Policy Switching by Left Populist Presidents in Latin America: The Influence of Civil Society

Christopher O'Connell

BCL, LLB, MA

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

School of Law and Government
Dublin City University

Supervisor: Professor Robert Elgie

May 2019

Declaration

I hereby certify that this material, which I now submit for assessment on the programme of study leading to the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is entirely my own work, and that I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the work is original, and does not to the best of my knowledge breach any law of copyright, and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

Signed:

Candidate ID No: 57211546

Date:

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have happened without the kindness and support of more people than there is room here to mention. It has been a humbling yet highly rewarding experience, and I hope that the contents reflect something of that process. Firstly, I am indebted to all of those who gave so generously of their time and experiences as participants in this research, and without whom this work would not have been possible.

I am particularly indebted to those wonderful friends and colleagues who were kind enough to help me during my periods of field research: Rocio Verastegui, Richard Intriago, Steven Wille, Lynda Sullivan, Thomas McDonagh, Dr Cathal Doyle, Paola Mora, Victor Flores, and everyone at the Latin America Solidarity Centre (LASC). Mil gracias.

In Dublin City University, my supervisor, Professor Robert Elgie, was a constant source of guidance and support, while providing the kind of rigorous examination that served to improve both the quality of my work and my professional development. I will be forever grateful.

I would also like to acknowledge the support provided by the Heads of the School of Law and Government, Professor Iain McMenamin and Professor Gary Murphy. Others who were kind of enough to share their time and thoughts include: Dr David Doyle, Dr Gemma McNulty, Dr Barry Cannon, and Professor Eduardo Silva.

I was lucky enough to encounter wonderful colleagues in the School of Law and Government, many of whom have since become firm friends. In particular I would like to thank Dr Clare O'Grady-Walshe, Dr Karl Murphy, Dr Elliott Jordan-Doak, Dr Orla Lehane and Dr Mohsen Moheimany. We got there in the end.

Finally, but most importantly, I would like to thank my wife and best friend, Fionnuala Griffin, and our two wonderful daughters, Clara and Rebecca. Without your love, support and laughter, I would never have been able to do this. I would also like to thank my mother Laraine, and sisters Sinead and Sally for all their support.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my father, Dr John D. O'Connell.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AAFP	Asociación de Administradoras de Fondos de Pensiones
	Association of Pension Fund Administrators
ABC	Administradora Boliviana de Carreteras
	Bolivian Roads Administrator
AFP	Agence France-Presse
AGD	Agencia de Garantía de Depósitos
	Deposit Guarantee Agency
AIDESEP	Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana
	Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest
ANSA	Agenzia Nazionale Stampa Associata
AP	Associated Press
APDHB	Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos de Bolivia
	Bolivian Permanent Assembly on Human Rights
BNDES	Banco Nacional de Desarrollo Económico y Social
	National Bank for Economic and Social Development
CAAP	Centro Andino de Acción Popular
	Andean Centre for Popular Action
CAO	Cámara Agropecuaria del Oriente
	Eastern Agricultural Chamber
CCCC	Comisión de Control Cívico de la Corrupción
	Civic Corruption Control Commission
CEPB	Confederación de Empresarios Privados de Bolivia
	Bolivian Confederation of Private Entrepreneurs
CGTP	Confederación General de Trabajadores del Perú
	Central General Workers' Union
CIDOB	Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia
	Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia
CLACSO	Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales
	Latin American Council of Social Science
CNA	Confederación Nacional Agraria
	National Agrarian Confederation
CNAMIB	Confederación Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Bolivia
	National Confederation of Indigenous Women of Bolivia

CNMCIOB	Confederación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas Indígenas Originarias de Bolivia - Bartolina Sisa Bartolina Sisa National Confederation of Peasant, Indigenous, and Native Women of Bolivia
COB	Central Obrero Boliviano Bolivian Workers' Centre
CODENPE	Consejo de Desarrollo de las Nacionalidades y Pueblos del Ecuador Council for the Development of Nationalities and Peoples of Ecuador
CONAIE	Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador
CONACAMI	Confederación Nacional de Comunidades del Perú Afectadas por la Minería National Confederation of Peruvian Communities Affected by Mining
CONALCAM	Coordinadora Nacional por el Cambio National Co-ordinator for Change
CONAMAQ	Consejo Nacional de Ayllus y Markas del Qullasuyu National Council of Ayllus and Markas of Qullasuyu
CONFENIAE	Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of the Ecuadorian Amazon
CONFIEP	Confederación Nacional de Instituciones Empresariales Privadas Confederation of Private Business Institutions
CONISUR	Consejo Indígena del Sur Indigenous Committee of the South
COPISA	Conferencia Plurinacional e Intercultural de Soberanía Alimentaria Plurinational and Intercultural Food Sovereignty Conference
CPSC	Comité Pro Santa Cruz Committee for Santa Cruz
CSCIB	Confederación Sindical de Comunidades Interculturales de Bolivia Syndicalist Confederation of Intercultural Communities of Bolivia
CSUTCB	Confederación Sindical Única de Trabajadores Campesinos de Bolivia Unitary Syndical Confederation of Peasant Workers of Bolivia
CUL	Comando Unitario de Lucha Unitary Struggle Command
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ECUARUNARI	Ecuador Runakunapak Rikcharimuy Confederation of Peoples of Kichwa Nationality
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (United Nations)
FDA	Frente de Defensa Ambiental de Cajamarca Environmental Defence Front of Cajamarca
FEINE	Consejo de Pueblos y Organizaciones Indígenas Evangélicas del Ecuador Council of Evangelical Indigenous Populations and Organisations of Ecuador
FEIREP	Fondo de Estabilización, Inversión Social, y Reducción del Endeudamiento Publico Economic Stability, Social Investment and Reduction of Debt Fund
FEJUVE	Federación de Juntas Vecinales de El Alto Federation of Neighbourhood Councils-El Alto
FENACLE	Federación Nacional de Trabajadores Agroindustriales, Campesinos e Indígenas Libres del Ecuador National Federation of Farm Workers and Free Indigenous Peoples of Ecuador
FENOCIN	Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas, Indígenas y Negras Confederation of Indigenous, Peasant, and Black Organisations
FES	Economic and Social Function
FETRAPEC	Federación de Trabajadores Petroleros Federation of Oil Workers
FSUTCC	Federacion Sindical Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos de Cochabamba Syndicalist Federation of Peasant Workers of Cochabamba
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
FNTMMSP	Federación Nacional de Trabajadores Mineros Metalúrgicos y Siderúrgicos del Perú National Federation of Miners and Steelworkers of Peru
GCC	Guayaquil Chamber of Commerce
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GP	Gana Perú Peru Wins
IACHR	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
ID	Izquierda Democrática Democratic Left
IIDS	Instituto Internacional de Derecho y Sociedad International Institute for Law and Society

IIRSA	Iniciativa para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Suramericana
	Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INRA	Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria
	National Institute for Agrarian Reform
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPS	Inter-Press Service
IPSP	Instrumento Político por la Soberanía de los Pueblos
	Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the Peoples
LAPOP	Latin American Public Opinion Project
LORSA	Ley Orgánica del Régimen de Soberanía Alimentaria
	Organic Law of the Food Sovereignty Regime
MAS	Movimiento al Socialismo
	Movement Toward Socialism
MINAM	Ministerio del Ambiente
	Ministry of the Environment
MINEM	Ministerio de Energía y Minas
	Ministry for Energy and Mines
MPD	Movimiento Popular Democrático
	Democratic People's Movement
MSM	Movimiento Sin Miedo
	Movement Without Fear
MST	Movimiento Sin Tierra
	Landless Peasants' Movement
MVR	Movimiento V Republica
	Movement for the Fifth Republic
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NSPD	Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo
	National Secretariat of Planning and Development
OAS	Organisation of American States
OCP	Oleoducto de Crudo Pesado
	Heavy Crude Oil Pipeline
OEFA	Organismo de Evaluación y Fiscalización Ambiental
	Agency for Environmental Assessment and Enforcement
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
OSAL	Observatorio Social de América Latina

	Social Observatory of Latin America
OSUNTRAMSA	Organización Sindical Única Nacional de Trabajadores del Ministerio de Salud Pública
	Organisation of Health Ministry Workers
PAIS	Movimiento País Altiva I Soberana
	Alliance for a Proud and Sovereign Homeland
PdVSA	Petróleos de Venezuela S.A.
	Petroleum of Venezuela
PIC	Plataforma Interinstitucional de Celendín
	Celendín Interinstitutional Platform
PK	Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik
	Pachakutik Plurinational Unity Movement
PP	Perú Posible
	Possible Peru
PRE	Partido Roldosista Ecuatoriano
	Ecuadorian Rolosista Party
PRIAN	Partido Renovador Institucional Acción Nacional
	Institutional Renewal Party of National Action
PRONACA	Procesadora Nacional de Alimentos
	National Food Processor
PSC	Partido Social Cristiano
	Social Christian Party
PSP	Partido Sociedad Patriótica
	Patriotic Society Party
SENACE	Servicio Nacional de Certificación Ambiental para las Inversiones Sostenibles
	National Environmental Certification Service for Sustainable Investment
SENPLADES	Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo
	National Secretariat for Planning and Development
SERNAP	Servicio Nacional de Áreas Protegidas
	National Protected Areas Service
SNMPE	Sociedad Nacional de Minería, Petróleo y Energía
	National Society for Mining, Petroleum and Energy
SOTE	Sistema de Oleoducto Transecuatoriano
	Trans-Ecuadorian Oil Pipeline System
SUTEP	Sindicato Unitario de Trabajadores en la Educación del Perú
	Union of Education Workers of Peru

TC	Tribunal Constitucional
	Constitutional Tribunal
TCO	Tierra Comunitaria de Orígen
	Original Community Lands
TIPNIS	Territorio Indígena y Parque Nacional Isiboro Secure
	Isiboro Sécure National Park and Indigenous Territory
TSE	Tribunal Supremo Electoral
	Supreme Electoral Tribunal
UNE	Unión Nacional de Educadores
	National Union of Educators
UP	Pacto de Unidad
	Unity Pact
UPI	United Press International
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Abstract

Policy Switching by Left Populist Presidents in Latin America: The Influence of Civil Society

Christopher O'Connell

This project examines 'left populist' presidents in Latin America. It asks, 'Why do some left populist presidents in this region engage in policy switching while others do not?' Policy switching is where presidents renege on campaign promises in office. Typically, the answer to this question is found in either institutional or economic factors. However, these explanations do not provide a complete account of why some presidents are 'switchers' but others are not. Left populist presidents typically front personalistic or poorly organised political parties; they eschew traditional institutional constraints; and they switch even amid favourable economic conditions. This project argues that switching can only be fully understood in the context of pressure exerted by civil society in the region. When the president faces pressure from civil society, switching is less likely to occur. To test this proposition empirically, this project examines four left populist presidents from three Andean nations – Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru – in terms of their general policy promises, as well as specific promises regarding constitutional reform, food sovereignty, and resource extraction policy. There is strong support for the argument. In cases where civil society was not mobilised or lacked articulation, populist presidents were more likely to move away from key promises. In cases where civil society was better articulated and strongly mobilised, however, populists tended to comply with their promises. This project also demonstrates the need to 'unpack' switching as typically framed. It is important to distinguish not only between presidents who 'switch' and those who do not, but also between those who keep their promises for a period of time and only then switch, and those who switch on some of their promises but not others. In these ways, this project provides the most detailed study of policy switching by left populist presidents in Latin America to date.

Introduction

This thesis addresses the puzzle of why some left populist presidents in Latin America honour their electoral promises while others 'switch' and abandon them. It argues that the reason some left populist presidents respected their mandates and some did not was due to differences in pressure from mobilised and broadly articulated social movements. This thesis also argues that the concept of switching needs to be 'unpacked' and viewed in a non-binary manner over an extended timeframe and across the policy spectrum.

The issue of fidelity to campaign promises has been acknowledged as a significant issue for democratic accountability and representation (Przeworski et al, 1999; Roberts, 2013). The phenomenon of 'switching' has frequently been studied in the context of Latin American politics. It was first documented as "bait-and-switch strategies" in the literature on Latin American populism (Drake, 1991; Roberts, 1995; Weyland, 1996).

The election of leftist presidents across Latin America in the 2000s has become known as the 'shift to the left' and has given rise to extensive scholarship (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; Weyland et al, 2010; Lievesley, 2009; Barrett et al, 2008; Cameron & Hirschberg, 2010). This literature has divided the Latin American left into two groups: the social-democratic left and populist left.

Recent scholarship has focussed on leftist switchers (Cunha, 2013; Campello, 2014). That is to say, candidates who campaign on a leftist platform, but who then switch to the centre or right on taking office. This literature typically approaches 'switching' by focussing on economic policy switches, limiting the period studied for switching to one year, and by adopting a binary division between switchers and non-switchers.

The most common explanation for switching and non-switching by left populists relates to the availability of finance via the commodities boom (Murillo et al, 2011; Weyland, 2013), although some also focus on politico-institutional constraints (De la torre, 2015; Conaghan, 2011). Nevertheless, there is an overwhelming focus on 'ideal typical' cases (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011), often excluding presidents that 'switch' upon taking power by retrospectively classifying them as 'non-leftists'.

In this context this study provides a new analysis of left populist policy switching in Latin America. To this end, it adds value in four ways:

1) conducting the first systematic qualitative analysis of the concept of left populist policy switching in Latin America from a comparative perspective;

2) contributing an original explanation for the conditions under which policy switching occurs and fails to occur: the core argument is that the social movements that were acknowledged as pivotal in bringing left populist presidents in Latin America to power remained influential after the election. Variations in the post-electoral strength of these movements is the primary cause of switching, non-switching, partial and late switching by these presidents.

3) challenging the binary way in which switching is conceived, demonstrating the need to 'unpack' the concept; it does so by examining these dynamics over an extended time period, in different policy sectors, and with presidents considered both switchers and non-switchers. In order to maximise variation and control, this study compares cases across countries, within the same country, and within the same presidency across policy areas; as well as at different levels, including over an entire presidency, in specific policy areas, and via key social conflicts. In this way it provides a more nuanced analysis of switching, which reveals that switching can be total or partial, can occur in certain policy areas and not in others, and can occur early or late in a presidency.

4) providing original material based on careful field work of various cases of switching and non-switching. The cases selected are: the presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez of Ecuador; policies relating to the constituent assembly and food sovereignty in the government of Rafael Correa in Ecuador; the Conga Mines conflict during the administration of Ollanta Humala in Peru; and the TIPNIS road conflict during the government of Evo Morales of Bolivia. Data was collected during three field trips, with over 100 qualitative interviews conducted with political and social leaders, academic and media commentators. This data was buttressed by primary and secondary documentary evidence, including plans for government, national development plans, social movement and official communiqués, newspaper articles and online videos.

The results reveal strong support for the thesis that mobilised social movements played a key role in pressuring presidents into keeping their promises. The findings further reveal that when divisions arose within and between movements, and levels of mobilisation declined, presidents tended to abandon and in some cases reverse key electoral promises. Furthermore, this study demonstrates the importance of unpacking switching, as it reveals the existence of late switches, partial switches, attempts at reversals of switches, and both switches and non-switches in separate policy areas of the same presidency.

