

focuses on cross-border (transnational) and cross-sectoral alliances within each country and at regional level.

Trade unions in Latin America have been at the forefront of creating alliances with social movements, especially on issues regarding regional integration processes. However, this strategy is a complex and sometimes contradictory one. The focus here is on the campaign against the FTAA and the role of trade unions, engaging with social movements and governments, in resisting the most ambitious neoliberal policy of the past decade. How can the success of transnational anti-FTAA campaigns be explained? What took place afterwards, leading to the demise of regional mobilization? Did the union movement renationalize after the FTAA was defeated? These are the main questions addressed in this paper with the aim of contributing to the much-needed discussion on trade unions as central actors in resisting neoliberal globalization, and their engagement with the political class, in a complex relationship of autonomy and dependence. The Latin American case reviewed here represents an example of the need to utilize alliances as a mode of mobilizing support, as was the case in the anti-FTAA struggle, and also an example of the contradictory demobilization that can take place when alliances develop into a form of dependency.

In Latin America, neoliberal policies were implemented from the early 1970s, with the Pinochet dictatorship beginning in 1973 as a central originating actor in this process. Soon, governments throughout the region began implementing policies of structural adjustment, reconfiguring capital–labor relations (in favor of the former) as one of its main policies. These policies that began during most of the military governments deepened in the late 1980s and 1990s under democratic regimes. Labor was one of the actors most affected by these policies, especially in those countries in which the labor movement had played a significant role in the past – as is the case for Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. It is important to note that, as a general observation for the region, labor unions were not widespread, and the majority of the working-class remained outside such organizations. Rural workers, informal workers, women, and indigenous people were among the non-unionized sectors in these societies. The lack of union presence did not mean, however, a lack of organization. A relevant aspect referred in this paper is the connection of unions with social movements organizing marginalized sectors. Trade unions were relevant political actors in those countries where industrial activity was relatively important and the population was concentrated in urban areas.ⁱ The neoliberal period decimated unions especially in those countries where they enjoyed political and social relevance.

In view of this situation, it was the creation of new trade unions that brought into question the role of organized labor in a context of state retrenchment and spreading informalization of labor. These new unions began organizing non-unionized sectors as well as creating alliances with social

movements that represented people in marginalized communities. These alliances reshaped the ways in which workers perceived themselves as allies in broader societal contexts, especially in view of threats by transnational capital. Alliances between unions, social movements, and community organizations have become more commonplace in recent years,ⁱⁱ showing the resilience of trade unions in times of crisis and the necessity to build cross-sectoral alliances to improve power relations, but such alliances are also a tool to avoid the demise of trade unions as an organizing force.

The case analyzed here is the construction of a resistance alliance against one of the most ambitious projects attempted by transnational capital: the Free Trade Area of the Americas. This project, led by the United States and its main corporations, received general support from the neoliberal administrations in the 1990s but was finally rejected by a new wave of progressive governments in 2005. A relevant actor in the resistance to this trade area was the trade union movement, which organized together with social movements and non-governmental organizations a broad alliance against the FTAA, known as the Hemispheric Social Alliance (HSA). The dynamics of this broad alliance of unions and social movements is a central topic of discussion in this paper. Further, the analysis also includes the complex relations with different administrations, some of which became relevant allies of the struggle against this massive free trade project. A main aim in this analysis is to highlight that the construction of a transnational campaign was only possible with the proliferation of local struggles in each country and region against neoliberal policies. In this sense, the intention is to connect how the local struggles contributed in carrying agency and creating meaning through “their complex and intricate relations with each other”.ⁱⁱⁱ

The campaign against the FTAA is a useful domain in which to consider the possibilities, and challenges, for labor movements to ally with sectors beyond their conventional spaces. The capacity of unions to reformulate policies, and construct alliances, is considered here within the debates regarding power resources provided by authors such as Silver,^{iv} Wright,^v Erne,^{vi} and Levesque and Murray.^{vii} The arguments presented by Silver and Wright regarding unions’ structural and associational powers are valuable to explore workplace-related resources, but the resources presented by Erne^{viii} regarding political mobilization power and exchange power are necessary here to understand the political dynamics of the mobilizations around the campaign against the FTAA. The use of the strategic triangle^{ix} of power resources – proactivity, internal democracy, and external solidarity – can explain the dynamics of successful campaigns focused on the specific local level. Complementing these resources, the works of Erne^x – with the category of *political mobilization* resources – and Boron^{xi} – who underlines the central element of strategy in social movement–union mobilization – help explain why the attempts to broaden the struggle fell short under given

circumstances because of the changing relationships with political parties and governments. In other words, the analysis of power resources partially explains the alliance between social movements and unions, but it is the relationship with governments – or political parties in government – explained through political mobilization and strategic vision that is a defining element when the outcomes are being analyzed. In the case in this paper, the winding relationship between the different alliances and governments plays an important role, not the sole one, in the moments of success – when the FTAA was indeed challenged – and also in the leading pitfalls of popular mobilization.

The use of these novel resources contributed to the formation of what some have discussed as 'new' labor internationalism,^{xii} meaning the reorganization of union actions internationally, promoting an alliance-based, democratic, and militant strategy for transnational actions. The novelty in this form of internationalism resides, briefly, in “an opening attitude towards social movements and community groups, and consequently, by the increasing role of the politics of alliances and coalitions”.^{xiii} In spite of the confrontation with the ‘old’ forms of international unionism, both forms might actually be explored in the same action, as in the case presented by Tattersall regarding the Service Employees International Union (SEIU).^{xiv} In the case of the anti-FTAA campaign, the new forms of union internationalism predominate not only because the alliance tackled a macro issue like free trade, but also because the main unions behind the alliance were already internally oriented towards social movement unionism.

The analysis in this paper is based on a research process that included nine interviews with relevant actors in the process from the trade unions, social movements, and governments, as well as on documents produced by the trade unions and the existing academic literature. The interviews were carried out in a semi-structured form to allow for a more flexible conversation that permitted the actors to expand on specific ideas. The paper is also grounded on informal conversations with critical actors who interacted with the author at different junctures in recent years. It is also relevant to mention that the article is based on personal observations of the author, a member of the Central de Trabajadores de la Argentina (CTA: Argentine Workers’ Confederation) and a contributor to the formulation of its international policy. This implies that the object of study is also an integral element in the author's practical – as opposed to observational and theoretical – experience with trade unions. This, following Bourdieu's reflective sociology,^{xv} means that the subjectivity of the author's participation in one of the organizations of study has an impact on the conclusions reached. This paper's conclusions are closely related to a process of internal reflection within the CTA regarding the mobilization against the FTAA and also regarding its relationship with

the government. Even though the discussion includes other trade unions, the main debate features those that had an active role in the process, mainly the CUT in Brazil, the CTA in Argentina, and the PIT-CNT in Uruguay. This implies that unions that were not an integral part of the movement – and its development – are not incorporated into this analysis, therefore limiting the overall scope of impact. Further research needs to be conducted regarding the perspective of those unions – considered generally as more conservative – that represent a significant size of organized workers but who are not disposed toward alliances with social movements as a mode of action.