Chapter 1: Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

This thesis is concerned with the question of why some left populists in Latin America 'switch' on their electoral mandates, while others do not. The concept of 'switching', whereby presidents win elections with one kind of policy platform and then adopt a radically opposed set of policies in power, is associated with both populism and the left in Latin America. The concept first originated in the form of 'bait-and-switch' strategies in the literature on populism (Drake, 1991; Roberts, 1995; Weyland, 1996). Academic interest in populism and switching in Latin America was revived in the wake of the series of electoral victories for presidential candidates running on leftist platforms which became known as the 'shift to the left'. There is evidence that the vast majority of switches occur in a left-to-right direction (Cunha, 2013; Campello, 2014).

This chapter will review the literature on left populism in Latin America. The chapter will begin with a brief overview of Latin America's 'shift to the left', and the creation of the 'left populists' who are the focus of this study. This review reveals that much of the literature on left populists is highly normative in nature, serving to obscure more than enlighten. The next section considers the literature on the emergence of left populists and electoral support for left populists. The chapter goes on to review what the literature on left populism has to say regarding the actions of these leaders once in power, while the final section specifically focuses on the phenomenon of 'switching'.

1.2 The New Left in Latin America

The series of electoral victories by broadly left-wing candidates across Latin America during the first decade of the 21st Century has been variously described as "unprecedented" (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 1) and "striking" (Weyland et al, 2010: 1) in terms of its scope and implications. This phenomenon has prompted significant scholarly attention, giving rise to wide body of work analysing the emergence and performance of these presidents (Ibid; Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; Cameron & Hirschberg, 2010; Barrett et al, 2008; Lievesley, 2009; Petkoff, 2005; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2009). The analyses in this literature are extremely varied but, while some reject the categorisation of these leaders as leftist (Ibid), the majority view was that the 'shift to the left' was incontrovertible (Cameron & Hirschberg, 2010).

Much of this literature is dedicated to identifying variants within this grouping. The most common approach to the study of these governments is that of the 'two lefts' (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 11). Within this literature, scholars have variously categorised leftist regimes as: "right" and "wrong" (Castañeda, 2006); moderate and radical (Weyland, 2009); social democratic and populist (Panizza, 2005; Leiras, 2007); moderate and contestatory (Weyland, 2010); liberal and interventionist (Madrid, 2010); reformist and bourbon (Petkoff, 2005); and "vegetarian" and "carnivorous" (Vargas Llosa, 2007).

Accordingly, some scholars do not accept this so-called 'bifurcation thesis'. Some consider the thesis to be a "blunt instrument" (Cameron, 2009: 333), and it has been the subject of considerable debate (Ibid; Luna, 2010). Cardoso dismisses the idea of a regional shift to the left, noting a "broad array of responses to current challenges" rather than a trend (2006: 14). Petras and Veltemeyer agree that these regimes are not truly leftist, although for very different reasons (2009). Others see a multiplicity of left governments, rooted in the peculiarities of each particular country (Ramírez Gallegos, 2006; Cameron, 2009; Luna, 2010). Cleary on the other hand believes there to be really only one left, and that "differences within the left, while real, are often overemphasised" (2006: 36). Schamis notes the need for "further differentiation" (2006: 21), adding a third intermediary type between institutionalised parties and the "petro-left".

In spite of these dissenting voices, however, a broad acceptance of the dichotomous approach to New Left regimes is apparent in the literature (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 11; Luna, 2010: 25), reflecting "widely shared intuitions" (Cameron, 2009: 334). Furthermore, there is overwhelming consensus on the cases that fall into each category. Thus a large number of works cite Chile, Uruguay and Brazil as examples of the 'good' moderate/social democratic left; and Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador as the 'bad' radical/contestatory left (Cardoso, 2006; Castañeda, 2006; Panizza, 2005; Weyland, 2010; Madrid, 2010). In spite of the plethora of descriptors set out above, perhaps the most commonly employed labels are "social democratic left" and "populist left" (Arnson, 2007; Panizza, 2005; Leiras, 2007). It is the latter group that is of interest to this study. In utilising the term 'populist left', however, this literature imports a certain conceptual confusion, and highly normative overtones, both of which tend to obscure underlying dynamics.

Populism in Latin America remains a "confusing and contested notion" (Weyland, 2001: 19). Scholars have employed a variety of approaches to its study (Roberts, 1995). Some have fallen into disuse or discredit (although occasionally come back into usage); others largely defy operationalisation for empirical use; while others appear incoherent or largely descriptive. The outcome has been the fragmentation of intellectual approaches to the study of Latin American populism (Jansen, 2015: 162). Accordingly, various Latin American political scholars simply reject

populism as an "analytically ambiguous concept" (Andrade, 2005: 104) that cannot be considered scientific (Quintero, 2009). In the words of Moreano, populism is "magical: vast, incessant, ubiquitous, multiple, diverse" but, in the end, it "tells us nothing" (1992: 102).

A second issue is the highly normative nature of the concept. As Panizza and Miorelli note, the populist label is often used in a "normatively charged" (2009: 39) manner, to castigate or dismiss rather than enlighten or explain. This normative view of populism is built into some of the intellectual approaches to populism. Those who adopt an economic perspective see populism as a "Bad Thing" (Knight, 1998: 243), and the term is used to pejoratively characterise the economic policies of any leftist government "usually a priori and with no precise definition" (Moreno-Brid & Paunovic, 2010: 197). For others, populism is associated with disregard for institutions and the rule of law (Leiras, 2007: 399). According to this conception, populist leaders are "authoritarian demagogues" who appeal to the emotions of followers, pander to prejudices, disregard democratic institutions, and make reckless promises (Ibid).

Another factor is the adoption of the term by the mainstream media (Vargas-Llosa, 2007:59; Lynch, 2017: 79), most commonly in the form of "apocalyptic warnings" (De la Torre, 2007: 384). The challenge of determining who is populist is aggravated by the fact that few if any leaders "embrace" the populist label (Moffitt & Tormey, 2013: 3). Instead it is most commonly perceived as an "epithet to be hurled" at opponents (Roberts, 1995: 86). As a result of these preconceptions, Panizza has referred to populism as a "toxic brand" (2013: 114).

The negative impact of this brand is evident in the literature on the left in Latin America, where many use 'populism' in "the most banal way, meaning that such regimes are openly demagogic and irresponsible" (Lynch, 2007: 376). In a seminal article, Castañeda categorises one set of leftist regimes as "wrong," describing them as "nationalist, strident and close-minded," and born of populism (2006: 29). This view of "good" versus "populist" leftist (Ellner, 2012: 97) is replicated in much of the New Left literature. The economic policies of these leaders are derided as irresponsible "idiocy" (Vargas Llosa, 2007); claims to promote social justice are dismissed (Ibid); and social achievements are said to "rest on quicksand" (Weyland, 2010: 12). Authors highlight the threat posed by the populist left, which is accused of "strangling democracy" (2013: 18), and which is considered more harmful than right-wing populism (Ibid). As a result of the "dismissal of these endeavours as merely 'populist'" much of their "apparent analytical significance" is lost (Luna, 2010: 29).

In response to this condemnatory strand of literature, another normative subset seeks to present these leaders as representatives of a form of radical (Ellner, 2012) or direct democracy (Peruzzotti,

2013). Thus Laclau, in contrast to Weyland, notes that the threat to Latin American democracy "comes from neoliberalism and not populism" (2006: 61). Similarly, Lynch notes that the term 'populist' is applied to discredit politicians that deviate from "the neoliberal order" (2017: 79). For some this wave of left populism hearkens back to the classical era when populism was "an important democratising force" that mobilised and incorporated previously excluded sectors (De la Torre, 2007: 384; Collins, 2014). However, even among scholars sympathetic to these leaders, there is confusion as to whether the 'populist' descriptor is positive or negative. Some hold the view that populists are the "true democrats" (Canovan, 1999: 7); that these leaders personify a renovating force which challenges the elitist status quo (Laclau, 2006; Raby, 2006), and implements social change (Collins, 2014). Others criticise the populist label as inaccurate and simplistic (Ellner, 2012: 112), or as irrelevant (Raby, 2006: 237). But other sympathisers accept the negative connotation of populism, and forcefully reject its application as an attempt to "delegitimate and disqualify" these leaders (Motta, 2011: 44).

The result is that "the distinction between good and bad Latin American lefts seems to resemble more closely the preconceptions and misconceptions of those who hold it" (Leiras, 2007: 399). Thus while there does exist a widespread consensus as to there being different variants of leftist governments in the region, there is a lack of agreement as to the characteristics that bind them (Ellner, 2012: 97). Nor is there consensus on how to deal with the more conceptually challenging intermediate countries that do not fit easily into these dichotomous groups (Leiras, 2007: 399). Instead one side is labelled 'good' and the other 'populist,' as if this were sufficient to adequately explain away the complex questions these regimes raise (Ellner, 2012: 112). But as Luna asserts, "these labels are both too normatively biased and analytically obscuring" (2010: 29) to perform that task.

There are some exceptions to the normative approach to the study of the New Left. The volume of contributions edited by Roberts and Levitsky (2011) offers insights across a range of disciplines, and goes beyond the "ideal-typical" cases (Ibid: 410) to include both Argentina and Peru. In place of a bifurcation, the authors offer four different categories of left, relating to their respective support bases (Ibid: 13). In doing so, however, it could be argued that the authors create three new categories of populism: the "populist machine" of Peronism; the "populist left" of Chávez and Correa; and the "movement left" of Morales (who, as noted, is not therein labelled "populist," but is elsewhere classed as "movement populist" by one of the authors (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013)). Thus rather than pointing to a new way of conceiving of leaders in Latin America, this typology instead directs us into the thicket of populism.

This section has revealed that in response to the unprecedented support for leftist presidents in Latin America, the 'bifurcation' thesis was widely adopted. This division between the 'good' social-democrats and 'bad' populists has served to add to the already highly normative concept of populism and strengthen its "toxic brand". As a result, the effect of characterising these leaders as populists is to obscure the process of democratic and political dynamics within these governments (Lynch, 2017: 92; Andrade, 2005: 17). However, there are some scholars that consider this normative labelling to be "open to challenge" (Panizza & Miorelli, 2009: 39). In particular, this approach begs the question of how these presidents won power in the first place, and went on in many cases to remain in office for some time.

On the basis of the foregoing, this study will not employ 'populism' as an explanatory concept in attempting to answer its central research question. Nonetheless, the persistence of this way of doing politics that many characterise as 'populism' indicates that aspects of it remain relevant to the study of politics in the region. As Knight notes, its staying power may suggest some "inherent qualities, some affinity with the Latin American reality" (1998: 224). This thesis adopts Quintero's view that populism is a largely descriptive category (2009) that can serve as a starting point for more comprehensive analysis. Leaders like Hugo Chávez, Evo Morales and Rafael Correa have been described as "exemplary cases of radical populism" (Cameron, 2014: 788), and were electorally legitimised on a variety of occasions over extended periods. Accordingly, the next section will review what the distinct but intertwined literature on populism and the left in Latin America says regarding the emergence of and support for left populists.

1.3 Support for Left Populists

Much of the literature under review concentrates on the 'emergence' of populism and the New Left in Latin America. This section will consider the explanations put forward for electoral support for populists or outsiders; leftist regimes; and left populists in particular. The most commonly cited causal factor that leads an electorate to support a populist or 'outsider' candidate is the presence of some preceding crisis or critical juncture (Cannon, 2009: 15; de la Torre & Arnson, 2013). However, the literature is divided on what constitutes a crisis, the causes of crises, and the causal mechanism that leads from crisis to support for these candidates.

In spite of the widespread consensus on the importance of crisis (Cannon, 2009: 15), some scholars nonetheless assert that the populist way of doing politics in the context of Latin America is not unusual (De la Torre, 2007; Knight, 1998; Montúfar, 2013). It is contended that these occurrences are rooted in the reality of Latin America (Knight, 1998: 224) and "people's daily experiences" (De la Torre & Arnson, 2013: 356). According to this view, populism is "mundane" (Knight, 1998: 229)

in that it "also arises in normal times" (de la Torre, 2007: 392). De la Torre cites Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela as examples of countries in which populism is a "recurrent feature" (Ibid). Nevertheless, the same author notes "what is needed are particular circumstances where these populist appeals will work" (2000: 118). Similarly, Peñaherrera draws a distinction between latent populism, which is ever-present, and actual populism, which finds particular support and legitimacy at times of crisis (1992). Roberts sees populism as a "perpetual tendency" which "surges most strongly in contexts of crisis or profound social transformation" (1995: 113).

Accordingly the majority view is that some form of "critical juncture" (Collier & Collier, 1991; Roberts, 2007) is needed for populism to succeed. Beyond this general explanation, however, the literature contains little by way of consensus on what crisis is or how it comes about. An overview reveals references to crises of security (De la Torre & Arnson, 2013: 356); economics (Weyland, 1996); institutions (Cammack, 2000; Levitsky & Loxton, 2013); representation (Panizza, 2000; Roberts, 2007); legitimacy (Conaghan, 2007; Collins, 2014); governability (Mayorga, 2006); and ideological discourse (Laclau, 1977). As Knight states, "'crisis' is a vague, promiscuously used, under-theorised concept which defies measurement and lacks explanatory power" (1998: 227). It is therefore necessary to more closely examine what the literature has to say about the nature and cause of critical junctures.

Adopting an economic approach, Remmer (2012) links such crises to the vulnerability of the region's economies to international pressures. The rentier state theory put forward by Weyland, on the other hand, posits that the "availability of huge raw material rents" accounts for the radical or populist left (2009: 151). According to this logic, knowledge of "windfall gains" from the natural resource "bonanza" led voters in Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia to lose patience with neoliberal constraints and fall prey to populist promises (Ibid: 146). To some extent this theory builds upon Weyland's previous work utilising "prospect theory" to posit that voters "who face the danger of losses prefer risky choices," (2002: 5), and which stresses the role of crises in bringing about radical change (Ibid: 7). However, this theory has been questioned empirically (Madrid, 2010: 592), and is more commonly cited in the literature as a determinant of governance (Schamis, 2006; Mazzuca, 2013). Accordingly it will be considered in the following section of this chapter that focuses on the actions of leaders once in power. Others highlight exogenous factors such as the destabilising effects of globalisation (Cannon, 2009; Stokes, 2009), or a backlash against neoliberal economic policies (Baker & Greene, 2011; Madrid, 2010), but do not necessarily find them compelling (Stokes, 2009).

Those adopting a discursive approach focus on crises that emerge as a result of either a "fracture in the power bloc," or a crisis in the ability of the system to meet demands from below, which Laclau

dubs a "crisis of transformism" (1977: 175). This crisis becomes a "populist rupture" (Ibid: 177) by way of antagonistic appeals to the people which "isolate mediating institutions" (Cannon, 2009: 21). Nevertheless, many leaders make direct appeals, but not all discourses are accepted (Raby, 2006; Roxborough, 1984). Under what circumstances might these appeals garner support? Some consider that crises arise independently, providing leaders with the opportunity to demonstrate 'extraordinary' qualities (Weyland, 1996: 18; Conniff, 2012: 17). But others believe leaders play an active role in making appeals that heighten crises (Zúquete, 2008: 93; Laclau, 2005). De la Torre refers to a "double-sided interactive social process" of relationship-building between leader and follower (2010: 10).

Other scholars take a political approach that focuses on the "institutional implications of populism" (Cammack, 2000: 152). In particular, explanations have focussed on the role of institutions in mediating between government and citizens (Ibid: 154), with a focus on "the weakness, ineffectiveness, or collapse" of political parties (De la Torre & Arnson, 2013: 354). When the institutionalised channels of political representation function effectively, latent "populist tendencies" are restrained (Roberts, 2007: 11). However when those institutions fail or are captured by particular interests (Cammack, 2000: 154), "political space" is created, allowing populist "saviours" to emerge (Roberts, 1995: 113). To put it another way, "populists appeal past ossified institutions to the living people" (Canovan, 1999: 14). If this is correct, populist waves should occur "during periods of institutional crisis, decay or transition" (Roberts, 2007: 4). However, this approach suffers from a lack of clarity regarding the causal interaction between crisis, institutional weakness, and populist emergence. Roberts outlines how neoliberal reforms "shredded the bonds" of corporatism relied on by traditional parties, opening the field to populism (2003: 39). Others contend that the weakness or collapse of party systems did not merely present a political opening for left populists, but attribute it to the temptation of direct appeals from populist candidates (Weyland, 2009; Levitsky & Cameron, 2003). This issue has led some to raise the issue of endogeneity within institutional explanations of the emergence and nature of populism (Doyle, 2011).

However the success of those appeals is said to depend on the intangible factor of charismatic leadership (Cannon, 2009; de la Torre, 2010). Charisma is said to help candidates overcome the lack of clientelistic or other linkages, due to "the psychic rewards and security" it provides (Conniff, 2012: 16). In this way the leader provides the "broad appeal" (Collins, 2014: 62; Madrid, 2008) needed for electoral success. Thus we return to the image of the charismatic leader appearing to fill the political void. As we have seen, however, direct appeals by these leaders are not always accepted (Raby, 2006). Collins describes the circumstances which produced the left populists in the following terms: "when elections take place in a context characterised by the collapse of the party

system and social movements are stridently questioning the legitimacy of the traditional political class, the scenario is ripe for the emergence of a charismatic leader" (2014: 79). This critical juncture has therefore been characterised as a crisis of legitimacy of the democratic order (Ibid; Conaghan, 2007). This builds upon the notion of the institutional crisis by focussing on the effects of the breakdown of representation on voters, with particular emphasis on the Andean region (Mainwaring et al, 2006).

According to the literature, this crisis was brought about by an erosion of trust in the institutions of liberal democracy (Doyle, 2011). The roots of that distrust are attributed to state weakness (Mainwaring, et al, 2006), which is noted to be particularly acute in the Andean countries (Ibid; Lehoucq, 2008; Levitsky, 2011). According to Mainwaring et al (2006) the crisis can be observed by both attitudinal and behavioural indicators. Scholars have put forward evidence of high electoral volatility (Ibid), and public opinion survey data which details the loss of legitimacy of formal democratic institutions. Political parties and legislatures have the lowest levels of legitimacy (Latinobarometro, 2007; Seligson, 2007), with the result that voters are attracted to "'outsider' or radical populist candidates" (Doyle, 2011: 1449).

An element that is of particular note in this literature is the assertion that not only are these candidates "keenly aware of the public's anti-political mood" (Conaghan, 2008: 49), but "actively capitalise" on it (Doyle, 2011: 1452). This view implies that the policy platforms of left populist candidates were not adopted by chance, but rather as a result of electoral calculation. Similarly, some attribute the electoral success of the left in general, including left populists, to the relative moderation of their electoral offerings (Baker & Greene, 2011). Particular attention is drawn to the moderation by left populists (including Correa and Humala) in run-off elections (Castañeda & Morales, 2007; Tanaka, 2011). This moderation related both to discourse (Ibid) and policy offerings (Castañeda & Morales, 2007; Baker & Greene, 2011), and is again suggestive of a degree of calculation by these candidates.

While some distinctive factors emerge from the literature analysing the New Left more broadly – such as geopolitical changes since the end of the Cold War (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 8), or the importance of ideology (Baker & Greene, 2011) – the dominant explanations for the emergence of these leaders overlap with the literature on populism. For example, Luna outlines the elements of the support for the New Left (not confined to the "so-called populist cases"): (1) opposition to incumbents; (2) broad, socially heterogeneous coalition; (3) charismatic leader (2010: 24). As Luna notes, theories regarding support for the left focus "almost exclusively on analysing leadership style, political discourse and rhetoric, and short-term institutional developments" (Ibid: 23). Thus the literature on left populism suggests elements that may lead to its emergence – crisis, weak

institutions, direct appeals, charismatic leadership – but is unclear if all are required, or how they fit together.

Due to the incomplete nature of these proposed explanations, some focus not only on "causes," but also on the underlying context from which they arise (Cannon, 2009: 19). For example, some scholars highlight the persistent poverty, inequality and exclusion across Latin America (De la Torre & Arnson, 2013; Doyle, 2011; Cleary, 2006; Levitsky & Roberts, 2011). According to Castañeda, the emergence of the left (including populist left) is a result of "the combination of inequality and democracy" (2006: 30). In response, some contend that this inequality is both long-standing and ubiquitous in Latin America (Cleary, 2006). Attention has also been drawn to the region's endemic corruption and high levels of crime (Doyle, 2011: 1452) and occasional security crises (De la Torre & Arnson, 2013: 356). Scholars have focussed in particular on exclusion, pointing to the fact that a majority of citizens are "legally poor" (O'Donnell, 2001: 602) as they receive "little or no protection under the law" (Oxhorn, 1998: 232). Cleary notes that in several countries the seeds for this exclusion were sown by way of 'pacted' transitions from authoritarianism to democracy (2006: 41).

Arising out of this entrenched inequality and exclusion, a separate theory for the left populists contends that powerful social movements have provided "the primary impetus for social and political change" (Barrett et al, 2008: 32). According to this reasoning, the impact of indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia, the *piqueteros* in Argentina, and the Landless Workers' Movement (MST) in Brazil, paved the way for electoral wins by leftist candidates (Ibid; Cleary, 2006; Lynch, 2007; Wolff, 2007). According to Cleary (2006), social and indigenous movements provided the "structural bases" for translating "latent and diffuse support" into electoral success for left populists (Ibid: 39). According to de la Torre, this organised support from social movements was also a factor in the success of left populists like Chávez, Gutiérrez and Correa (2007: 393).

Silva (2009) builds on this premise in a comprehensive analysis of the role played by waves of anti-neoliberal contention by horizontally articulated social and protest movements in South America in bringing leaders of the New Left to power. While not framed explicitly in terms of populism or the left, Silva's chosen cases largely map onto the countries where left populists have emerged. This analysis reveals that movements engaged in mobilisations which forced ousters of presidents and ushered in governments that were more inclined to reform neoliberalism (Ibid: 53). Lynch agrees, asserting that these governments are the "political expression" of these movements (2017: 97), while Lievesley believes that popular struggles were "vital" to the process of the leftward turn in the region (2009: 25). In the case of the left populists, Collins goes further, describing the indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia as "incubators of these future campaigns" (2014:

62). Collins asserts that charismatic leaders merely "piggybacked" on the work of those movements, and rode it to victory (Ibid: 61). The labelling and demonising of these leaders as 'populists', however, "blinded" analysts from recognising the legitimacy or influence of popular sector demands (Silva, 2009: 11).

This review of the literature on when left populist candidates attract electoral support finds considerable consensus regarding the importance of crisis. However, the nature of the crisis or the precise mechanism that brings these candidates to power is not particularly clear. The literature points to certain factors that contribute to the emergence of left populist or outsider candidates: economic bust or boom, weak political institutions, direct appeals, and (charismatic) leadership. Nonetheless, these factors do not appear sufficient of themselves to explain the widespread electoral success of left populists. The literature points to other factors that arguably better account for the timing and individual characteristics of the shift to the left, notably the influence of social and indigenous movements in shaping the electoral agenda. The next section will analyse the literature on left populism in power.

1.4 Left Populism in Power

The difficulties that have been identified in this review of the literature on populism and the left in Latin America are strongly evident in what has been written about the performance of left populists in power. Conceptual confusion, normative charge, excessive focus on the leader, and the tendency to either 'define away' or incorporate characteristics which do not fit, all contribute to limiting the value of this literature beyond providing a general descriptive overview. The inability of this literature to deepen understanding of the actions of these leaders in power has seen scholars import outside concepts that at least indicate that 'populists' are not born but rather formed by external influences. Nevertheless, with regard to 'switching', the established weaknesses and contradictions of left populism serve more to obscure than enlighten.

As noted in the foregoing section, populism is conceived of in the literature as an electoral appeal (Madrid, 2008), but also a type of "political regime" (Panizza, 2000). What then does the literature on left populism tell us about how candidates that make populist appeals on the campaign trail will govern upon taking power? The answer appears once again to depend on the approach taken to the concept of populism. In spite of this lack of clarity regarding the contents of 'populism in power', however, there is an inherent assumption in much of the literature that populist campaigns lead inevitably to populist governance; and therefore that the populist style of governance may be induced from the behaviour in office of those actors.

One example is provided by the discursive approach, which offers little in the way of specifics on policy initiatives but focuses on "ideational components" (Zúquete, 2008: 93). In particular, it emphasises a Manichaean anti-status quo discourse which frames the struggle as an "ethical and moral confrontation between good and evil" (De la Torre, 2007: 389). In this way political actors are populist "to the extent and only to the extent" that they make direct appeals to the people "against their countries' political and economic orders" (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 73). Analogous elements of governance are the use of symbolism (Zúquete, 2008), and impatience with dissent that can result in repression (De la Torre, 2007). References to charisma are common (De la Torre, 2013a), but not all scholars consider it central (Oxhorn, 1998; Barr, 2009). According to this perspective, these presidents legitimate their leadership via mass rallies and the occupation of public spaces (Rovira, 2013: 11), without setting out the mechanism through which such events are organised. Nevertheless, even adherents to this approach acknowledge there is more to these leaders than oratory (Raby, 2006: 249); they also implement changes that challenge the status quo (Collins, 2014). As Rovira notes, "there is a political economy beyond this anti-imperialist rhetoric" (2014: 6), but this approach does not purport to analyse it beyond referencing a discourse "centred on material redistribution" (2013: 11).

Those advocating an economic perspective provide more detail regarding these redistributive policies, but typically view them normatively as signifying reckless spending (Kaufman, 2011). As noted, the economic policies of left of centre governments in Latin America have typically been labelled 'populist' (Moreno-Brid & Paunovic, 2010: 196). According to this view, the advent of the commodities boom incentivised leftist leaders to engage in redistribution (Weyland, 2009), but did not entirely define their strategies in power (Murillo et al, 2011: 65). Some note that while left populists like Chávez and Correa pursued more redistributive economic policies (Kaufman, 2011), they did not substantively break free of the global economic system (Panizza, 2005). Others however take a more normative view, asserting that this newfound wealth led left populists to delegitimise fiscal responsibility, and promote "dangerous polarisations and confrontation" (Weyland, 2009: 152). Having also asserted that the commodities boom led voters to support left populists (Ibid), this argument appears more normative than explanatory. A more nuanced view is that these leaders used the newfound state wealth to alter the political balance of power (Moreno-Brid & Paunovic, 2010: 196), thereby pointing toward political factors to provide a more rounded view of their actions in office.

The political perspective fails to provide much more detail on how populists govern as a result of conceptual confusion and normativity, however. This approach emphasises the unmediated, uninstitutionalised, and "mostly" unorganised nature of their political support (Weyland, 2001). This literature focuses on the support bases and institutional aspects of populism, pointing to a direct

connection between leader and follower (Ibid; Roberts, 2007). Yet the dynamics of this relationship between the leader and 'the people,' and its impact on performance in power is not clear. Some believe this approach puts too much attention on leaders and treats followers as a "disorganised mass" (Rovira, 2014: 3). In response, some scholars point to the importance of clientelism in ensuring public support, noting its use among the bases of Chávez (Lynch, 2007) and Correa (De la Torre, 2013a). Nevertheless, Lynch believes that top-down leadership and reliance on clientelism are not of themselves 'populist' qualities (2017: 85). Conniff concurs, noting that populist leaders are less reliant on clientelism due to the security provided by the figure of leader (2012: 16). It is therefore hard to disagree with Andrade's assertion that political populism fails to account for these dynamics due to an "excessive concentration" on the leader which only causes confusion (2005: 104).

The other problem with the political approach is its normativity when applied to left populists in power. Scholars frequently reference the relationship between populism and liberal democracy, holding populists responsible for weakening institutions of accountability (Weyland, 2003, 2013; Levitsky & Cameron, 2003). As noted however, populist appeals are more likely to succeed at times of weak institutions, meaning that they will likely govern under similar conditions (Cameron, 2007). Furthermore, this perspective does not acknowledge new institutions of democracy, which some argue have been created by populist regimes (Mayorga, 2006; Motta, 2011; Philip & Panizza, 2011). Regarding the tendency by these leaders to strengthen the powers of the executive branch, some view it as a means to ensure their survival (Conaghan, 2011: 270), while others see it as an attempt to overcome the damaging power of special interests (Peruzzotti, 2013: 146). Lynch notes a tendency to extend this logic to view left populists as authoritarian (2017: 87), with some arguing that populist campaigns result in "competitive authoritarian" regimes (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013). While de la Torre rejects this label and other normative views, he notes anti-democratic tendencies among the populist left, but inevitably incorporates these features into the expanding definition of populism (2013c).

Thus due to a combination of normative judgement and lack of conceptual clarity, the established approaches to populism fail to provide a complete account of how left populists govern beyond descriptions. Nor does the literature on the New Left, with its reliance on the 'two lefts' taxonomy and excessive focus on "ideal-typical" cases (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 410), provide much additional analysis. Instead it invokes theories of populism. Perhaps acknowledging the limitations of these analytical tools, authors have imported concepts from US politics like the permanent campaign (Conaghan & de la Torre, 2008; López Maya, 2013), the plebiscitary presidency (Conaghan, 2008), and political linkages (Barr, 2009) to attempt to explain the actions of these leaders in power. The first concept of the permanent campaign appears primarily descriptive,

however, and is another example of populism being expanded incorporate more features in response to empirical reality (Rovira, 2013: 11).

The concept of linkages is also largely descriptive, but raises some issues around constraints that are relevant to this study. Political linkage "concerns the means by which political actors and constituents exchange support and influence" (Barr, 2009: 34). Particular attention is given to the concept of plebiscitarianism, an "extremely vertical form of linkage" which Barr considers the distinguishing feature of populism (Ibid: 36). Conaghan defines plebiscitarianism as "direct, unmediated appeals to public opinion in order to govern 'over the heads' of other institutions" to study the Correa presidency (2008: 47). The use of this concept of plebiscitarian linkages is increasingly common in the literature on left populism (Roberts, 2007, 2012; Conaghan, 2008; Barr, 2009; Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; López Maya, 2011; Levitsky, 2011; Collins, 2014). Per this conception, left populists govern via plebiscitarian linkages with "followers" (Philip & Panizza, 2011), aided by a mix of clientelistic (Freidenberg, 2008a; De la Torre, 2013a) and charismatic linkages (Conniff, 2012), while moderates forge coalitional linkages with opposition parties (Levitsky, 2011).