Changing labor realities and subjectivities

Labor reform is one of the pillars of neoliberal restructuring, and in Latin America there was no exception to this rule. Throughout the region, the neoliberal administrations beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s promoted new labor legislation that made hiring and firing more flexible, diminished trade unions' participation in the workplace, and pushed the state to side with capital. As outlined by De la Garza Toledo,^{xvi} the last three decades previous to the shift away from neoliberal policymaking produced two significant changes: a reduced share of manufacturing and especially agriculture in overall employment (as a regional trend)^{xvii}; and the predominance of finance as the greatest wealth generator in an economy. The cases of the Maquila industries in Central America and Mexico are examples of places where industrial production increased during the 1990s, but under anti-union labor legislation.^{xviii} The expansion of informalization throughout the region is the most visible reality in the decline of trade unions as relevant actors. In 1992, informal employment averaged 42.8%, a figure that rose to 46.4% in 1999.^{xix}

The process of undermining workers' rights was particularly important in those countries that historically had a strong labor movement – especially Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil.^{xx} The attack on unions came right after the labor movement had been a significant factor in challenging military dictatorships and contributing to their fall in the mid-1980s.^{xxi} The trade unions that had close links with the ruling parties tried to negotiate their way through the period of structural adjustment, and many converted into “trade union companies,” allied with capital, saving the union at the expenses of workers.^{xxii} As detailed by Etchemendy,^{xxiii} with central reference to Argentina, the corporatist unions “had a major goal concerning the liberalized economy: the preservation of non-competitive corporatist institutions in the new order”.^{xxiv} This led several unions, including and especially those in state-owned sectors, to participate in the process of privatization, receiving in exchange the continued monopoly of representation in the workplace, participation with shares in the new companies, and the continuation of subsidies to the union-run healthcare system – although with new legislation –, a fundamental source of power and resources.^{xxv} Similar negotiations took

place in those countries with strong corporatist union systems, like Mexico and Brazil.^{xxvi} A central problem with this system, as mentioned by De Gennaro,^{xxvii} was that, in exchange for maintaining union power, labor leaders accepted legislative reforms that liberalized labor markets, and in the case of the publicly owned enterprises this led to thousands of unemployed workers. In this way, the corporatist trade unions maintained their structures and leadership at the expense of millions of workers affected by precarious working conditions, unemployment, and poverty.

In an analysis based on the situation in Argentina, but that can be extended to the realities of other labor movements in the region, Novick^{xxviii} details how the reforms in labor laws and practices affected workers' identities and their identification with trade unions. Novick outlines two changes in particular: the weakening of collective bargaining and the deregulation of social insurance schemes.^{xxix} By forcing changes in the structure of collective bargaining – and in real terms discouraging or prohibiting it – the trade unions lost the most powerful tool that justified their representation. Collective bargaining was the main relationship between companies and trade unions, but also between the union leaders and their membership. By losing the capacity to negotiate collective agreements, trade unions lost workers' identification with the structure, and a crisis of representation ensued. Furthermore, the flexibilization of the union-run healthcare system also led to loosening the links between union and members, since members' daily lives no longer functioned through the unions. The trade unions thus lost the capacity to participate in negotiations and in workers' lives. The combination of decreasing capacity to negotiate with capital and the lack of union rights in the enlarging informal economy produced a crisis in trade unions throughout the region.

The crisis generated by neoliberal reform produced two main realities for the trade union movement: for those unions that could negotiate with the party in government, there was the extension of corporatist unionism^{xxx} in which the survival of the union (and its leadership) was more important than improving workers' conditions; for those workers expelled to the margins, into informality, and the trade unions with a class-based identity, confrontation with the administration and reorganization of the labor movement was the common reaction. Among the unions in the former group, the most representative are the CMT in Mexico, CGT in Argentina, and Forza Sindical in Brazil. In the latter group, we can identify, among others, CUT in Colombia, CUT in Brazil, CTA in Argentina, and PIT-CNT in Uruguay. The latter unions were the leading ones in extending alliances with social movements at local level, and later on extending transnational action as a fundamental factor in confronting the neoliberal regime. These alliances focused mainly on social movements, but in some cases they also had a direct relationship with political parties from the left. This was especially the case for CUT Brazil and its historic link with the Workers' Party

(PT) and the PIT-CNT in Uruguay connected to the Frente Amplio coalition.

The crisis in the trade union movement also led to the emergence of social movements throughout the region, some of which already existed and were leading struggles – especially in rural areas where trade unions are historically weak – and some of which rose from the new identities generated by neoliberal restructuring. As outlined by De la Garza Toledo,^{xxxii} neoliberalism produces the decline of a subject (the worker identified with the workplace) while other new subjects emerge. For these new subjects, the struggle against the economic system remains, but their identity might not be shaped by labor organizations or labor relations, since dimensions such as the community and the territory become much more important in defining their subjective reality. For the trade unions, the re-emergence of territorial identities did not signify their disappearance, but rather a critical response to a form, both in material and symbolic terms, of trade unionism that no longer predominated and therefore had to change.^{xxxiii}

The changes in trade unions, as suggested by Garcia Linera, began taking place in different forms in the region, according to the specific characteristics of each country. The central goal was to link production (where unions originated) with society (where workers struggle).^{xxxiiii} This is a challenge that implicates reflecting on the relationship between work and territory (community). Trade unions began questioning workers' factory-based identity, instead seeing a situation in which a worker produces a good or service, but also has problems with education, healthcare, his/her environmental context, and community violence, among others.^{xxxiv} The articulation of production-related demands with those issues that workers dealt with outside the workplace is the central object of the restructuring of labor movements and allied these with social organizations struggling with those other aspects.

The organizations extending alliances were those with a history of confrontation with the administrations in the 1980s and 1990s – such as the CUT in Brazil, the PIT-CNT in Uruguay, the CGTP in Peru, and the COB in Bolivia – and the new unions created out of the demise of the 'business' trade unions – the most significant being the CUT Colombia and the CTA in Argentina. The CUT in Brazil was born out of the struggle for democracy in the 1980s, with a close alliance with the liberation theology churches and the Landless Workers' Movement (MST) which originated at around the same time.^{xxxv} Similarly, in Uruguay, the unification of the PIT and the CNT broadened the space for alliances with social movements such as the cooperatives and housing movements, but also non-governmental organizations.^{xxxvi} The CUT in Colombia as a relatively new actor, created during the mid-1980s to combat neoliberal reforms, has also led the way in terms of broadening alliances with social movements and peasant organizations.^{xxxvii} In Bolivia, the class-based COB was a leading actor in the broad social alliance that created the so-called water and gas

wars^{xxxviii} that brought down neoliberal governments and eventually led to the rise of Evo Morales to power.

The reorganization of struggles from a vertical articulation – as a trade union is in capital–labor relations – to one that incorporates different sets of demands and therefore is more horizontal in nature – because of the diversity of actors – created what Garcia Linera^{xxxix} calls the “multitude form”,^{xl} defined as “a block of collective action that articulates autonomous organized structures of subaltern classes around discursive and symbolic constructions of hegemony.” This multitude is characterized by both unified and flexible modes of territorial organization; broader demands; and the proposal of proactive demands.^{xli} This multitude can take the form of a single, but broad, organization, or of a set of organizations targeting a specific challenge. In contrast to the concept popularized by Hardt and Negri^{xlii} in that it takes the multitude as a “bloc of collective action that articulates autonomous organized structures of subaltern classes”,^{xliii} this is clearly identified in different political moments of Bolivia’s recent history under neoliberalism. It emphasizes the sum of collective identities, rather than subjective individual ones, as the main base for the production of a counterhegemonic force.