Much of the above could be said to recreate the 'characteristics' of left populism in the form of linkages. The approach taken by Handlin and Collier (2011), however, develops the concept of participatory linkages between leftist governments and civil society. This view comes from a recognition that the "catch-all" view of plebiscitary linkages with "atomised individuals" is not precise enough to capture the dynamics of the left in power (Ibid: 147). Instead it is necessary to pay more attention to the "organic collective links mediated through organisations" such as labour or social movements (Ibid). To this concept of linkages, Luna adds an emphasis on constraints in determining how these leaders govern (Ibid: 26). These fresh conceptions of linkages and constraints are important provide some evidence of external factors that may control and shape the governance of left populists.

Other scholars have attempted to extend the concept of political populism in Latin America to cover differing outcomes by presenting it as "part of the strategic repertoire of political leaders who may not usually be regarded as populists but who occasionally make populist appeals" (Philip & Panizza, 2011, 73). This "instrumental use" of populism (Bejarano, 2013) allows not only for populist actors, but also "interventions" (Panizza, 2013: 106). According to this view, political actors may combine, adapt or abandon populist stratagems, and thus are "never entirely defined" by populism (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 73). This vision suggests that governing in a populist fashion is a conscious, rational act, with both risks and rewards. In this vein, scholars have written about right-winger Uribe in Colombia (Bejarano, 2013), and leftists Lula in Brazil, and Mujica in Uruguay (Panizza, 2013),

making use of populist strategies as part of their repertoire, while refusing to consider them populists. This instrumental conception is highly problematic, however, as it essentially disregards previous theories regarding the emergence of populism as requiring some form of 'critical juncture'. Furthermore, this view does not merely clash with other approaches to populism (Lynch, 2017), but presents a division within the political perspective.

As this section has revealed, the literature on the performance of left populists in power contains numerous deficiencies. The next section will consider what this literature has to say more specifically with regard to policy switching.

1.5 Switching and Left Populism

In addition to this work on left populists in power, the literature on this topic has addressed the issue of 'switching' in office. In the opinion of Quintero, this phenomenon of exploiting the public via "shiny promises that are later shown to be false" is one that populism as a concept struggles to capture (2009: 76). It has been acknowledged (Cunha, 2013: 520) that this phenomenon was first identified as "bait and switch strategies" in the literature on Latin American populism (Drake, 1991: 36), and which has attracted recent attention focussed on switching by leftist candidates (Cunha, 2013; Campello, 2014). Adopting an economic perspective, Drake makes reference to "resource constraints" (1991: 36), but does not outline a detailed explanation. Using a similar approach, Murillo et al (2011) assert that the absence of such constraints due to the commodities boom "empowered" presidents elected on left-wing platforms, highlighting the availability of credit and financial space. Yet this economic perspective is acknowledged by proponents as failing to provide a complete account of whether or not a switch occurs (Ibid).

The political perspective on left populism and switching fails to elucidate the dynamics that lead some to switch while others do not. Instead this literature is once again dogged by conceptual confusion and normativity. While those writing from an economic perspective viewed switches by those elected on leftist platforms toward neoliberal policy as evidence of the absence of populism (Kaufman & Stallings, 1991), other scholars instead incorporated this 'switching' as a core characteristic of a new form of populism (Roberts, 1995). "Unexpected affinities" (Weyland, 1996) were found between neoliberalism and populism to justify the expansion of the populist governance style to include different economic policies, but without in-depth analysis of the factors that brought these switches about.

This tendency in the populism literature to obscure or absorb the puzzle of switching is evident in two other forms: namely in the assumption of continuity between campaign and presidency on the

one hand, and the defining away of the puzzle on the other. Firstly, the literature contains only passing mentions of the distinction between populism as a form of governance and as an electoral appeal (Peñaherrera, 1992; Madrid, 2008; Collins, 2014). This "double phase of populism" does not, some scholars note, necessarily amount to a "two-step process" (Peñaherrera, 1992: 79). Nevertheless, a more common assumption is that populism is path dependent. Both the economic and political perspectives implicitly assume that those classified as populists on the campaign trail will proceed to govern in a 'reckless' or 'radical' manner unless constrained from so doing. For example, Weyland's political definition refers to the use of populism "to win and exercise power" (2001: 11), without differentiating between them. Writing with regard to left populists, the same author stresses the path-dependent nature of populism, believing the "radical posture" of the campaign was automatically reproduced in office, noting that these leaders were "born radical" and "remained contestatory" in office (Weyland, 2010: 22).

The corollary of this approach is the literature's tendency to define the puzzle away. That is to say, when left populists fail to honour their promises, scholars revise their account of the election of these presidents to claim that they were never left populist, thereby obscuring the 'switch' that occurred. Take, for example, the case of Alan García, twice President of Peru. Upon his election in 2006, García was placed squarely within the 'left turn' in Latin America (Cleary, 2006; Schamis, 2006; Castañeda & Morales, 2007). García won office by way of a campaign that used a Manichaean anti-elite discourse (Patriau, 2012), abetted by "populist promises" (McClintock, 2006: 106). Although he moderated his discourse in the second round of voting, García's APRA party was cited as an example of an "established populist machine" (Cameron, 2007) returning to power under "reinvigorated populist leadership" (Roberts, 2007: 12). Once in power, however, García moved to the right, opting to govern for the APRA base and the business elite, rather than the Peruvian people as a whole (Cameron, 2007). García forged a coalition in Congress, and did not attack "institutions of horizontal accountability" (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013: 123). As a result, García's presidency is classed as non-leftist (Lynch, 2007) and non-populist (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013). Furthermore, in retrospect his campaign has been described as "anything but populist" (Ibid: 123).

In an attempt to shed some light on switching, Roberts suggests that a lack of "organisational bonds" – including with "civic support groups" – allows those elected as populists the freedom to switch allegiances and policies (2006: 138). Conaghan makes a similar argument in the context of the left, noting that a lack of congressional support incentivised Correa to ensure his political survival by engineering a new Constitution which strengthened the power of the Executive (2011). Thus the contention is that Correa did not switch due to his lack of legislative support. However elsewhere it is contended that Gutiérrez was forced to switch due to his lack of seats in Congress (De la Torre,

2015). Furthermore, the fact that both 'non-switcher' Correa and 'switcher' Gutiérrez are classified as 'populists' – on the basis that Gutiérrez abandoned his policy platform but "maintained political populism" (Weyland, 2003: 1109) – signifies that the concept is incapable of explaining switching.

With the emergence of left populist presidents, the treatment of switching became increasingly normative, and even more confusing. Abandoning his prior view of switching as a characteristic of populism, Roberts now contends that switching is a factor in the emergence of left populism, citing the case of Chávez in Venezuela (2013). Per this view, the adoption of neoliberal policies in a "bait-and-switch fashion" helped engender a crisis that led to a populist movement (Ibid: 1440). More specifically, these switches were "highly destabilising" for the political party system (Ibid: 1442), and led to discontent being channelled into social and protest movements that helped to bring outsider or anti-system populists to power (Ibid: 1444). On the other hand, Weyland – who similarly abandoned his prior view of switching as linked to populism (1996) – contends that switching on policy platforms helps to avoid the emergence of populism (2009). According to this view, switches away from 'radicalism' by the left in Brazil and Chile laid the foundations for the success of the good/non-populist left in those countries (Ibid).

According to the literature, populists "do not accept the rules of the game" (de la Torre, 2013c: 11). While this assertion has a ring of truth, it overlooks the fact that 'left populist' actors have governed a variety of ways. Nestor Kirchner and Alan García headed large party organisations, yet between them made liberal use of executive decrees (Schamis, 2013), and repressed protest (Burron, 2012); radical leftists like Gutiérrez, Humala in Peru, and Ortega in Nicaragua forged pacts with the opposition to assemble governing coalitions (Ibid; Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005; Ellner, 2012). Even Chávez, the trailblazer radical leftist, began his rule by as head of a broad leftist coalition that pursued moderate 'third-way' economics and respected institutions (Sánchez-Urribarri, 2008). Nevertheless, the impression given by much of the literature is that if a candidate elected as a populist proceeds to govern broadly within the rules of the political or economic game, then it is as a result of a rational and logical assessment of the constraints and opportunities. However, if they proceed to govern in a manner that seeks to avoid or perhaps re-define those rules, it is because that is their nature.

This underlying assumption is to be found both in writings by scholars that are critical of these leaders (Weyland, 2010), and those who view them in a more positive light (Lynch, 2017), offering little detail on why these leaders "do what they say" while others "did what they wanted", i.e. 'switched' (Ibid: 97). This study contends that there is more to this dynamic than the 'nature' of these leaders. Instead it is contended that upon taking power these leaders make choices with regard

to honouring their campaign promises based on an assessment of the correlation of forces. As Panizza writes about a 'neoliberal neopopulist':

> "Once in office Collor faced two options: he could either radicalise the 'politics of anti-politics' campaign and refuse to acknowledge the legitimacy of the existing political establishment or, alternatively, become immersed in the political game, thus losing his status as political outsider" (2000: 187-8)

In relation to switching by left populists, the literature reviewed offers no comprehensive account of policy switching, making only oblique references to the pressures that may be brought to bear on an incumbent in that position. As has been noted, the transition from "campaign to governing alliance" is uncertain (Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 137). Much is made of the risks inherent in candidates abandoning their mandates (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013; Panizza, 2013); however, there are clearly risks in pursuing a strategy based on "high-stakes electoral contests" (Conaghan & de la Torre, 2008: 269; Ellner, 2012). While the literature implicitly acknowledges the changed political landscape of the region, noting that unlike in the past contemporary presidents "do not dare betray their popular mandates" (Lynch, 2007: 373), it is deficient in providing detailed explanations for this change. For example, consider the case of two populist presidents in Ecuador: Gutiérrez "followed the strategy of accommodation with the establishment and lost power," while Correa "chose the foundational path and won re-election" (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 88).

As this section has revealed, the tendency of the concept of the literature on populism in Latin America to obscure rather than explain is particularly evident with regard to switching, even though it is a phenomenon that is closely associated with left populism in the region. While the literature makes tangential reference to the choice that faces left populist presidents upon taking power, it fails to outline systematic explanations for why some switch and others do not.

1.6 Conclusion

This thesis is concerned with why some left populist presidents switch and abandon their mandates, while others do not. With regard to the emergence of these left populists, the literature advances economic and politico-institutional explanations. However, these elements struggle to comprehensively account for the timing, policy offerings, and distinctive linkages that characterise the populist left. A separate school of thought focuses on the influence of social and protest movements on support for left populists. Nevertheless, accounts of left populist leaders in power make little reference to these movements. Instead emphasis is again placed on economic and institutional constraints and incentives. Furthermore, attempts to account for the actions of left populists in power are clouded by conceptual confusion, normative judgement, and the incorporation of puzzling behaviour into populism. This tendency in particularly apparent with

regard to switching, which has variously been described as a characteristic of populism, a cause of populism, and a contributory factor to the avoidance of populism.

Building on the literature on left populist switching, the next chapter will set out in more detail the universe of cases being studied, consider competing explanations for this behaviour, critically assess the concept of 'switching', and advance an original theoretical framework for explaining why some left populists switch and others do not.

Chapter 2: Explanations for Switching

2.1 Introduction

In recent years some populist leaders have gained power with broadly leftist appeals, which this thesis will refer to as the left populists. When studying these leaders, one of the puzzles that has been identified is why some left populist presidents in Latin America once in office move away from the policies that they proposed during their campaigns, while others do not? Why do some switch but not others?

As the previous chapter revealed, the treatment in the literature is largely inconsistent and disorderly. In particular, the issue raises a number of subsidiary questions, including: who are these left populists? What does left populism in power look like? What constitutes a switch in this context? Does switching vary over time? What explains why some left populist leaders switch and others do not? This thesis addresses these issues. In particular, it will help to systematise the identification of these phenomena by proposing characteristics of both switching and non-switching in power, and by providing an explanation for why switching occurs in some cases but not in others.

This chapter will provide descriptive tools for identifying left populists. switchers and non-switchers in power, and the members of the overall universe of cases. The chapter will then consider competing explanations for switching, drawing not only from the literatures on left populism in Latin America, but also the literature on mandates and 'policy switching'. The chapter concludes by setting out this study's preferred causal explanation and theoretical framework.

2.2 Identifying Left Populist Switching: The Universe of Cases

This section will begin by assembling a broad set of election offerings that are associated with the contemporary populist left in Latin America. It will then proceed to outline general characteristics of switching and non-switching in this particular context. These characteristics are assembled predominantly by induction from the behaviour in office of those considered "full populists" (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013). However, as previously outlined, not all actors that present as left populist during their election campaigns necessarily govern in line with their mandates. This section will go on to consider the path of switching, and identify its characteristics in a similarly inductive manner.

A review of the literature on populism reveals a tendency to classify actors as populist "by fiat rather than through any kind of systematic measurement" (Hawkins, 2009: 1041). This thesis instead sets out a general list of campaign offerings that are the basis for classifying a presidential candidate as left populist in order to facilitate comparison. In both the early populism literature on 'bait-and-switch' presidents (Drake, 1991), and the literature on policy switching (Stokes, 2001; Campello, 2014), the overwhelming focus has been on the promise of redistributive policies (what Stokes terms 'security-oriented' policies (2001)). This focus is in line with that expressed in the literature on the left in Latin America, which views the "programmatic centrality" of redistributive policies as they key distinguishing feature of leftists (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 5). Nevertheless, the set of proposed reforms associated with the particular context of the contemporary left in Latin America was considerably broader than economic redistribution.

Firstly, the economies of most countries in the region rely heavily on rents from natural resources. As a result, enhanced state control over these strategic resources was frequently presented as an essential pre-condition to redistribution (Mazzuca, 2013). Furthermore, the literature has revealed that the conditions, or critical juncture, that led to increased support for left-wing candidates was mainly politico-institutional rather than economic (Conaghan, 2008; Collins, 2014). This has been attributed mainly to the decline in the ability of parties to effectively channel demands, leading to the political exclusion of large numbers of citizens (Cleary, 2006; Roberts, 2013). Accordingly, offers of institutional reform were commonly contained in the electoral offerings of left populists (Silva, 2009; Ellner, 2014). Some scholars assert that this political exclusion had its roots in the advent of neoliberal economic policies that subordinated social outcomes in the region to market forces (Roberts, 2008; Silva, 2009). Thus the electoral offerings of the new leftists contained plans to extend both rights and social protections to a wider percentage of the populace (Ibid). Finally, in response to the disarticulating effects of globalisation, many promised to assert the nation's sovereignty and realign its international relations (Cannon, 2009; Ellner, 2014).