The novelty in recent years is that trade unions, a relatively self-centered historical actor, began to join different forms of 'multitudes' throughout the region. Important as those experiences are, their success – if it is possible to measure it – depended on the use of power resources to mobilize the bases, through a proactive agenda, internal democracy, and external solidarity, but also on the capacity to relate to political movements, or even directly participate in them. In the case of Bolivia, Garcia Linera asserts that the multitude form also intervened in the political system, eventually leading to the government of Evo Morales.^{xliv}

The relevant aspect to note is that the trade unions mentioned above were already reorganizing themselves according to new realities for workers and for social organizations. The new alliances were not the “product of a fantastic surplus-producing universal subject known as worker, but of a multiplicity of subjects, whose articulation is not guaranteed unless shown in practice”.^{xlv}

Transnational action in the Americas

As the Berlin Wall fell, the United States began preparing the ground for several free trade agreements that extended neoliberal globalization throughout the globe. The intensification of trade talks through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and later the establishment of the World Trade Organization in 1995 were the global symbol of the advancement of free trade as the dominant ideological and practical organization of international economics. Free trade represents

one of the greatest challenges to local populations and to workers' capacity to negotiate with capital, because it directly affects sovereignty over resources and decision making. In the Americas, the move towards liberalizing trade barriers deepened with the creation of the free trade agreement between Canada and the US, later extended to become the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), beginning on 1 January 1994. By and large, the most ambitious project in terms of expanding neoliberal policy and deepening the retrenchment of the state in economic decision making was the FTAA.

In Miami in 1994, 34 countries, with the sole exception of Cuba, met to announce the beginning of negotiations toward creating the largest free trade area on the continent, becoming the most ambitious trade integration scheme to be created.^{xlvi} The FTAA gathered the support of all Latin American governments, coinciding with neoliberal administrations throughout the region. It was only expected that the policies being implemented at home would be matched by an overarching trade scheme that complemented them. The FTAA agenda was certainly in line with the emerging NAFTA, which prioritized benefits to corporate capital at the expense of democratic sovereignty. It soon became clear to social movements and unions that such a treaty would not benefit the working-class in any of the regions.

The trade union movement debated whether to build alliances with social movements and confront the FTAA, or to demand the inclusion of a social clause in the negotiations.^{xlvii} The issue about including a labor-related clause was that the negotiations were closed to civil society participation, and they remained in the hands of technical government officers who could not be easily contacted.^{xlviii} This was not specific to the FTAA negotiations, and other trade blocs had the same attitude towards civil society participation. There was already a diversity of movements that had experience in building coalitions, from the Mexican activists against NAFTA to the South American trade unions involved in the MERCOSUR negotiations.^{xlix} The central challenge with NAFTA was the broadness of the proposal and therefore the need to consider significantly different realities, historical paths, and identities. For the unions that intended to negotiate a social clause, the possibility was so restricted that it eventually pushed them to join the mass demonstrations.

The main response by unions and social movements was the formation of the HSA. This alliance incorporated movements from all of the Americas, with a strong presence of militant trade unions (especially in the 2000s) from the Southern Cone (Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay). The plus side was that the FTAA, with US as the leading imperial force behind it, and the collaboration of the neoliberal administrations, actually provided a specific political opportunity structure to unify positions within civil society. As explained by Tarrow,¹ a political opportunity structure arises when social movements can emerge and acquire political influence in the presence of favorable

conditions. In the case of the HSA, the overarching image of the US as the leading cause of many of the problems with Latin American development had a definite impact on the coalition. Moreover, the social and economic crisis that neoliberalism was producing throughout the region contributed to the creation of a critical mass of mobilizations against these policies.^{li}

The Trade Union Summit organized in Belo Horizonte, Brazil, in 1997 was the initial pillar behind building a coalition of unions, social movements, and NGOs because it was a union-organized summit to which other actors from the region were invited for the first time.^{lii} One of the most important actors in calling the summit and forming the coalition was the CUT from Brazil, and its push inside the regional union organization, the ORIT, the regional branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). This meeting became the building moment for the formation of the HSA and the establishment of a common position rejecting the FTAA.^{liii} Up to this point, we can refer to the uses of two of the power resources outlined by Levesque and Murray^{liv}: internal democracy and proactive ideas. Regarding the former, the changing dynamics within the ICFTU had a lot to do with opening spaces of participation to trade unions from South America, and especially for a larger role for CUT Brazil, at the cost of lesser influence for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).^{lv} Internal democracy was complemented by a proactive agenda regarding the FTAA, in which the unions decided to extend beyond the official negotiations and promote their own counterhegemonic – counter-neoliberal in fact – project.

The HSA included at the time leading trade unions from around the Americas, opening chapters in most of the countries in the region. The HSA signified an alliance between environmental movements, farmer and peasant organizations (such as the Latin American Congress of Rural Organizations – CLOC), trade union confederations (ORIT), and independent trade unions such as the CTA in Argentina and the PIT-CNT from Uruguay. The North American trade unions were also active participants, especially after the AFL-CIO decided to put all its weight behind the alliance. However, it is important to reiterate the role that trade unions had in the alliance as providers of the structural resources needed to mobilize against the majority of the governments in the region. The largest demonstration organized by the HSA took place in Quebec in 2001, parallel to the official Summit of the Americas in which governments were negotiating the FTAA.^{lvi} This counter-summit managed to attract over 60,000 people, who met with harsh police repression. The conclusion of the counter-summit was that it enjoyed great momentum from the increasingly critical voices against free trade (also witnessed during the Seattle WTO meetings in 1999), but further efforts were needed to build legitimacy beyond the organizational actors.^{lvii} The Quebec counter-summit contributed to building legitimacy around the HSA and to the realization that free trade was

experienced as a common threat both north and south.^{lviii} In this regard, the third element of Levesque and Murray's^{lix} strategic triangle was clearly utilized, that of external solidarity. This referred to the established relationships with social movements at national and local level, as well as to the cross-border alliances that gained momentum at the time of the Quebec counter-summit.

The HSA represented precisely the concept of multitude expressed by Garcia Linera,^{lx} meaning a block of autonomous organizations that through collective action in a common cause managed to organize identities, sets of beliefs, and ideological disparities into a unified cause, in this case the struggle against free trade. The HSA was possible also due to the changing subjectivities – identities – at local level, which led to broadening the scope of action of labor unions. As Hyman asserts, trade union identities and ideologies involve a triangulation between market, class, and society.^{lxi} In the case of the HSA, this triangulation contributed to creating a common unity in terms of class and society against the overwhelming idea of free markets, represented in the figure of the FTAA. However, it is important to stress that these identities are not definite and can change over time, according to the context and the relevance of each of the elements – market, class, society – in that given context.

There are, though, elements that made the HSA especially capable of mobilizing and eventually challenging the trade negotiations altogether: mass participation through the organization of referendums; the effect that free trade would have on overall society through changes in public services and local industries; political crisis in several South American countries that led to the emergence of center-left governments who became eventual allies of the HSA.

The first major event after the massive protests and mobilizations was the call for popular referendums throughout the region during 2004. The HSA expanded throughout the continent a process of consultation with the population on whether or not they supported the FTAA. The political momentum of the crisis in neoliberalism led to the obvious rejection of the FTAA. The important element is that the referendums provided popular legitimacy to the HSA in challenging free trade. The largest votes took place in Brazil and Argentina, where the local coalitions included the CUT and the CTA, respectively, as leading organizers. In Argentina, the call against FTAA (Autoconvocatoria No al ALCA) gained 2.5 million votes, and in Brazil 10 million people participated in the referendum.^{lxii} The overall numbers in the referendums remain symbolic, but they were powerful tools to show national governments the unpopularity of the FTAA. Referendums have been a widely used tool in Latin America, particularly in moments of conflict with the state in which subaltern groups do not have access to the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of government. Popular referendums were used extensively in the 1990s regarding public services^{lxiii} and have continued to be used in recent years regarding the rejection of extractive

resource projects – especially mining, oil, and agribusiness.^{lxiv}

The fact that the FTAA affected fundamental rights like access to public services was a contributory factor to the formation of the HSA and to unions being able to build on local struggles beyond their own. The fact that free trade agreements basically implied a loss of sovereignty for decision making on fundamental rights was a rallying point against the proposal.^{lxv} Moreover, the experience of what had taken place in NAFTA regarding Mexican farmers, local communities, and the expansion of Maquila industries did not place free trade in the highest regard.