The precise campaign promises varied between countries, candidates and over time. Nonetheless, along with promises of redistribution, the electoral offerings of those that may properly be classified as left populist typically covered five broad policy areas of reform: politico-institutional, economic, natural resources, social and international. Below is a descriptive checklist of common aspects of these policy platforms:

i) Politico-Institutional: Substantive reforms to the institutional frameworks of these countries in order to permit increased democratic participation and citizen control, including combating corruption. These offers were frequently "bundled" into constituent assemblies to re-write or reform the constitution, and re-order institutions.

ii) Economic: Along with express criticism of neoliberalism, promises in this sphere typically related to the 'return' of the state, implying greater involvement in the planning and regulation of the economy. In some circumstances, promises extended to systematic wealth redistribution, in the form of land reform and stronger taxation, and to alternative economic models based on sustainability and enhanced environmental protection, such as food sovereignty and solidarity economics.

iii) Natural Resources: Offerings by left populist candidates frequently contained appeals to resource nationalism, ranging from promises to increase both the role and income of the state, to partial or full nationalisation of strategic resources.

iv) Social: Campaign offerings frequently responded to calls for stronger social protection by extending both services and rights. The former included promises to increase investment and coverage of key public services such as health, education and infrastructure. In terms of rights, offers varied but broadly included the extension of 'positive' rights to address basic needs, women's rights, collective and indigenous rights, cultural rights, labour rights, and rights for the environment.

v) International: Promises to assert national sovereignty, typically by distancing from the US in moves such as refusing to sign free trade agreements or cooperate in the security sphere. Other aspects identified include antipathy toward international financial institutions such as the IMF, and offers to pursue a multi-polar foreign policy that strengthened intra-regional and South-South cooperation.

It is not asserted that each left populist candidate included these precise offerings in their campaigns, nor did they give to them equal emphasis. Nevertheless, aspects of each of these five broad offerings can be found in the campaign messages of those generally classified as left populists in contemporary Latin America. As well as assisting with the identification of a suitable 'universe' of cases for study, the list above makes clear that the electoral offerings of left populist candidates extended far beyond redistribution. Thus while redistribution is correctly considered a generally unifying strand for leftism, in the context of the contemporary left populists in Latin America, the programmatic offerings encompassed a range of substantial reforms to economies, polities and societies across the region.

Secondly, having identified the left populist candidates and the parameters of their electoral offerings, this section identifies a broad set of common characteristics that distinguish left populist 'switchers' from 'non-switchers' in the contemporary Latin American context. These characteristics are not intended to provide a rigorous test of switching; that will be provided via the in-depth case studies in subsequent chapters. Rather these common features that broadly cover

policy output, discourse, strategies, and institutional reform, are provided as easily observable indications of switching or not switching.

With regard to 'non-switching', these features are primarily based on the literature of left or radical populism in power, which exhibits a particular focus on the presidencies of Chávez, Morales and Correa (Philip & Panizza, 2011; Ellner, 2014). These are the presidents that the literature overwhelmingly considers 'left populist' and that are typically classified as 'non-switchers' (Jonson & Ryu, 2010). Scholars have noted the differences in the personal backgrounds, bases of support, and relations with social movements of Chávez, Morales, and Correa (Ellner, 2012; de la Torre, 2013b). Nonetheless, there exist considerable similarities in the policy platforms and political methods of all three presidents (Ellner, 2012; de la Torre & Arnson, 2013). On this basis we can identify the existence of a baseline that can be described broadly as non-switching in the context of contemporary Latin American left populism.

In particular, these leaders have been noted to: avoid forging links or coalitions with existing elites (Ellner, 2012); convoke Constituent Assemblies to "re-found" the nation (Bernal, 2014; Philip & Panizza, 2011); govern in a direct, unmediated fashion (Weyland, 2013); employ "plebiscitary tactics" to legitimise their rule (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013); use state funds for political purposes (Ibid; Corrales & Penfold, 2007); recentralise political power (Eaton, 2013); re-order institutions in order to weaken legislatures and strengthen the executive branch (Ellner, 2012; Weyland, 2013); create new institutions allowing for citizen participation and oversight (Collins, 2014); utilise Manichaean discourse (De la Torre, 2013b); move to harness a greater state share of natural resource rents (Weyland, 2009; Mazzuca, 2013); criticise neoliberalism and adopt state-centred economic policies (Flores Macias, 2010); assert sovereign control of natural resources (Ellner, 2012); and seek to distance the country from the influence of the US (Philip & Panizza, 2011).

A similar inductive process reveals that the characteristics of 'switching' by left populists in Latin America include the following elements: seeking accommodation with established political parties (Philip & Panizza, 2011; Levitsky & Loxton, 2013); the formation of coalitions of convenience (Montúfar, 2008; Mejía & Polga-Hecimovich, 2011), or vote-buying to maintain power (De la torre, 2015); the commencement or continuation of governance strategies associated with the neoliberal period, such as decentralisation and privatisation (Burron, 2012); the adoption of 'investor-friendly' economic policies (Ibid; Abente-Brun, 2009); the preservation of the existing institutional framework (Ibid; Burron, 2012; McClintock, 2013); the cultivation of close relations with the domestic landed and/or business elites (Ibid; Montúfar, 2008); and the promotion of stronger diplomatic relations with the US (Ibid; Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005). This approach can be broadly characterised as one of continuity and compromise.

It is this gap between the "imagined change" (Saltos, 2002: 12) of the election and the compromises with domestic and international power blocs that follow that distinguishes switching and non-switching behaviour in this context. Yet as noted previously, this puzzle of switching by left populists is under-studied, mainly because it is obscured as a result of the elastic nature of the concept of populism (Jansen, 2015). Those considered 'left populist' on the campaign trail are subsequently classified as 'non-populist' if they switch once in power (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013; McClintock, 2013). On the other hand, those that fail to switch are considered unremarkable on the basis of an understanding of populism as the "faithful representation" of the preferences of voters (Müller & Strøm, 1999: 4).

Deviations from this approach are rare, but Philip and Panizza do acknowledge that left populist leaders "face a number of options" in office (2011: 88). In particular, they can "radicalise the 'politics of anti-politics' campaign and refuse to acknowledge the legitimacy of the existing political establishment" (Ibid). Alternatively, they can "become immersed in the political game" thereby losing their status as political outsiders (Panizza, 2000: 188) and risk being tainted by their association with "politics as usual" (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 88). The first option reflects, in broad terms, the 'non-switching' path outlined above, an extension of which is the promotion of "new institutional arrangements" to shore up their rule and weaken opponents (Ibid). Meanwhile, the second option fits conceptually with the 'switching' path. In spite of the vulnerability of newly elected populist presidents, the literature on left populism in Latin America fails to devote much attention to the pressures that may be brought to bear on them upon assuming power. As noted, this transition from "campaign to governing alliance" is uncertain (Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 137), but by overwhelmingly treating left populists as extraordinary leaders, the literature fails to shed light on this puzzle.

This study contends that left populists are motivated by broadly the same factors as other politicians. What distinguishes them, however, are the circumstances in which they take office. Frequently these leaders assume power amidst a crisis of some kind, often requiring radical measures. Furthermore, the literature tells us that they typically enter power without a solid party organisation behind them. While this lack of institutionalised party support notionally affords them the freedom to choose how they will govern, it also presents them with the challenge of governing into the wind of a legislature often dominated by opposition political parties. As Hunt notes, upon taking power the challenge for leftist presidents is to reshape institutions while negotiating with "new political and social forces" and dealing with opposition actors (2016: 8).

While some level of contestation inevitably exists about the precise make-up of each group, a review of the literature reveals that the following leaders are considered to have been elected as left populists: Evo Morales in Bolivia; Lucio Gutiérrez and Rafael Correa of Ecuador (de la Torre & Arnson, 2013; Phillip & Panizza, 2011); Fernando Lugo of Paraguay (Prevost et al, 2012; Fassi, 2010); Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua (Close, 2011; Prevost et al, 2012); the Kirchners in Argentina (Roberts, 2007; Panizza, 2005a); Rafael Caldera, Hugo Chávez and Nicolas Maduro of Venezuela (Davila, 2000; Ellner, 2012; Savage, 2014); and Alan García and Ollanta Humala in Peru (McClintock, 2006; de la Torre & Arnson, 2013).

Furthermore, utilising the descriptive characteristics set out above, and based on an overview of the literature, we can tentatively classify the following left populist leaders as 'switchers': Rafael Caldera, Alan García, Ollanta Humala, Lucio Gutiérrez, Daniel Ortega, and Fernando Lugo. Meanwhile the following presidents can be classified as 'non-switchers': Hugo Chávez, Nicolas Maduro, Rafael Correa, Evo Morales and the Kirchners. These broad characterisations are not considered definitive, but rather are utilised here as indicative categorisations for the purposes of illustrating the puzzle that this thesis sets out to address. The case study chapters will unpack and problematise these broad descriptions by way of detailed analysis.

That the inclusion in these lists of some actors should be more contentious than others speaks to the very heart of the puzzle that is the subject matter of this research. Firstly, some would not be typically classified as 'left populists' but, as noted, this discrepancy relates primariliy to their behaviour in office rather than their electoral platforms. Put simply, some actors that won election on the basis of a left populist campaign have proceeded to govern broadly in line with their 'radical' discourse and electoral platform. Others, however, took a markedly different path upon gaining office, abandoning key promises to seek accommodation with the status quo. Still others switched at a later stage, while a small group were considered to have 'switched back' to their original mandate.Yet the literatures on Latin American populism and policy switching largely fail to capture these dyanmics.

This section has attempted to bring some order to the area of left populist switching in contemporary Latin American not hitherto provided by the literature. In particular, it formulated a broad set of electoral offerings that can be classified as left populist in the contemporary context of the region. Furthermore, this thesis has further proposed a set of descriptive features characteristic of left populist switchers and non-switchers in the contemporary setting. The formulation of these features constitutes a contribution by this study. These frameworks assist with the identification firstly of a 'universe' of cases in terms of left populist candidates; and secondly, with the determination of whether these candidates switched or not once in power. Furthermore, this thesis contributes more

broadly to the debate regarding left populists in power by drawing attention to the distinction between campaign and office, and the pressures that can be applied to presidents throughout this transition, which are dealt with at best tangentially in the literature. The next section will utilised these tools to identify the universe of cases for study.

2.3 Explaining Left Populist Switching

This section will identify and evaluate proposed explanations for the puzzling divergence of governing styles among leaders identified as 'left populists', drawing briefly on the literature on left populism in Latin America, before going on to consider the niche literature on policy switching. While not all of these explanatory factors relate to the leaders that are of specific interest to this thesis, they are examined for their potential to contribute to our understanding of why switching occurs.

Much of the literature on Latin American left populism in power tends more toward the descriptive than the explanatory. The treatment of switching in the literature on Latin American populism is confusing, treating it both as a characteristic and cause of populism (Roberts, 1995; 2013). Furthermore, this literature typically does not concern itself with policy outcomes, but whether or not these candidates governed as populists, hence the classification of both switchers nad non-switchers as example of populism in power. This literature therefore fails to offer any systematic explanation for switching by populists. Nevertheless, it does point to some elements which can contribute to our understanding of switching by these presidents.

The first is an institutionalised party system, which is said to promote "moderation and mutual accommodation" (Schamis, 2006: 22), preventing the advent of a radical "superpresidency" (Ibid: 26). This same logic is advanced as an explanation for the 'two lefts,' with the populist left's economic policies made possible by an absence of these "crucial restraints" (Flores Macias, 2010: 428). The contribution of this constraint to switching and non-switching is not clear, however. At best we can say that populists who come to power in the context of weak or fragmented party systems may enjoy the "autonomy … needed to switch policies and appeal to new groups" (Roberts, 2006: 138), and is no more than a permissive condition (Weyland, 2009: 158). Similarly, more formal institutionalist approaches are rare in a region "notorious for bending and evading such rules" (Weyland, 2002b: 66).

Others point to economic factors. Drake cites "resource constraints" as forcing the hand of 'bait-and-switch' populists (1991: 36), but does not elaborate further. More recently other scholars have employed this logic from the perspective of resource wealth. Weyland attributes support for left

populists in power to "the availability of huge raw material rents" (2009: 158). Similarly, Murillo et al. (2011) argue that the decision of a president about whether or not to "govern left" is shaped by the availability of "capital free of external constraints" (Ibid: 64). Nevertheless, these authors view the commodities boom as a necessary but insufficient condition for determining the governming strategies of government (Ibid: 65; Kaufman, 2011: 111). Instead authors point to constraints such as the power of political parties (Ibid), and the economic power of creditors and corporations (Mazzuca, 2013: 111).

The literature on "policy switches" in Latin America (Stokes, 2001; Campello, 2014) takes a different approach to the puzzle of variation in the constraints on left populists or their governing styles. The study of "neoliberalism by surprise" (Stokes, 2001) examines the violation of electoral mandates by presidents who "strenuously campaigned" (Siavelis, 2004: 278) against market reforms, only to introduce them once in power. This literature looks at presidents of all types, across the region and over time. It frequently utilises quantitative methods to analyse large data sets. For example, Stokes (2001) studies 44 elections, 16 of which are coded as 'switches'; Campello (2014) finds 19 examples among the 89 elections analysed. Although the terminology owes a debt to "bait-and-switch" populism (Drake, 1991; Roberts, 1995), this literature does not employ the lens of populism (Cunha et al, 2013). Nonetheless, this behaviour is closely associated with presidents elsewhere classified as 'populist' (Weyland, 1996; de la Torre & Arnson, 2013), while recent attention has focussed on switching by leftists (Cunha e al, 2013; Campello, 2014). Furthermore, the explanatory variables are broadly similar to those cited in the populist literature.

While the impact of an institutionalised party system in inhibiting switches is acknowledged in this literature, in contrast to the prevailing trend in the literature on populism it is overtly treated as permissive condition. For example, Stokes notes that "policy switches were more likely under relatively weak parties" (2001: 23). Campello finds evidence that it is harder for a president from a strongly institutionalised party to switch (2014: 278). Weyland notes that the strongest resistance in the case of Venezuela came from the president's own party (2002a: 153). Nevertheless, none of these studies cite the strength of political parties as a causal factor. With regard to other institutional constraints, Stokes finds that term limits do not affect the probability of policy switches (Ibid: 90). Campello finds some evidence that switches are more likely when executives are constitutionally strong, but that legislative support is not significant, perhaps due to the "predominant role" of Latin American presidents in policy making (2014; Stokes, 2001).

Instead Stokes proposes a "representation model" (Ibid), arguing that mandate switching has a "rationally consistent and representative logic" (Siavelis, 2004: 279). In fact she contends that in spite of the violation of their mandates, these politicians believed that they were acting in the best

interests of their constituents, but for strategic reasons could not reveal their preferences on the campaign trail (2001: 18). This form of "representation by dissimulation" (Ibid) undoubtedly carried risks, as evidence indicates that voters will hold 'switchers' to a higher standard than those that fulfil mandates (Ibid: 63; Johnson & Ryu, 2010; Roberts, 2013). Nevertheless, Stokes notes that fealty to campaign promises also involved risks – in particular, of "creating economic havoc" (Ibid: 68) – that could have equally disastrous results for their political careers.

While ultimately privileging a political model, Stokes' explanation is closely related to economic factors. In particular, Stokes finds that switching behaviour is tied to politicians' beliefs about the efficacy of "efficiency-oriented" policies to improve the economic situation of voters (2001: 88-90). Nevertheless, according to this theory, only "sizeable economic gains" were sufficient to win public support (Murillo et al, 2011: 66). Thus the particular conditions in which these policies will appear attractive include high inflation and sluggish growth, with presidents banking on these policies to both stabilise and stimulate the economy, leading to electoral reward (Ibid). To illustrate this, Stokes provides detailed evidence of advice given to presidents-elect by a mix of domestic financial advisors and representatives of international financial institutions (Ibid: 69-70). On the basis of this evidence, she concludes that "pressures from markets" played a greater role in determining switches than institutional factors (Ibid: 91-92). For some scholars, however, this account does not give enough attention to "interest groups, business, and other informal policy networks" (Siavelis, 2004: 281).