A third defining element in the coalition was the arrival to power of center-left parties and governments in Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina, and later on in many other Latin American countries.^{lxvi} The governments of the Workers' Party in Brazil, Kirchner in Argentina, and Hugo Chavez in Venezuela played a significant role in the official negotiations, especially during the Mar del Plata Summit of the Americas in November 2005, when the FTAA project was finally buried. The Cuban government – Cuba being the only country outside the FTAA negotiations – had already been a central supporting element in the HSA campaign and in incorporating left parties and movements into the alliance.^{lxvii} The combined efforts of the mobilization and the political influence of the new administrations resulted in the collapse of the negotiations. As Prevost^{lxviii} says: “It is clear that the governments and social movements come at the FTAA from different points but in many ways their stances are complementary and draw from the strengths of both.” As one of the central organizers of the People’s Summit in Mar del Plata noted: “even though we had massive organizations behind the summit, at the end of the day, what made the difference from other counter-summits was the political collaboration of the Kirchner administration in the organization of the event, and the participation of political figures like Hugo Chavez together with the Cuban government”.^{lxix}

The neoliberal administrations and the collaboration provided by many trade unions to the process of structural adjustment led the critical movements to uphold an idea of autonomy that has been identified as ideological, in terms of social movements and unions being autonomous (self-directed) from state actions.^{lxx} This idea was upheld especially within the trade unions that were identified as social movement unionism,^{lxxi} such as the CTA in Argentina and the CUT in Brazil. However, the relationship with the state does not need to be always in subordination, and governments can be potential allies when both governments and unions are facing larger opponents. In the case of the HSA, the Summit of the Americas in 2005 provided a fruitful arena in which the popular mobilization outside in the People's Summit coincided with the formal opposition of the governments of Venezuela, Argentina, and Brazil inside the official negotiations.^{lxxii} The final blow to the FTAA was then a combination of massive mobilization, a concerted alliance between trade

unions and social movements, and the collaboration of friendly governments.

The struggle against the FTAA carried by the HSA did not take place in a vacuum. The fact that the World Social Forums (WSF), at least the first ones, were organized in South America is a sign of the historical, counterhegemonic momentum that the region was building. The HSA campaign was certainly supported by the WSF in Porto Alegre in 2002, 2004, and 2005.^{lxxiii} Actually, the campaign itself was officially launched at the 2002 WSF, with massive participation by Brazilian and other South American activists.^{lxxiv} The proliferation of struggles in Latin America at the time was the basis on which the HSA could be built. Without such local struggles taking place against the neoliberal hegemony of the time, the HSA would have become simply a network of transnational activists without a firm base in local and regional spaces.

Challenges and limitations to cross-sectoral, transnational alliances

The relative success of the HSA in being a major contributor to the fall of the FTAA was not continued in an organized form after the 2005 People's Summit in Mar del Plata. As a relevant organizing actor in the HSA, the trade unions began changing their priorities, joined by a retrenchment of neoliberal policymaking in most of South America (where the participating unions originated) and the wave of center-left governments that came to power in the region.

The changes in unions' strategies were related to the tensions between what we can call multiple agendas: a national agenda for advancing labor demands; a capital–labor negotiating agenda; the wider society-demands agenda; an international agenda for labor action. A central argument in this section is that, during the post-2005 period, the labor movements that had been an important player in advancing transnational and trans-sectoral actions began to return to older forms of corporatist negotiation at national level, prioritizing collective bargaining over wider social demands. The changes in identities during the neoliberal times, mainly based on the retrenchment of the state, did not regain the same political impact once the state was placed back as a central political and economic actor. The territorial movements that had mobilized during the 1990s were now placed under the umbrella of different government initiatives, which tended to co-opt the autonomous actions of those movements.^{lxxv} This is not to say that alliances stopped altogether, but they were certainly constrained until they returned in the period 2012–2013.

Countries in which new left administrations came to power experienced multiple changes that led to the demise of transnational actions in the form they had reached during the anti-FTAA struggle. First, the 'pink tide' administrations brought back state intervention; this meant that national politics became more relevant than the dependence on international financial institutions like the IMF and the World Bank that had been typical of the neoliberal administrations. The

national dynamic for solving major socioeconomic issues implied less need for transnational action. Second, the governments took on the agenda regarding regional integration,^{lxxvi} and this implied that unions began participating mainly through official summits, less engaged with critical or autonomous social movements. A third element was the contradictions within trade unions because of their relationship with the governments, which affected their image with autonomous social movements. Lastly, a fourth element was the lack – after 2005 – of a hegemonic figure to confront. During the struggle against the FTAA, the fact that the US was behind the project was a leading element that contributed to unifying positions among social movements and trade unions. Once that project was defeated, which coincided with US attention moving elsewhere in the world, there was no clear enemy to face.

National responses

The proliferation of state-oriented administrations throughout the 2000s, especially in the Southern Cone, presented trade unions with the opportunity to tackle at national level many of the demands that they had previously regionalized. In Brazil, the rise of Lula da Silva and the Workers' Party to power in 2002 signified a radical change for state–labor relations, as Lula was a former trade unionist himself and participated in the creation of the CUT during the 1980s. The Brazilian government opened up spaces for negotiation and union participation that had never existed during the neoliberal administrations. The National Labor Forum, in which all trade unions sat down with the government to discuss the main problematic concerning labor, was one such instrument. More collective bargaining, sustained minimum wage increases, and the expansion of social security and social assistance represented a shift from past neoliberal policies, and one with which unions could identify.^{lxxvii} Furthermore, as opposed to the past, unions were open spaces of participation within government delegations in major foreign policy events and negotiations.^{lxxviii}

Similarly, in the 2000s, Argentina witnessed improvements in most labor-related indicators because of changing political dynamics. From 2002 onwards, labor unions were revitalized,^{lxxix} and even those, like the CTA, that had historically been excluded from participation in negotiations were partially incorporated into tripartite negotiations.^{lxxx} This implied that, similar to the case of Brazil, trade unions were given a priority on the national agenda that had not existed during the 1990s and throughout the period of the FTAA proposal. Therefore, most trade unions' priorities shifted towards reinforcing their local-national action at the expense of international action.

As with the cases of Brazil and Argentina, the new pro-labor government administrations were active actors in placing unions at the negotiating table and collaborating with those actors that had been at the forefront of confronting neoliberal policymaking. The situation was similar in

countries like Uruguay with the Frente Amplio government, Venezuela with Hugo Chavez, and Paraguay with Lugo. The improvements in national well-being meant that unions had less need to use international action as a means of changing their local and national realities. Moreover, the receding interference of institutions that during the 1990s represented foreign intervention, like the IMF, the World Bank, and the different American institutions – including embassies – also led to a nationalization of socioeconomic struggles that in the neoliberal policy era had been regional.