Weyland (2002a) deviates from the rational-choice approach, employing "an influential alternative" called prospect theory which "argues that people are most sensitive to changes in probability near the natural boundaries of 0 (impossible) and 1 (certain)" (Elster, 2007: 223). This concept of "risk-seeking in the domain of losses" holds that "crises trigger bold actions, while better times induce risk aversion" (Weyland, 2002a: 38-9). Weyland also notes the importance of advice from international financial institutions (Ibid: 105-8). Where he diverges from Stokes is in explaining the "breakneck speed" and "drastic nature" of these reforms (Ibid: 108). For Weyland, the severity of the crisis is the key variable in "conditioning presidents' capacity to reshape the established institutional framework" (Ibid: 154); the failure of Carlos Andres Pérez's reform programme in Venezuela is attributed to lower degree of crisis there, for example (Ibid). Nevertheless, the precise causal mechanism is somewhat unclear, and for some it is "arrayed on too small a set of cases" (Hagopian, 2005: 188).

Campello's work (2014) builds on Stokes' logic, methodologies, and data set, adding the preferences of investors to those of voters (Ibid). Nevertheless, she notes the inability of the representation model to account for the fact that "policy switches have consistently occurred in one

single direction," i.e. toward neoliberalism (Ibid: 265). Instead Campello shares Weyland's focus on crisis, albeit defined more narrowly. A large-N analysis finds the strongest predictor for switches to be economic: specifically, dollar scarcity in conditions of a currency crisis, which leads presidents from all ideologies to converge around market-oriented policies (Ibid: 280). She argues that in conditions of currency shortage, presidents must adopt "investor-friendly policies to attract foreign capital" (Ibid: 267). Interestingly in the context of this study, Campello cites the contrasting cases of Gutiérrez and Correa in Ecuador in support of her argument, claiming that Correa was elected during an oil boom (Ibid: 268).

Though compelling, it must be noted that the literature on switching focuses exclusively on macro-economic policy, excluding the wider elements of left populist electoral offerings highlighted previously. How do high oil prices account for Correa's decision (and determination) to re-found the nation via a Constituent Assembly? Or for his acknowledged failure to implement structural changes in Ecuador's agrarian sector? This explanation fails to pay sufficient attention to the correlation of forces at domestic level. The literature also opens the door to the possibility of switching being temporary. For example, Campello explains the counter-intuitive coding of Hugo Chávez as a 'switcher' to neoliberalism by noting that he "switched back to his original agenda" at a later stage (2014: 284, n8). This admission raises questions regarding the artificially restricted nature of the time period analysed in this literature, which is typically limited to between six months or one year after election.

In summary, the literature on policy switching addresses the puzzle of discontinuities between presidential campaign platform and (economic) policy programme in office, including 'left populists' the subject matter of this research. Of particular interest to this study is Campello's finding that "institutionalised electoral competition seems insufficient to force presidents toward the implementation of the policies they were voted to advance" (2014: 280). The view that presidents need to be compelled to adhere to their mandates flies in the face of the prevailing assumption in the populist literature. Nevertheless, despite the contrasting theoretical and methodological approach it takes, this literature throws up a similar set of explanatory variables as the populist literature. This thesis contends that additional variables can more comprehensively account for the puzzling variation in populist governing styles.

Furthermore, this review of policy switching has revealed other problems with the way in which the concept of switching is operationalised in the literature. Scholarship in this area is typically based on regressions using large election data sets. As a result the literature imposes upon itself several limitations. In the first place, the data analysed is usually limited to a time period of one year following elections to determine whether a switch has occurred (Campello, 2014). While such

a limitation aids coding for comparative analysis across multiple cases, it presents only a snapshot of the period around elections, and fails to analyse changes in dynamics that may cause switching to occur at a later stage.

Consider, for example, two former presidents of Venezuela: Rafael Caldera – typically viewed as a populist 'switcher' (López Maya, 2013) – and Hugo Chávez, seen as a prototypical left populist (Weyland, 2013). In the policy switching literature, Caldera's campaign is classified as 'leftist' by some (Stokes, 2001; Johnson & Ryu, 2010), but not by others (Campello, 2014). In turn, Caldera is classified as a 'switcher' (Stokes, 2001) or 'promise breaker' (Johson & Ryu, 2010) by some, but a 'non-switcher' by others (Campello, 2014). While Chávez's campaign is universally categorised as leftist, in office he is classified both as a 'promise keeper' (Johnson & Ryu, 2010) and 'switcher' (Campello, 2014) by scholars explicitly using the same methods and data. Furthermore, Campello asserts that Chávez later 'switched back' to his original platform, but deems it "exceptional" and offers no explanation (Ibid: 284). A brief overview illustrates the value of the approach taken by this thesis.

Caldera was elected in 1994 as an unlikely populist, having helped to build Venezuela's pacted '*Punto Fijo*'[1] democracy (Buxton, 2003). However, in 1989 mass protests known as the *Caracazo* resulted in repression and the deaths of hundreds of citizens (Ibid; Philip & Panizza, 2011). This "milestone" led to widespread protest and failed coups (Silva, 2009; López Maya, 2003). Caldera's election was viewed as a "direct result" of these dynamics (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 25). Running as an outsider (Landman, 1995; Philip, 1998: 82) with an "anti-party discourse" (López Maya, 2011: 219), Caldera formed an "electoral vehicle" (Silva, 2009: 220) that was supported by a broad coalition including leftists (Landman, 1995). His platform was identifiably left populist. Caldera ran a "fiercely anti-neoliberal campaign" (Davila, 2000: 233) that promised to reverse prior reforms (Landman, 1995: 104). Furthermore, Caldera offered: constitutional reform and direct democracy (López Maya, 2013: 245); a more responsive state (Davila, 2000: 234); a new model of development (Sonntag, 1997: 4) that would halt the liberalisation of Venezuela's oil industry (Lander, 2008: 90); and amelioration of the impacts of neoliberalism on the lower and middle classes (Silva, 2009: 220).

Caldera's presidency is an example of the tendency to define away left populism as a result of switching. Yet this switch did not occur until two years into his presidency (Silva, 2009: 221). Prior to that, Caldera had proved "true to his campaign promise" and responded to the demands of protest movements by adopting heterodox economic recovery measures, introducing price controls and

[1] Fixed Point.

halting privatisations (Ibid). Faced with the collapse of several banks in 1994, Caldera responded with partial nationalisations and state intervention (Davila, 2000: 234). The honouring of these promises saw protest movements de-mobilise, lessening the pressure on Caldera (Sonntag, 1997: 3). Nevertheless, as a minority president Caldera remained vulnerable to political opponents whose support depended on him abandoning promises of institutional reform (Ibid). As economic problems mounted, fuelled by rising state debt, this support grew uncertain (Davila, 2000). Rather than pursue plans for constitutional reform (Sonntag, 1997: 4), Caldera switched and signed a letter of intent with the IMF in April 1996 (Cammack, 2000: 158), completing a "sweeping turnaround" in his policies (Silva, 2009: 221).

Caldera's successor, Hugo Chávez, ran on an identifiably left populist platform. After his political career was "jump-started" by leading a 1992 coup attempt which established his radical credentials (López Maya, 2013: 247), Chávez founded an "electoral vehicle" party, the Movement of the Fifth Republic (MVR) (Hawkins, 2003: 1142), which drew support from a broad range of smaller radical parties (Silva, 2009: 224). Chávez ran on an anti-neoliberal platform, promising to increase the role of the state as an economic actor, with a particular focus on reducing the crucial oil sector's openness to private interests (Ibid: 224-5). Chávez also offered to strengthen protections and redistribute wealth to the most vulnerable, and promote the inclusion of the popular sector by means of a constituent assembly (Ibid; Hawkins, 2003: 1142).

In office Chávez moved quickly to fulfil a key promise to hold a referendum on a constituent assembly (López Maya, 2003: 85; Silva, 2009). According to Hawkins, Chávez enjoyed "tremendous success" in implementing his politico-institutional reforms, not only convoking a constituent assembly, but ratifying a new Constitution by the end of 1999 that extended rights and protections (2003: 1142). However, in the economic sphere Chávez was slow to enact reforms, with analysts characterising his approach as 'third way' economics (Ibid; Buxton, 2003; Philip & Panizza, 2011). This image of a moderate, centre-left democrat persisted into his third year in power (López Maya, 2011; Sánchez Urribarri, 2008).

The turning point relates to state oil company PdVSA (Hawkins, 2003; Silva, 2009) which was crucial to honouring Chávez's economic reforms (Ibid: 227). López Maya points to a "climate of intense social polarisation and political conflict" at that time, and which she attributes partially to Chávez's confrontational approach (2011: 221). Instead she also highlights the role of opposition from economic, political, and other elite interests unwilling to cede their privileges (Ibid). The result was a coup attempt against Chávez in 2002 that ultimately weakened the opposition (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 29). The main reason for the failure of the coup was the reaction of social sectors that mobilised in large numbers to demand his reinstatement (Ellner, 2003: 152; Philip & Panizza,

2011: 29). According to these authors, this support related to the plausibility of Chávez's programme rather than his personal qualities (Ibid; Ellner, 2003: 152).

From that point onwards, the Chávez presidency fits the description of a non-switching left populist. Nevertheless, the literatures on left populism and policy switching fail to adequately capture or account for his earlier moderation, leading to inconsistencies in how his presidency is classified. Similarly, Caldera's initial fidelity to a left populist mandate is obscured by his subsequent switch. These findings highlight the problems with existing approaches to switching.

This thesis will contribute to a more rounded understanding of switching by 'unpacking' the concept through a systematic qualitative analysis of the concept from a comparative perspective. Firstly, this thesis extends that time frame in order to capture a more comprehensive picture of the implementation of key electoral promises. Secondly, by focussing on a non-economic policy areas, this thesis provides a more nuanced analysis of policy switching. Finally, this thesis will examine whether switches can be total or partial, immediate or delayed, or varying across distinct policy areas.

This section has analysed the prevailing explanations for switching and non-switching in the context of Latin American left populism. This analysis reveals that these very different literatures utilise contrasting methodologies, but tend to focus on a similar broad set of explanations. These can be summarised as the presence or absence of constraints on presidents from political institutions and economic factors, with some mention of the personal qualities of the leaders being studied. While the relevance of these factors is acknowledged, they fail to provide a comprehensive account of why, when and in what circumstances left populists switch or do not switch. The following section will proceed to propose an alternative explanation, centred on the role played by mobilised civil society movements and organisations.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

According to Kirby and Cannon (2012: 13), the shift to the left in contemporary Latin America was shaped in significant ways by civil society activism, which "generated a discourse critical of the neoliberal project, built movements to challenge it" and contributed leaders to state projects opposed to its furtherance. The role of social resistance (Roberts, 2008) or political contention (Silva, 2009) by social actors is recognised as a key component of the rise to power of left populists in Latin America. According to Ellner, social movements "paved the way" for these leaders (2012: 100). In particular, Roberts notes that the "political leverage" of social and protest movements depended not only on mobilisation, but their ability to frame and broadly articulate their claims

across civil society (2008: 341). Nevertheless, according to Becker there is a "relative absence" (2013a: 45) of academic studies examining the relationship between civil society and these leaders in power that has only been somewhat addressed in recent years (Philip & Panizza, 2011; Prevost et al, 2012; Silva, 2017; Silva & Rossi, 2018).

This thesis argues that switching can only be understood in the context of pressure from civil society. When left populist presidents face pressure from mobilised and articulated social and protest movements, switching is less likely to occur. The literature discussed in this section provides the theoretical foundation for this argument.

The broader literature on switching in Latin America provides a starting point. Przeworski, Stokes and Manin (1999) consider the issue of "mandate responsiveness" (non-switching) as part of a wider consideration of democratic representation. The authors analyse mechanisms by which voters can induce governments to be representative, concluding that elections – a "vertical" accountability mechanism – are not the only method for achieving this goal (Ibid: 19). Instead the authors highlight the mechanism of "horizontal accountability" developed by O'Donnell (1999), defined as the existence of state actors "legally enabled and empowered, and factually willing and able" to sanction or impeach other state actors (Ibid: 38). Nevertheless, in the context of Latin America, O'Donnell admits that his interest in this kind of institutionalised accountability related to its "absence or severe weakness" (2003: 35).

In particular, O'Donnell highlighted the tendency of the executive to seek to "eliminate or render ineffective" these horizontal controls (Ibid: 36), reducing many institutional constraints to little more than "parchment barriers" (Ibid: 42). Perhaps for this reason, some scholars turned their attention to informal institutions, which ranged from bureaucratic and legislative norms, to practices like clientelism and patrimonialism (Helmke & Levitsky, 2006). These informal institutions, it is contended, can limit presidential power (Ibid). Stokes (2003) applies this notion of informal rules of accountability to Argentina, concluding that if politicians disappoint "shared citizen expectations" voters will punish them. The 'punishment mechanism' cited by Stokes is confined to the classic electoral view of vertical accountability, however.

While maintaining his view as to the significance of free and fair elections as a key element of vertical accountability, O'Donnell came to question whether this mechanism was of itself sufficient to ensure the responsiveness of presidents in Latin America (2003: 48). Similar doubts about the effectiveness of elections as an accountability mechanism were expressed by Przeworksi, Stokes and Manin (1999). O'Donnell noted that in Latin America, electoral vertical accountability

"functions deficiently" (2003: 48), and on this basis embraced the concept of '(vertical) societal accountability' developed by Smulovitz and Peruzzotti (2000).

According to these authors, traditional understandings of accountability had "largely ignored civil society" (Ibid: 149). They instead proposed the existence of another form of accountability in the context of Latin America, which they characterised as a non-electoral yet vertical mechanism of control that "rests on the actions of multiple array of citizens' associations and movements" as well as the media (Ibid: 150). Among the actors explicitly cited as able to exercise societal control are "civic associations, NGOs, social movements" (Ibid: 151). The manner in which social movements can exercise this control via social mobilisation is, in the conception of the authors, limited to their ability to "activate the operation of horizontal mechanisms" of accountability, however (Ibid: 152). According to Smulovitz and Peruzzotti, mobilisation by civil society interacts with media exposure and legal mechanisms both indirectly, in the form of "reputational costs" (Ibid), and directly in the forms of legislative override and presidential impeachment (2000: 153). Per this view, social mobilisation is most effective as a form of accountability when others actors – including legislatures, judiciaries, ombudsmen, and the media – retain a level of autonomy.

Not all scholars agree with the assertion that non-institutionalised societal mechanisms are dependent on institutionalised horizontal accountability to function, however. Machado et al. (2011) believe that these two 'paths' represent alternative methods of influencing political decision-making, and find the latter non-institutionalised path to be more likely in countries where political institutions are weak (Ibid), as is the case in much of Latin America (Weyland, 2002b).

As the work of Roberts (2013) has demonstrated, the effects of the introduction of neoliberal reforms across Latin America were not confined to the economic sphere. Instead the reforms sought to "subordinate political and social structures" to market principles, in what Silva characterises as a "market society" (2009: 18). The result was to alter the balance of forces in the region, weakening not only political parties but also the traditional leaders of civil society, labour unions (Ibid; Roberts, 2013). At the same time neoliberalism strengthened business organisations (Weyland, 2004), which interacted with political actors, including presidents, to exercise influence over policy making (Siavelis, 2004; Roberts, 2013). According to Weyland, the influence of business and investors grows stronger in the post-election period, when voters' preferences are no longer important (2004: 146). Furthermore, where civil society actors like unions are unable to provide a counter-weight to local and international business elites, switching on leftist promises is more likely. According to Smith (2005), radical politicians were unable to implement radical policies due to the power of controlling domestic and international interests. It is therefore clear that non-institutional, informal

powers can influence the occurrence of switching by presidents under conditions where formal institutions are weak.

It was in this context that presidential ousters as a non-institutional form of accountability focussed scholarly attention on new actors: social and protest movements. A number of authors have drawn attention to the phenomenon of extra-legal presidential ousters that were particularly prevalent in the early part of the Twenty-First Century (Valenzuela, 2004; Hochstetler, 2006; Marsteintredet & Berntzen, 2008; Pérez-Linan, 2007). Some scholars view ousters or protest-driven impeachments as a non-institutional form of accountability. Hochstetler (2006) characterises these ousters as vertical societal accountability, with mobilisations triggering a legislative response to impeach. Other scholars (Mejía & Polga-Hecimovich, 2011; Pérez-Linan, 2007) frame the issue in more horizontal accountability terms by focussing on impeachments, but nevertheless note that ousters "hinge" on popular mobilisation (Ibid: 3). Marsteintredet and Berntzen (2008), meanwhile, contend that ousters are a result of both horizontal and vertical accountability, associated with "stronger congresses and street protests" (Ibid: 95-6). All of these studies highlight the central importance of social and protest movement mobilisation to the ousting of presidents. As noted, protests are more likely to occur in the context of weak political institutions (Machado et al, 2011). These are the same circumstances that are said to lead to the emergence of left populism in the region.

Thus in the context of Latin America, already weak institutions were further debilitated by neoliberal reforms that de-aligned political parties from organised bases (Roberts, 2013). Neoliberalism also fragmented leftist actors like unions, and empowered business that used its influence on political actors to push for the deepening of these reforms (Weyland, 2004). The further weakening of institutions made the electoral success of left populists more likely, but also increased the frequency of street protests. Thus populist presidents that were highly vulnerable due to their lack of strong political bases, took office in a context of street protests that had the proven potential to oust them from office. Furthermore, there is agreement that ousters condition the behaviour in office of presidents. Hochstetler notes that this kind of accountability can serve to restrain presidents (2006: 410), while Pérez-Linan goes further to assert that presidents have learned lessons from these ousters and have "adapted their strategies accordingly" (2007: 11). In this way, mobilised civil society represented a counter-weight to right-wing influence, and emerged as the new "moderating power" for presidents in the region (Hochstetler & Friedman, 2008: 7; Philip & Panizza, 2011: 41).

This thesis theorises that the existence or absence of social pressure "from below and to the left" (Becker, 2013b: 113) can explain switching and non-switching among left populists in Latin America.

Nevertheless, not all mobilisations threaten presidents. Accordingly, it is necessary to consider in more detail the circumstances in which these mobilisations arise, the form that they take, and the way the organisational structure influence strategies and approaches to the state, in order to understand the circumstances in which they can influence political decisions (Escobar & Álvarez, 1992; Amenta, 2014). The literature on social movements can offer some clues in this regard.

The main areas of concentration in terms of the study of Latin American social movements have been: political opportunities; mobilisation/organisational structures; and framing processes (McAdam et al, 1999). Political opportunities relate to the national contexts in which movements arise (Ibid), with Silva (2009) drawing attention to the need for 'associational space' in order for movements to develop. The influence of social movements does not depend on political openings alone; if a movement lacks organisational structure, it will not be able to take advantage of opportunities (McAdam et al, 1999: 30). Furthermore, collectively framing issues as broad systemic criticisms is said to be an "active, creative, constitutive process" (McAdam et al, 2004: 16) which requires the existence of like-minded groups that maintain "regular and intense contact" in order to articulate demands and strategies (McAdam et al, 1999: 31). This process of articulation is said in turn to be dependent on the existence of political openings (Ibid).

The literature on social movements has been criticised as excessively "movement-centric" (McAdam & Tarrow, 2010: 529), with a traditionally strong focus on the rise and fall of movements. As a result, in recent times this literature has shifted its focus to the influence of movements on politics (Ibid; Luders, 2010; Prevost et al, 2012; Amenta, 2014). Amenta reviews the literature on this subject, identifying different approaches. Noting that there are no "magic bullets" (Ibid: 18) for comprehensively explaining how and when movements matter, he favours a 'political mediation' model which holds that the influence of movement collective action is "contingent on specific contexts" (Ibid). One such context outlined in the literature is the vulnerability of the "target" of mobilisations (Luders, 2010). Left populist presidents are examples of vulnerable targets, it is contended. The approach ultimately advocated by Amenta to the study of social movement influence on political outcomes is to start from politics and work back to movements (2014: 27). This thesis adopts this approach by focussing on the outcome of switching/non-switching.

The application of these lessons to the contemporary Latin American context is illustrative. The finding regarding the need for openings, organisation, framing and articulation chimes with the literature on ousters, in which Hochstetler found that the sustained nature of mobilisations was the key component in removing presidents (2006). Writing about social movement influence on politics in Latin America more generally, Philip and Panizza appear to concur, noting that the capacity of

movements to sustain mobilisations is "crucial" to affecting outcomes (2011: 49). This kind of sustained mobilisation would by its nature require both a degree of organisation, along with the use of framing processes and linkages with other movements, in order to have a significant impact on political outcomes.

According to Silva's analysis (2009), this is what occurred in Latin America in the period preceding the emergence of left and left populist governments. Utilising the concept of "contentious politics" (Ibid: 14) – defined as episodic, public, collective challenges to government (McAdam et al, 2004: 5) – Silva (2009) highlights the importance of associational space, issue framing, and horizontal linkages that articulated movements, in bringing about waves of contention that ousted neoliberal presidents and elected leaders that promised to take a different path. In particular, scholars emphasise that the influence of movements was collective, and depended therefore on the ability of social actors to frame ideas, coordinate action and to establish coalitions and alliances (Roberts, 2008; Silva, 2009). As Silva notes, the more broadly articulated the mobilisation, the greater the influence, with contentious events that included coordination among the popular sectors and the middle class considered to achieve a "higher plane" of collective power (Ibid: 38).

On the basis of the foregoing, it is argued that these conditions did not necessarily disappear upon the election left populist presidents. Instead it is contended that the electoral promises of these presidents to enact broad reforms of the kind outlined in the framework above, were not of themselves sufficient to de-mobilise movements. The story of contention did not end with elections. Indeed, it is theorised that in cases where these movements sustained high levels of mobilisation via framing and broad articulation, vulnerable left populists were far less likely to switch and abandon those promises.

It is nonetheless acknowledged in the literature that the impact of collective action is contingent. There are several points to be made in this respect. Firstly, it must be acknowledged that the influence of mobilised collective action is dynamic and not static. As Taylor-Robinson makes clear, collective action is difficult to organise and costly to maintain in terms of time, resources and personal security (2010: 35). According to Roberts, in contrast to class-based civil society movements like unions, modern social movement are "more cyclical or ephemeral in their patterns of mobilisation" (2008: 342). This dynamic makes it a challenge to maintain unity, with fragmentation often the result (Ibid). Roberts notes, however, that the contemporary Latin American countries where levels of social mobilisation have been "high and relatively sustained" (Ibid) are Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela – the same countries that are most associated with 'non-switching' left populists.

Nevertheless, it is the case that movements can de-mobilise as well as mobilise. Accordingly the level of mobilisation can vary over time. If the premise of this thesis is correct, we should observe changes in the attitudes of left populist presidents regarding adherence to their electoral mandates in line with a decline in social movement influence. Secondly, although the subject of issue framing is acknowledged to be under-studied (McCarthy et al, 1999: 27), it is logical to assume that not all issues are equally important. Therefore it is expected that the levels of articulation can vary across the policy spectrum, depending on the importance ascribed to them by a broad range of movements. Thus switching on some issues might matter less to mobilised movements than others.

Finally, it is asserted that power or influence has a relational dimension (Silva, 2009; Hunt, 2016). It is necessary to consider the relative strength of both institutional and non-institutional forms of power on levels of mobilisation by movements, and therefore on switching and non-switching behaviour. The rise in influence of business elites during the neoliberal period has been noted (Weyland, 2004), with Stokes (2001) acknowledging the influence that behind-closed-doors meetings with domestic and international investors had on switching by presidents such as Fujimori and Collor de Mello. As Taylor-Robinson notes, wealthy elites typically enjoy a range of mechanisms for influencing politicians, among them personal connections, campaign contributions, and privileged access, as well as indirect power over the actions of established parties (2010: 34). The power of domestic elites and international investors (including financial institutions like the IMF) acted as an additional non-institutional constraint on left populist presidents.

Furthermore, as a number of scholars have noted, the advent of leftist presidents has seen business elites gradually expand their repertoire of mechanisms for influencing politics (Wolff, 2016; Durand, 2010). Notable among these mechanisms are the organisation of counter-mobilisations to challenge the street politics of social movements (Philip & Panizza, 2011), and strategies of accommodation with populists, particularly at electoral junctures (Durand, 2010). As such, the influence of business elites spans both the institutional and non-institutional spheres. Furthermore, research has established that the political influence of business associations in Latin America tends to be stronger when they are horizontally linked and articulated (Durand, 1998).

As Hunt notes, rather than populism, the challenge for many newly elected leftist presidents was reshaping institutions while negotiating with social actors new to the political game, and resisting the "vehement opposition" of well-resourced right-wing opponents (2016: 8). These presidents typically came under immediate pressure from economic elites to ameliorate or abandon their mandates. Traditionally that path would appear to offer a variety of benefits and low costs. The series of large social mobilisations across the region driven by collective social action by articulated movements, challenged this assumption. Along with representing a threat to the survival of

presidents, however, social mobilisation also constituted a source of political legitimacy that is "often more powerful than the rule of law and representative institutions" (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 86). As scholars point out, for a movement to be influential, state actors like presidents must see it as "potentially facilitating or disrupting their own goals" (Amenta et al, 2010: 298). If carefully harnessed, left populists had the opportunity to inherit that legitimacy by giving a "state form" to mobilisations with a view to defusing it (Lievesley, 2009: 34). However, it is noted that unity among and between movements tends to reduce exposure to co-optation or repression (Crabtree & Crabtree-Condor, 2012: 47). In those circumstances, it is anticipated that left populist presidents will attempt to "control or fragment such expressions of resistance" (Lievesley, 2009: 34).

As a result of the foregoing, it is further argued that in circumstances where left populist presidents faced strong constraints via institutional or non-institutional channels – or a mix of those two – then switching on electoral promises becomes more likely. However, a strategy of accommodation with movements could offer a path to enhanced legitimacy and electoral approval.

In summary, this thesis theorises that in cases where levels of social mobilisation were sustained via issue framing and broad articulation among social actors was sufficiently high to overcome constraints by institutions and elites, left populist presidents tended to broadly honour their mandates. However, where in spite of high levels of social mobilisation, elite power was of an order that left populist presidents were either incentivised to abandon mandates, or blocked from implementing them, switching tended to occur. Lastly, in cases where social mobilisation failed to reach high levels due to intra-movement fragmentation or government co-optation, left populists tended to switch.

As noted above, however, the correlation of forces in each of these countries is dynamic, therefore allowing for the possibility of presidents chaning their behaviour over time. Factors that are noted to have the potential to alter the situation include: a decline in levels of mobilisation and/or levels of articulation between social actors; increased levels of internal unity and the adoption of new approaches by business and other elite actors; a decline in the level of vulnerability of the left populist president, owing to high levels of public approval, increased formal powers, or enhanced legislative support. As the influence of social movement mobilisation declines, or is superseded by other forces, the likelihood of switching increases. Nevertheless, in cases where left populists succeeded in growing their personal legitimacy and electoral mandate as a result of their association with broadly leftist movements and policies, we may observe the maintenance of a left populist discourse even while switching is occurring in the policy space.

This section has outlined a broad theoretical framework within which we can understand switching and non-switching by left populist presidents in Latin America. The proceeding chapters will empirically investigate the argument laid out above with a view to determining overall whether variations in levels of social mobilisation influence switching or non-switching behaviour in this context.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has considered explanations for the puzzle of switching by left populist presidents in Latin America. The chapter contributed to the study of this phenomenon by developing a framework for determining the circumstances in which an electoral campaign can be considered left populist, and further outlining characteristics of switching and non-switching behaviour in office. The utility of these frameworks was demonstrated via short vignette case studies of president in the region. Applying these frameworks to the study of presidents in Latin America, this chapter identified a universe of cases, and classified them broadly as switchers and non-switchers. The chapter proceeded to evaluate competing explanations for switching from within the literatures on left populism and policy switching in Latin America, noting a strong emphasis on institutional and economic factors.

The chapter went on to outline an alternative explanation, positing that pressure from social mobilisations can influence the behaviour in office of left populist presidents. In particular, it is theorised that when levels of social mobilisation are high and movements are broadly articulated, left populist presidents tend to honour their campaign promises. The next chapter will describe how this thesis proposes to investigate this theory. In particular, it will outline the research design and methodologies, and justify the selection of cases for further study from within the universe of cases set out above.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The central research question of this study is: why do some left populist presidents in Latin America respect their electoral mandates while others 'switch' and abandon them? The hypothesis set out in the previous chapter is that variation in levels of civil society mobilisation can explain the variation in adherence to electoral mandates by left populists. It is further hypothesised that certain circumstances are nevertheless required for this to be achieved, as previously outlined. This thesis will set out to test these central hypotheses.

Furthermore, as noted in the previous chapter, the concept of policy switching is problematic, and suffers from a number of limitations that restrict insight into the political calculus of left populist presidents in Latin America. Therefore this thesis will add further value by unpacking the concept of switching, broadening its application in several ways that add to our understanding of these events. This chapter sets out how these questions will be answered and aims achieved. The first section will discuss the research design. The second section will explain the methodology, and the advantages of elite interviewing and fieldwork.

3.2 Research Design

This research project will address the question of switching and non-switching behaviour by left populists in Latin America. This thesis will employ a comparative case study approach and utilise a most similar systems design (MSSD) (Przeworski & Teune, 1970) to address this question.

Case Selection

1. Countries:

While authors have noted that the region is conducive to cross-country comparison (Lijphart, 1971: 688), Latin America is nevertheless highly diverse, and as much a cultural construct as a geographic area. Accordingly, in order to maximise controls, this study will now focus on South America, and in particular the Andean region, commonly understood as comprising Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela. As Lijphart notes, countries in geographic proximity to each other will frequently share common characteristics (Ibid). This is true of the countries of the Andes, which have a similar colonial past, and share regional institutions created by the Andean Pact (Mainwaring

et al, 2006: 7). This region is also noted to be historically understudied (Bejarano, 2006: 260). In the specific context of this thesis, this region is acknowledged to have experienced a deep crisis of its political institutions (Mainwaring et al, 2006). While this crisis was not confined to the Andean region, it was "felt with special intensity" there (Drake & Hershberg, 2006: 3). It was this crisis which has been posited as a causal factor in the rise of both populism and the left, making it an appropriate region to study in the context of this thesis.