Government-led regional integration

During the 1990s, ideas of a larger Latin American integration process at governmental level were mostly linked to free trade projects. The center-left governments, with all their pitfalls, took up the agenda of regional integration that had been promoted by trade unions and social movements, concretely as a response to the FTAA. In this way, the continent experienced a wave of new regional blocs, from the Bolivarian Alternative of the Americas (ALBA) to the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), and to the latest Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC). All these initiatives were at some point promoted by the elements of civil society that had opposed free trade. In practical terms, the new agenda implied that many trade unions and movements familiar with these projects, and close to the governments, began mainly to participate in the official summits and negotiations, with social summits – no more counter-summits – becoming a secondary practice. Paraphrasing a Uruguayan trade union member, the social summits became co-opted by governments, with officials in charge of organizing and shaping the final declarations.^{lxxxix}

For the trade unions, transnationalism was not abandoned altogether but focused largely on government initiatives and participation in official forums.^{lxxxix} The corresponding dependence on government structures for participation in regional integration processes diminished the impact, if any, of unions and social movements' autonomous strategies. As outlined by Botto,^{lxxxix} in the new context, social organizations had to deal with three main questions: how to participate in government-sponsored initiatives; the nature of these initiatives (were they actually emancipatory?); the ambiguity about whether dependent participation represented a more viable solution than the former autonomous strategy. These three questions were critical and can be considered the main factor behind the paralysis of regional action. The lack of a regional solution to these issues led to national disputes between different unions and social movements, diminishing the focus on the regional process altogether.^{lxxxix} A main consequence was that the loss in autonomy also meant the lack of participation by social movements, such as Via Campesina, that had been allies before and were now not part of the official delegations.

Contradictions within the alliance

A central issue in trans-sectoral alliances is the tension between a labor–capital negotiating agenda that is most common to trade unions, and the expression of broader societal demands that take place in alliance with social movements (generally in relation to public services, transport, education, healthcare). This tension arises when the core of the alliance, usually the trade union, utilizes greater resources to support broader demands than those needed for collective bargaining.

As von Bulow states,^{lxxxv} labor organizations become relevant in alliances, especially in trade-related alliances, because they generally have at their disposal greater financial and human resources than most other organizations. Unions became the backbone for structural reasons, especially their autonomous capacity to finance through struggles. In the context of trade negotiations, trade unions were certainly among the most affected actors, and therefore it was in their own interest to extend participation to potential allies. However, the fact that there are competing unions at the workplace, fighting for workers' affiliation, means that the resources used by the union in collective bargaining have to remain central in order to maintain those workers. It is therefore the tension between those two struggles in which progressive unions are placed that leads to limiting trans-sectoral alliances.

Similarly, the issue of autonomy from governments put critical pressure on the social movement–trade union alliance. Unions like the CUT in Brazil and the CTA in Argentina are considered as social movement unions,^{lxxxvi} meaning those trade unions that have militant, democratic practices and are autonomous from political parties and governments. A central characteristic of social movement unionism is that it promotes alliances with social movements and makes broader demands. The relationship outlined in this section between the trade unions and the pro-labor governments represented a challenge to that conception.^{lxxxvii} The alliance with governments challenged the autonomous thesis defended by these unions during the 1990s, when criticism towards the conservative unions was based on their alliance with neoliberal governments. This challenge was also presented by the social movements, increasing the tensions between historical allies such as the case of the CUT and the Landless Workers' Movement (MST) in Brazil, or the break-up of the CTA into an independent-oriented fraction and a government-allied one.^{lxxxviii}

The end of the hegemon?

The fact that the United States – with all its history of intervention in Latin America – proposed the FTAA and that the president in charge of implementing the final stage was George W. Bush – who had a negative image after the invasion of Iraq – meant that the resistance to the project was framed

significantly around an anti-imperialist struggle.^{lxxxix} Even though the trade union movement in the US participated and was involved in mobilizing support, the fact that the leading struggle took place in Latin America and in Quebec was a fundamental element in giving the HSA campaign a counterhegemonic tone. The triumph in 2005 during the Mar del Plata summit was experienced as a victory against a hegemonic idea at the time. As the CTA's international relations' secretary stated, "we can have our differences, but when it comes to US imperialism there is a common rejection in Latin America that unites us all, mostly a consequence of our experience in the past."^{xc}

In spite of a continuing counterhegemonic discourse, especially by the more radical governments in the region, the lack of such a clear enemy also played a significant role in the demise of transnational action. The cross-sectoral mobilizations since that time have taken place in different places across the region, and even though they imply some common demands (end of transnational companies' control over natural resources), they do not constitute a common bloc struggling against a common enemy. Transnational companies, especially in the mining sector, appear as an enemy throughout the region,^{xcⁱ} but there is no common struggle that has managed to unify those local, dispersed, mobilizations. Even the increasing presence of China as a hegemonic development 'partner,' with increasing influence on the development model practiced by Latin America,^{xcⁱⁱ} has not attracted the same level of rejection. There is even a growing literature referring to the change from the Washington Consensus to the Beijing Consensus,^{xcⁱⁱⁱ} propelled by the boom in exports of primary commodities to that country.

Even though the US has retreated from a broad-based project regarding the region, this does not imply its absence from the region's political dynamics. However, there is a clear reduction in its presence and interference in historical terms. This, together with the three abovementioned elements, led to changing circumstances in the region and the demise of transnational action and alliance with social movements at that level.

Conclusion

The advance of neoliberal globalization placed labor movements in a defensive mode throughout the world. Labor movements as relevant economic and political actors were in crisis,^{xc^{iv}} whereby unions began to look like organizations of the past, especially in the literature celebrating the 'new' social movements. This paper has outlined the case of trade unions in Latin America and their capacity to build cross-sectoral, transnational alliances that moved them from a defensive position to an offensive one, managing to produce a serious defeat for one of neoliberalism's principal initiatives: free trade. As Silver argues, the reorganization of production in the South has weakened labor movements in the North but also produced new powerful labor movements in the South.^{xc^v}

This reorganization in the South, and new forms of work, must not be considered as the demise of labor. This essay has outlined some of the actions and alliances built by labor in Latin America to challenge neoliberal reforms in the 1990s and 2000s, with a focus on the formation of a broad anti-FTAA alliance and the results consequent to changes in the socioeconomic situation in the region.

The argument throughout this paper is that the defeat of the FTAA was possible because of a combination of factors that included: a decade of building trans-sectoral alliances at national level against neoliberal reforms; the transnationalization of labor struggles because of lack of inclusion in governments' agendas; the capacity to build alliances with pro-labor administrations from 2002 onwards. These factors were then reviewed in an analysis of the challenges and limitations to further construction of trans-sectoral and transnational coalitions. Levesque and Murray's^{xcvi} strategic triangle of power resources contributed to explain the combination of strategies utilized during the continental struggle. The trade unions were especially proactive in setting a different agenda, promoted further internal democracy at regional level, and implemented a form of external solidarity through alliances with social movements and beyond borders. For many of the unions analyzed here, there was a shift from one form of power to another. The neoliberal administrations restricted the capacity of unions and workers to influence the economic system – through massive unemployment, flexible labor legislation, and lack of collective bargaining – but in response unions used external solidarity as a power resource with other organizations to challenge that reality. The changing dynamics with pro-labor governments that led to the strengthening of unions at the workplace by increasing collective bargaining and improving labor standards led to the retrenchment of unions into their conventional structural power. This was especially the case of unions in Argentina and Brazil.

Additionally, the context of the anti-FTAA campaign and later on the demise of the regional struggles needed to be addressed by using the concepts of political mobilization and political exchange power resources.^{xcvii} It is not possible to explain trade union action through their position in the economy without focusing on the capacity to influence the political system as well. Political mobilization power can result from the connections with the political parties in governments, and also from the capacity to organize massive mobilizations that incorporate broader sectors of society – something complex to achieve in a strike – and public opinion.^{xcviii} Related to this is the exchange power through which labor can negotiate political or economic exchanges with employers and/or governments according to the perceived and real threat that unions present to these organizations. Exchange power resources are connected to labor's structural, associational, and political power resources, since it depends on these to offer and exchange. The use of mobilizations and popular referendums was a source of power in pressuring governments to take a stance against the FTAA.

At the same time, they provided legitimacy to the new administrations that came to power in the early 2000s, and whose position on free trade was closer to that of the HSA.

The close relationship with the left opposition parties and then governments led to further use of the exchange power resource once the FTAA was defeated, whereby trade unions and social movements gained concessions in government positions and policymaking. The capacity to engage with the political system was one of the main reasons for success, and also for demise later on. Boron^{xcix} argues that a central element in the strategy of some of the most radical social movements in recent years in Latin America was the organization of political parties from movements ‘in the streets.’ The most effective cases presented by Boron in changing political representation are those of Ecuador and Bolivia. Boron is critical of the insurrectional social mobilizations that overthrew governments and then, when governments changed, they were “demobilized by the same parties that had asked their support in the elections”.^c This, he considers, was the case in Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, where popular mobilization took place in large numbers during the 1990s and early 2000s, only to be decimated by the center-left administrations. Boron’s analysis fits into the overall debate of this paper. The HSA and regional mobilization against the FTAA was a peak of mobilization, only to be replaced by the predominance of exchanges and negotiations between left-administrations and trade unions, which improved overall conditions but also led to a loss of autonomy. This process of back-and-forth exchanges between left governments and social movements has been creatively described by Dangl as “dancing with dynamite”.^{ci} In his book, Dangl asserts that this dance – exchanges – is a central force crafting many countries’ collective destiny, and also a source of contradictions for social movements – including trade unions. This is essentially what Garcia Linera^{cii} has referred to as the “creative tensions” in the relationship between the state and popular organizations.

The organization of transnational action requires, among other elements, the capacity to build a counterhegemonic movement to a clearly hegemonic project. In the case analyzed here, the clear hegemonic project – a continental free trade agreement – was matched by resistance that resembled more Polanyi’s thesis of a double-movement than Gramsci’s counterhegemonic force. In Polanyi’s thesis, the advances of market forces in the late nineteenth century were resisted by a movement by society to protect itself from the perils of a market-driven economy.^{ciii} This advance of market forces with society’s counter-reaction against them is what Polanyi deemed a double-movement. This concept re-emerged in the face of advancing free trade, and several authors have argued that from 2001 onwards there was a double-movement in society against free trade.^{civ} As also outlined by Webster, Lambert, and Bezuidenhout,^{cv} in Polanyi’s analysis there is a lack of understanding on how society’s countermovement is made and takes place. Polanyi does not

consider then the power dynamics under which society reacts to market forces. Here, a central focus has been to underline how workers and social movements organized the countermovement against free trade in Latin America. Polanyi's analysis is useful to elucidate the reactions against free trade and neoliberal reform, but does not suffice to explain why the countermovement ceased to be active after the hegemonic force withdrew. The lack of a counterhegemonic project that could move beyond neoliberal free trade, not only resist it, was a fundamental limitation to furthering the HSA agenda.

In order to extend from specific contexts, a trans-sectoral and transnational alliance like the HSA requires the capacity to propose alternative models for organizing economic and social life, beyond resisting neoliberal policies. The last two years in Latin America have witnessed a rise in territorial conflicts regarding environmental degradation and loss of livelihoods, produced by the resource-extraction model of development implemented by the center-left administrations. The drawback of reproducing development models that were practiced in the past is also a limitation for the forces that managed to resist, partially, neoliberal policies, but could not further that resistance with an alternative strategy. The case of the anti-FTAA campaign and its aftermath shows that labor movements did indeed have the capacity to transform their structures and ally with other sectors of society; but this alliance depended on a critical economic situation, neoliberalism, and a very clear enemy: a US-led free trade agreement. The return of trade unions to conventional agendas after this process signals the remaining challenge of debating and thinking about models of development that go beyond existing models.

Notes

-
- i Collier and Collier. *Shaping the Political Arena*.
- ii Tattersall. "Labor-Community Coalitions"; Tattersall. *Power in Coalition*; Celis Ospina. *Sindicatos y territorios*.
- iii Voss and Williams. "The Local in the Global," 353.
- iv Silver. *Forces of Labour*.
- v Wright. "Working-Class Power."
- vi Erne. *European Unions*.
- vii Levesque and Murray. "Local Versus Global."
- viii Erne. *European Unions*, 29–32.
- ix Levesque and Murray. "Local Versus Global."
- x Erne. *European Unions*.
- xi Boron. "Strategy and Tactics in Popular Struggles."
- xii Mazur. "Labor's New Internationalism"; Ghigliani. "International Trade Unionism"; Webster, Lambert, and Bezuidenhout. *Grounding Globalization*; Waterman. "A Trade Union Internationalism."
- xiii Ghigliani. "International Trade Unionism," 361.
- xiv Tattersall. "Labour-Community Coalitions."
- xv Bourdieu and Wacquant. *Una invitación a la sociología*.

- xvi De la Garza Toledo. *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición*, 14-15.
- xxvii The situation of employment and labor markets changed significantly in favor of the service sector, within which the working conditions were considerably worse than those in manufacturing jobs, especially in the main industrial countries – Brazil, Mexico, Argentina. For a detailed analysis, see Weller 2000. The situation began to change from the mid 2000s onwards, with the process of economic growth, as shown in a recent ECLAC report (ECLAC 2014).
- xviii Anner. *Solidarity Transformed*.
- xix De la Garza Toledo. *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición*, 16.
- xx Murillo. *Sindicatos, coaliciones partidarias y reformas*.
- xxi De la Garza Toledo. *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición*, 15.
- xxii De Gennaro. “Transiciones políticas,” 48.
- xxiii Etchemendy. “Old Actors in New Markets” ; Etchemendy. *Models of Economic Liberalization*.
- xxiv Etchemendy. “Old Actors in New Markets,” 64.
- xxv Ibid, 75-77.
- xxvi Bensusan. “Reformas laborales.”
- xxvii De Gennaro. “Transiciones políticas.”
- xxviii Novick. “Nuevas reglas del juego en Argentina.”
- xxix Ibid., 31-34.
- xxx The corporatist model of trade unionism in Latin America has been widely discussed (see Collier and Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena*; Murillo, *Sindicatos, coalitions, partidarias y reformas*; Etchemendy, *Models of Economic Liberalization*). It is here understood as a system in which unions access policymaking and systems of representation through alliances with the ruling party, and in some cases with sectors of the business community.
- xxxi De la Garza Toledo. “Del concepto ampliado del trabajo,” 15-16.
- xxxii Garcia Linera. *La potencia plebeya*, 294.
- xxxiii Celis Ospina. *Sindicatos y territorios*, 16.
- xxxiv Ibid., 71.
- xxxv Galvao, Boito, and Marcelino. “Brasil: O movimento popular e Sindical.”
- xxxvi Rossel. *Te amo, te odio*.
- xxxvii Celis Ospina. *Sindicatos y territorios*.
- xxxviii Garcia Linera. *La potencia plebeya*.
- xxxix Alvaro Garcia Linera is a Bolivian intellectual, currently the Vice President of Bolivia. His most relevant works refer to the collective struggles against neoliberalism, state repressions, and indigenous emancipation (see Garcia Linera. *Críticas de la nación, Las armas de la utopía, Sociología de los movimientos sociales*). Regarding the Evo Morales government, see Garcia Linera. *Las tensiones creativas de la revolución* and *Potencia plebeya*.
- xl Ibid., 294.
- xli Ibid., 300.
- xlii Hardt and Negri. *Empire*.
- xliii Garcia Linera. *La potencia plebeya*, 294.
- xliv Ibid.
- xlv De la Garza Toledo. “Del concepto ampliado del trabajo,” 17.
- xlvi Saguier. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation*, 252.
- xlvii Von Bulow. “Networks of Trade Protest.”
- xlviii Ibid.
- xlix Von Bulow. *Building Transnational Networks*.
- l Tarrow. *Power in Movement*.
- li Saguier. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation*, 255.
- lii Ibid., 256.
- liii Saguier. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation*; Von Bulow. “Networks of Trade Protest.”
- liv Levesque and Murray. “Local Versus Global.”
- lv Jakobsen. “Rethinking the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.”
- lvi Saguier. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation*; Von Bulow. “Networks of Trade Protest.”
- lvii Ghiotto. “El ALCA.”
- lviii Dufour-Poirer and Levesque. “Building North-South Transnational Alliance.”

-
- lix Levesque and Murray. "Local Versus Global."
- lx Garcia Linera. *La potencia plebeya*.
- lxi Hyman. "How Can Trade Unions Act Strategically," 197.
- lxii Berron and Freire. "Los movimientos sociales del Cono Sur."
- lxiii Chavez and Torres. *La reinención del Estado*.
- lxiv Aranda. *Argentina originaria; Zibechi. América Latina*.
- lxv Von Bulow. *Building Transnational Networks*.
- lxvi Levistky and Roberts. *The Resurgence of the Latin American Left*; Natanson. *La nueva izquierda*.
- lxvii Saguier. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation*.
- lxviii Prevost. "Contesting Free Trade," 386.
- lxix Author's interview with CTA organizer Andrés Larisgoitia, 29/12/2011 (own translation).
- lxx Modonesi. *Subalternidad, antagonismo, autonomía*, 103-105.
- lxxi For details on social movement unionism see Scipes. "Understanding the New Labor Movements"; Seidman. *Manufacturing Militance*; Lambert and Webster. "Southern Unionism."
- lxxii As with most free trade agreements, all the parties have to agree to it in order to apply the agreement. This made it especially challenging for FTAA and its main backers after the early 2000s when governments of a different political orientation were elected to office.
- lxxiii Von Bulow. *Building Transnational Networks*.
- lxxiv Ibid., 129.
- lxxv Dangl. *Dancing with Dynamite*.
- lxxvi Dobrusin. "Argentina's Labour Movement."
- lxxvii Lenguita and Montes Cato. "La Argentina y Brasil: recomposición sindical."
- lxxviii McGuire and Scherrer. *Developing a Labour Voice*.
- lxxix Etchemendy and Collier. "Down But Not Out."
- lxxx Lenguita and Montes Cato. "La Argentina y Brasil: recomposición sindical."
- lxxxi Expressed during a 2014 South American trade unions coordinating meeting by a representative in conversation with the author.
- lxxxii Dobrusin. "Argentina's Labour Movement."
- lxxxiii Botto. "Movimientos sociales y libre comercio," 206-208.
- lxxxiv Ibid.
- lxxxv Von Bulow. "Networks of Trade Protest," 8.
- lxxxvi Scipes. "Understanding the New Labor Movements" ; Seidman. *Manufacturing Militance*; Lambert and Webster. "Southern Unionism" .
- lxxxvii Seidman. "Social Movement Unionism" ; Sluyter-Beltrao. *Rise and Decline*; Serdar. "Strategies for Revitalizing Labour" ; Rossi. "Juggling Multiple Agendas."
- lxxxviii Rossi. "Juggling Multiple Agendas."
- lxxxix Ghiotto. "El ALCA."
- xc Interview with Adolfo Aguirre, 15/12/2011 (own translation).
- xcii Saguier. "Socio-Environmental Regionalism."
- xciii Slipak. "América Latina y China."
- xciv Ibid.
- xcv Silver. *Forces of Labor*.
- xci Ibid., 5-6.
- xci Levesque and Murray. "Local Versus Global."
- xcvii Erne. *European Unions*.
- xcviii Ibid., 32.
- xcix Boron. "Strategy and Tactics in Popular Struggles," 246.
- c Ibid, 247.
- ci Dangl. *Dancing with Dynamite*.
- cii Garcia Linera. *Las tensiones creativas*.
- ciii Polanyi. *The Great Transformation*.
- civ Webster, Lambert, and Bezuindenhout. *Grounding Globalization*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anner, Mark. *Solidarity Transformed: Labor Responses to Globalization and Crisis in Latin America*. Ithaca: ILR Press, 2011.
- Aranda, Dario. *Argentina originaria. Genocidios, saqueos y resistencias*. Buenos Aires: Lavaca Editores, 2010.
- Bensusan, Graciela. "Reformas laborales en países desarrollados y en desarrollo: entre el conservadurismo y la innovación institucional." *Perfiles Latinoamericanos* no. 22 (2003): 11–49.
- Berron, Gonzalo, and Rafael Freire. 2004. "Los movimientos sociales del Cono Sur contra el mal llamado 'libre comercio'." *OSAL* 5, no. 13: 297–306.
- Boron, Atilio. "Strategy and Tactics in Popular Struggles in Latin America." *Socialist Register* 49, (2013): 241–254.
- Botto, Mercedes. "Los movimientos sociales y el libre comercio en América Latina: ¿qué hay después del ALCA?" *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals* no. 105 (2014): 191–213.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Wacquant. *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno, 2008.
- Celis Ospina, Juan. *Sindicatos y territorios. Dimensiones territoriales de la acción sindical. Aproximación teórica y descripción de experiencias colombianas*. Ensayos Laborales 11. Colombia: Escuela Nacional Sindical, 2004.
- Chavez, Daniel, and Sebastián Torres (eds). *La reinención del Estado. Empresas públicas y desarrollo en Uruguay, América Latina y el mundo*. Netherlands: Transnational Institute, 2013.
- Collier, David, and Ruth Collier. *Shaping the Political Arena Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Dangl, Benjamin. *Dancing with Dynamite: Social Movements and the States in Latin America*. Oakland: AK Press, 2010.
- De Gennaro, Víctor. "Transiciones políticas y procesos de recomposición sindical en Argentina." In *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición política*, edited by Enrique De la Garza Toledo, 47–54. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2001.
- De la Garza Toledo, Enrique (ed.). *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición política*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2001.
- De la Garza Toledo, Enrique. "Del concepto ampliado de trabajo al de sujeto laboral ampliado." In *Sindicatos y nuevos movimientos sociales en América Latina*, edited by E. de la Garza Toledo, 9–17. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2005.
- Dobrusin, Bruno. "Argentina's Labour Movement and Trade Policy: The Case of CTA within Mercosur during the Kirchners' Governments." *Political Perspectives* 6, no. 2 (2012): 58–77.
- Dufour-Poirier, Melanie and Levesque Christian. "Building North-South Transnational Trade Union Alliances. Prospect and Challenges." In *Transnational Trade Unionism: New Capabilities and Prospects*, edited by Peter Fairbrother, Christian Lévesque, and Marc-Antoin Hennebert, 63–77. Florence, KV, OR: Routledge, 2013. What does KV stand for here?
- ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean). *Compacts for Equality. Towards a Sustainable Future*. Santiago de Chile: United Nations, 2014.

-
- Erne, Roland. *European Unions. Labor's Quest for Transnational Democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Etchemendy, Sebastian, and Ruth Colliers. "Down But Not Out: Union Resurgence and Segmented Neocorporatism in Argentina: 2003–2007." *Politics and Society* 35, no. 3 (2007): 363–401.
- Etchemendy, Sebastian. "Old Actors in New Markets: The Transformation of the Populist/Industrial Coalition in Argentina, 1989–2001." In *The Politics of Institutional Weakness: Argentine Democracy under Menem and Beyond*, edited by Steven Levitsky and Victoria Murillo, 62–87. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- Etchemendy, Sebastian. *Models of Economic Liberalization: Business, Workers, and Compensation in Latin America, Spain and Portugal*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Galvao, Andreia, Armando Boito, and Paula Marcelino. "Brasil: O movimento sindical e popular na decada de dois mil." In *Una década en movimiento. Luchas populares en América Latina en el amanecer del siglo XXI*, edited by Modonesi and Julian Rebon, 153–182. Buenos Aires: Prometeo and CLACSO, 2011.
- García Linera, Alvaro. *Críticas de la nación y la nación crítica*. La Paz: Ofensiva Roja, 1989.
- García Linera, Alvaro. *Las armas de la utopía*. La Paz: Umbrales and Punto Cero, 1996.
- García Linera, Alvaro. *Sociología de los movimientos sociales en Bolivia*. La Paz: Oxfam and Plural, 2005.
- García Linera, Alvaro. *La potencia plebeya. Acción colectiva e identidades indígenas, obreras y populares en Bolivia*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2008.
- García Linera, Alvaro. *Las tensiones creativas de la revolución*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado, 2011.
- Ghigliani, Pablo. "International Trade Unionism in a Globalizing World: A Case Study of New Labour Internationalism." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 26, no. 3 (2005): 359–382.
- Ghiotto, Luciana. "EL ALCA, un fruto de la relación capital-trabajo." In *El ALCA y sus peligros para América Latina*, edited by Jaime Estay and German Sanchez, 167–196. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2005.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Hyman, Richard. "How Can Trade Unions Act Strategically?" *European Review of Labour and Research* 13, no. 2 (2007): 193–210.
- Jakobsen, Kjeld. "Rethinking the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its Inter-American Regional Organization." In *Place, Space and the New Labour Internationalisms*, edited by Peter Waterman and Jane Willis, 59–79. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Lambert, Robert, and Edward Webster. "Southern Unionism and the New Labour Internationalism." *Antipode* 33, no. 3 (2001): 337–362.
- Lenguita, Paula, and Juan Montes Cato. "La Argentina y Brasil: recomposición sindical en los albores del siglo XXI. Tendencias y desafíos para las estrategias de los sectores subalternos." In *Estado, instituciones laborales y acción sindical en países del Mercosur frente al contexto de la crisis mundial*, edited by Arturo Fernández and Cecilia Senén González, 85–124. Buenos Aires: Prometeo, 2010.
- Levesque, Christian, and Gregor Murray. "Local Versus Global: Activating Local Union Power in the Global Economy." *Labor Studies Journal* 27, no. 3 (2002): 39–65.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Kenneth Roberts (eds). *The Resurgence of the Latin American Left*.

-
- Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2011.
- Mazur, Jay. "Labor's New Internationalism." *Foreign Affairs* 79, no. 1 (2000): 79–93.
- McGuire, Donna, and Christoph Scherrer, with Svetlana Boinceau et al. *Developing a Labour Voice in Trade Policy at the National Level*. Working Paper No.8, 2010. Global Labour University. Accessed 18 November 2014. http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.8.pdf
- Modonesi, Massimo. *Subalternidad, antagonismo, autonomía. Marxismos y subjetivación política*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo-CLACSO-Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2010.
- Murillo, Maria Victoria. *Sindicatos, coaliciones partidarias y reformas de mercado en América Latina*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 2005.
- Natanson, Jose. *La nueva izquierda. Triunfos y derrotas de los gobiernos de Argentina, Brasil, Bolivia, Venezuela, Chile, Uruguay y Ecuador*. Buenos Aires: Debate, 2008.
- Novick, Marta. "Nuevas reglas del juego en Argentina, competitividad y actores sindicales." In *Los sindicatos frente a los procesos de transición política*, edited by Enrique De la Garza Toledo, 25–46. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2001.
- Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon, 2001 [1944].
- Prevost, Gary. "Contesting Free Trade: The Development of the Anti-FTAA Movement in the Streets and in the Corridors of State Power." *Journal of Developing Societies* 21, nos. 3–4 (2005): 369–387.
- Rossel, Cecilia. *Te amo, te odio, dame más. ONG, participación y representación en el primer gobierno de izquierda de Uruguay*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2013.
- Rossi, Federico. "Juggling Multiple Agendas: The Struggle of Trade Unions against National, Continental, and International Neoliberalism in Argentina." In *Transnational Activism and National Movements in Latin America: Bridging the Divide*, edited by Eduardo Silva, 141–160. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Saguier, Marcelo. *Transnational Labour Mobilisation in the Americas: Claiming Workers' Rights Across Borders*. Working Paper Series No. 45. Argentina: FLACSO, 2007.
- Saguier, Marcelo. "Socio-Environmental Regionalism in South America: Tensions in New Development Models." In *The Rise of Post-Hegemonic Regionalism*, edited by Pia Riggiozzi and Diana Tussie, 125–146. London and New York: Springer, 2012.
- Scipes, Kim. "Understanding the New Labor Movements in the 'Third World': The Emergence of Social Movement Unionism." *Critical Sociology* 19, no. 2 (1992): 81–101.
- Seidman, Gay. *Manufacturing Militance. Workers' Movements in Brazil and South Africa, 1970-1985*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1994.
- Seidman, Gay. "Social Movement Unionism: From Description To Exhortation." *South African Review of Sociology* 42, no. 3 (2011): 94–102.
- Serdar, Ayse. "Strategies for Revitalizing Labour Movements: Union Organizing and Building Alliances with Community in Argentina." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 33, no. 3 (2012): 403–420.
- Silver, Beverly. *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization Since 1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Slipak, Ariel. "América Latina y China: cooperación Sur-Sur o 'Consenso de Beijing'?" *Nueva Sociedad* no. 250, 2014: 102–113.
- Sluyter-Beltrao, Jeffrey. *Rise and Decline of Brazil's New Unionism: The Politics of the Central Única dos Trabalhadores*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Collective Action, Social Movements and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Tattersall, Amanda. "Labor-Community Coalitions, Global Union Alliances, and the

-
- Potential of SEIU's Global Partnerships." In *Global Unions. Challenging Transnational Capital Through Cross-Border Campaigns*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, 155–173. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Tattersall, Amanda. *Power in Coalition: Strategies for Strong Unions and Social Change*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Von Bulow, Marisa. "Networks of Trade Protest in the Americas: Toward a New Labor Internationalism." *Latin American Politics and Society* 51, no. 2 (2009): 1–28.
- Von Bulow, Marisa. *Building Transnational Networks. Civil Society and the Politics of Trade in the Americas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Voss, Kim, and Michelle Williams. "The Local in the Global: Rethinking Social Movements in the New Millennium." *Democratization* 19, no. 2 (2012): 352–377.
- Waterman, Peter. "A Trade Union Internationalism for the 21st Century: Meeting the Challenges from Above, Below and Beyond." In *Labour and the Challenges of Globalization. What Prospects for Transnational Solidarity?*, edited by Andreas Bieler, Ingemar Lindberg, and Devan Pillay, 248–263. London: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Webster, Edward, Robert Lambert, and Andries Bezuidenhout. *Grounding Globalization: Labour in the Age of Insecurity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- Weller, Jurgen. "Employment Trends in Latin America and the Caribbean during the 1990s." *CEPAL Review*, no. 72 (2000): 31–51.
- Wright, Erik, O. "Working-Class Power, Capitalist-Class Interests, and Class Compromise." *American Journal of Sociology* 105, no. 4 (2000): 957–1002.
- Zibechi, Raúl. *América Latina: Contrainsurgencia y pobreza*. Bogotá: Desdeabajo, 2010.