Nevertheless, the Andean region is not monolithic. The MSSD comprises three countries from within the region: Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador. These countries have been selected primarily on the basis of controls. Firstly, as Lijphart notes, these three geographically proximate countries share a number physical characteristics. All three demonstrate similar variation between mountainous, lowland and rainforest regions. Furthermore, these countries have the same demography; in particular, all three have high levels of ethnic heterogeneity along with significant indigenous populations (Yashar, 2005). Given their common historical backgrounds, these countries have been said to have had "parallel political trajectories" (Ibid: 226). These commonalities allow for institutional factors such as party systems to be held constant, with all three notable for their fragility and volatility (Drake & Hershberg, 2006). This contrasts with the system in Venezuela which, until the election of Caldera in 1994, was considered among the strongest in the region (Ellner, 2003).

Crucial in terms of this thesis is that all of these countries have elected leaders considered left populists. Similar leaders have been elected elsewhere in South America in the period under review, but which are ruled out for a variety of reasons. While Fernando Lugo has been described as a left populist (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 15), Paraguay is seen as an isolated case (Fassi, 2010). Although the presidencies of Nestor and Cristina Kirchner in Argentina bear some similarities to the cases selected, the literature is divided on whether or not they are true populists (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011). Within the Andean region, though occasionally classified as a 'populist' (Doyle, 2011), neither Alvaro Uribe of Colombia, nor his successor Manuel Santos, are considered leftists. The most obvious omission is Venezuela, and in particular the case of Hugo Chávez. While this case fits the criteria set for this study, it is a contribution of this research to go beyond this best-known case to provide a more nuanced analysis.

This study will carry out a comparison between three countries in the region, Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru. Along with the surface-level similarities mentioned, these countries are comparable in terms of levels of popular discontent they exhibit with the existing economic and political orders. The mid-point of the first decade of the Twenty-First Century demonstrates in particular the conditions that contributed to support for left populists. Firstly, as Table 3.1 below highlights, all three

countries demonstrated comparable levels of poverty, extreme poverty and inequality throughout the period that preceded the election of left populists in the three countries selected.

Table 3.1: Rates of Poverty, Extreme Poverty and Inequality, 1999-2010

Country	**Poverty**		**Extreme Poverty**		**Inequality (Gini Index)**	
Year	**1999**	**2010**	**1999**	**2010**	**1999**	**2010**
Bolivia	60.6	42.4	36.4	22.4	0.586	0.508
Ecuador	63.5	37.1	31.3	14.2	0.513	0.485
Peru	54.8	31.3	24.4	9.8	0.525	0.458

Source: ECLAC.

Secondly, survey data from the period under study shows that in these three countries (along with Venezuela) contemporary election debates centred on issues of "ownership of natural resources, inequality and poverty, and a new type of relationship between the State and large corporations" (Latinobarometro, 2007: 84). Furthermore, as set out in Table 3.2 below, survey data has recorded generally low levels of trust in political institutions, including courts and legislatures in these countries (Ibid). In particular, all three evidence some of the lowest rates of trust in political parties in the region, with levels of trust rising in Bolivia between 2004 and 2006 following the electoral triumph of Evo Morales. As Seligson notes, levels of overall public trust in democratic institutions in Ecuador were notably low (2007).

Table 3.2: Levels of Trust in Institutions, 2004-06

Institutions	**Ecuador (2006)**	**Peru (2006)**	**Bolivia (2006)**	**Bolivia (2004)**
Supreme Court	24.7	34.5	44.5	39.3
Congress	16.7	32.6	45.3	37.5
Political Parties	15.1	32.3	31.1	23.4
Average Trust	**22.2**	**37.8**	**42.9**	**43.7**

Source: Barómetro de las Americas, Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP).

While allowing for significant levels of control, the cases selected demonstrate considerable variation on the variables of interest to this research. Specifically, these three countries vary in terms of the strength, geographic reach, and make-up of civil society. In Ecuador, the once-predominant role of the national Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) has given way to a patchwork quilt of movements and sectors which, while active, are diffuse (Silva, 2009). In contrast, Bolivia's social movements, while regional in scope (Yashar, 2005), were horizontally articulated as part of a Unity Pact (UP) (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013). Peru presents a different picture

again, with a weakened, geographically limited set of organisations concentrated on single-issue agendas (Silva, 2009). Apart from social movements, Peru is also home to a notably influential business lobby (Durand, 1998; Crabtree & Durand, 2017).

Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia demonstrate some other variations of interest. While all three countries have histories of political instability, they vary in important respects during the early years of this century, the period under review. Although all of the countries selected have witnessed the non-electoral removal of one or more sitting presidents (Valenzuela, 2004; Hochstetler, 2006), in Bolivia and Ecuador the election of a left populist was preceded by ousters. By contrast in Peru, prior to the election of Humala, two arguably 'populist' presidents (Barr, 2003; McClintock, 2006; Roberts, 2007) – Toledo and García – successfully completed their terms.

Another key distinction between Peru and the other countries selected regards regional power dynamics. While all three countries evince regional divisions, in Ecuador there is some parity between Quito, the capital and political centre, and Guayaquil, the largest city and economic hub. In Bolivia the split is three-way, between the capital Sucre, seat of political power La Paz, and the economic pole of Santa Cruz. In Peru, however, capital city Lima plays the role of both political and economic centre. Furthermore, its demographic power dwarfs all other cities and regions, its population almost ten times larger than its nearest rival, Arequipa. This concentration of economic and political power ensures that Peru does not exhibit the same tension between highland and lowland poles evident in Bolivia and Ecuador (Crabtree & Crabtree-Condor, 2012).

While the three countries selected demonstrate significant similarities which allow for a high degree of control, they do demonstrate variation. For this reason, this thesis will also include a within-country comparison. Specifically, this research will study two left populist presidents who came to power in Ecuador in successive elections: Lucio Gutiérrez, elected in 2002, and Rafael Correa, who triumphed in 2006. This case study allows for the control of a series of factors, including culture, geography, regional dynamics political institutions, and personality. The fact that these presidents were elected consecutively also allows for time to be held more or less constant. The next section will consider in more detail the four presidents selected for study.

2. Presidents:

This study focuses on four leaders that may properly be classified as 'left populists'. The presidents we will study are: Lucio Gutiérrez and Rafael Correa, both in Ecuador; Evo Morales in Bolivia; and Ollanta Humala in Peru. As has been discussed at length, the determination of who is, or is not, 'populist' is challenging and often subjective in nature. However, the classification of all four of

the leaders selected as left populists at the time of taking office is justified by reference to the framework set out in the previous chapter. This framework was utilised to assess the formal programmes for government and media reports of campaign utterances by the candidates. The results are set out in Table 3.3, and support the classification of all four presidents as left populist candidacies. More detailed analysis of the campaign offerings is set out in the case study chapters.

Table 3.3: Evaluating left populist electoral platforms

Policy Sector	Description	Gutiérrez 2002	Correa 2006	Humala 2011	Morales 2005
Politico-Institutional	Institutional reform; citizen participation; anti-corruption	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Yes
Economic	Anti-neoliberal; stronger state; redistribution	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Natural Resources	Resource nationalism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Social	Social protections; services; positive rights	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
International	Sovereignty; alterered US relations	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Yes

All of the programmes reviewed demonstrate a concern with poverty and inequality, and all vow to increase social spending and redistribute wealth. Furthermore, all four campaigns contained offers of substantive institutional reform including provisions for increased civil society participation in the running of the country. This was packaged as a constituent assembly to re-found the nation, a promise contained in the initial platforms of all the selected candidates. The four candidates all committed to combating corruption. Additionally, all the electoral programmes provide for the extension of social protections, via not only enhanced spending, but also positive rights, such as to universal needs like health and education. In the economic sphere, all of the programmes committed to moving away from neoliberalism by reasserting the role of the state. Other promises included tax

reform, and audits to review the legitimacy of external debts in order to free up funds to pay for public services. Key to the spending plans, however, was enhanced state participation in the proceeds of resource extraction, which was another common feature of the electoral platforms reviewed. Finally, all candidates studied pledged to assert national sovereignty, usually by offering to reorient trade relations.

In summary, all four candidates were drawn from non-political backgrounds; all ran for election with little institutionalised party support; and, as noted, all four made broadly similar left populist appeals centred on politico-institutional, social and economic reform. The next section will consider the classification of these presidents as switchers and non-switchers.

3. Switchers and non-switchers

While all four presidents selected can reasonably classed as left populists, the key element for the purposes of this study is that upon taking power two of these leaders – Correa and Morales – are considered to have broadly adhered to their mandates. On the other hand, the other two leaders are said to have abandoned or substantially moderated key electoral offerings with a relatively short time after taking office. In other words, Gutiérrez and Humala can be considered 'switchers', whereas Correa and Morales cannot. The determination as to whether or not a president has 'switched' in office is by its nature a matter of degree. Nevertheless, a review of the literature relating both to mandate violations, and to the presidents selected more generally, provides a basis for their classification.

The literature on switching codes Gutiérrez as a switcher, and both Correa and Morales as non-switchers (Johnson & Ryu, 2010; Campello, 2014). This view is supported by the wider literature. Correa, it is said, understood the importance of making good on his electoral promises (Freidenberg, 2008a; Spronk, 2008) in order to maintain his popularity (Conaghan, 2008). Morales likewise moved quickly to carry out his promises (Silva, 2009: 145), most notably when nationalising hydrocarbons (Mayorga, 2008). Gutiérrez, on the other hand, is said to "turned on his mandate" (Silva, 2009: 190), leading to a break with his left-wing coalition partners (Conaghan, 2011; Philip & Panizza, 2011). While recent data sets do not capture Humala, scholars have noted the abandonment of his mandate (Murillo Ramírez, 2012), describing it as a "switch which took years and two electoral processes" (Murakami, 2014: 105).

One of the aims of this research is to unpack the notion of switching. We do so in several ways. Firstly, the literature on switching is typically dichotomous nature: presidents (or, more accurately, presidential terms) are classified as examples of switches or non-switches. This decision is justified

in order to aid quantification and avoid issues of continuous coding (Stokes, 2001: 29). Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that behind these blunt classifications exists a "complex reality where these policies are a matter of degree" (Campello, 2014: 272). It is these complexities which are of interest to this thesis. The ability of a president to wholly or partially switch in one policy area and not in another has implications for our understanding of this behaviour. In particular, it further elucidates the pressures and constraints under which they operate than does the standard dichotomous approach of the existing literature.

Secondly, the literature that deals with policy switching defines this behaviour exclusively by reference to economic policy. This choice is defended on the basis that the "basic message" of presidential campaigns in the region are "often framed between statist and promarket orientations" (Campello, 2014: 272). Yet as has been previously noted and is clear from the literature on left populism in Latin America, the electoral offerings of the contemporary wave of leaders was not confined to economic reforms (Silva, 2009; Philip & Panizza, 2011; Ellner, 2012). Accordingly, this research will also 'unpack' the notion of switching by going beyond broad macro-economic policies to examine presidential behaviour in a number of different policy areas. It is further contended that this broader approach is more in keeping with the nature of contemporary left populism in Latin America as established in the previous chapter, and illustrated in Table 3.3.

Thirdly, studies of policy switching restrict the timeline for a switch to occur to within one year after election. This choice is justified on the basis that this is typically enough time for the overall macroeconomic approach of a president to be established. Yet this may not hold true in all cases. Referring back to the examples of two Venezuelan presidents elected on left populist platforms: Caldera's switch did not occur until after two years, but when it did it was severe; while Chávez did not begin to fulfil many of his promises until three or more years into his presidency. Similarly, a limit of one year means that only a certain kind of delivery will be captured. This period may be enough to pass a law, but may not serve to capture enacting regulations, enforcement, or other ancillary measures to translate that paper law into practice. This restricted approach therefore risks capturing 'credible commitments' for by presidents but not the implementation of reforms that were sought by the electorate. For the concept to reflect real-world perceptions, an extended time period is required. This thesis employs this approach to its cases.

4. Switching Unpacked: Policy and Conflict

This study will provide a mix of president-centred and policy-centred case studies. In the first instance, this research will carry out a detailed case study of the presidency of one of these presidents, Lucio Gutiérrez of Ecuador. In keeping with much of the literature on both left populism

and switching, this research will consider the Gutiérrez presidency as a whole. As noted, the electoral offering of Gutiérrez, while broadly leftist, was lacking in detailed policy proposals (Montúfar, 2008). By examining Gutiérrez's entire (albeit truncated) presidency, we can establish that in general terms he can be classified as a switcher. However, this approach also allows us to unpack switching by conducting a detailed analysis of decisions in different policy areas. This analysis will reveal that the degree of switching varied across four of the five broad policy areas set out in Table 3.3 above. The exception is international policy, which falls outside the scope of this thesis. This analysis reveals a more mixed picture of the Gutiérrez presidency than presented elsewhere, noting attempts to honour certain promises, and even a belated and unsuccessful attempt to 'switch back' in response to mobilisation.

In order to gain further explanatory leverage over switching and non-switching, this research will then carry out comparative analyses of specific areas of public policy. Here we keep the focus on Ecuador, but analyse Gutiérrez's successor, Rafael Correa, and in particular the honouring of two key electoral promises: to convoke a constituent assembly to rewrite the Constitution; and to reform the agrarian sector in accordance with the principles of food sovereignty. This within-case comparison of different policy areas within the same presidency reveals that Correa largely adhered to his mandate in one area (convoking a constituent assembly), but in the other it is contended that he 'switched' (food sovereignty) (Clark, 2013; McKay et al, 2014).

The selection of food sovereignty as a policy area is justified on the basis that unlike the call for a constituent assembly to re-found the nation, which was a demand of a wide range of social actors, food sovereignty is a more recent concern, mainly confined to rural organisations (Peña, 2016). In spite of enshrining the concept in its constitution (McKay et al, 2014) and NDP, the execution of food sovereignty has failed to materialise (Rosero, 2011; Clark, 2013). In a comparative analysis of the food sovereignty policies of Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador under Correa, it is the latter which is portrayed as having achieved least in terms of translating promises into policy (McKay et al, 2014). This failure is not readily explained by competing variables such as dollar scarcity or institutional constraints, and therefore provides a suitable case for this research. This case further illustrates the value of extending the time horizon for assessing switches, as it also evidences the case of a late switch during Correa's second terms in office.

Control over the exploitation of natural resources – and the attendant rents accrued from their export – is a major concern in all three countries selected for study. As Bebbington notes, these activities are "central to the historical and contemporary political economy" of Latin America, and the Andean region in particular (2012: 3). As Table 3.4 below demonstrates, extractive industries

represent the bulk of these countries' exports, and in turn the most significant source of income for the economies of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia.

Table 3.4: Exports of primary products as a percentage of total exports, 2009.

Country	Primary products	Hydrocarbons	Minerals and derivatives
Bolivia	91.9	46.1	24.8
Ecuador	91.3	59.2	n.d.
Peru	87.4	7.8	55.1

Source: ECLAC.

Beyond this historical significance, resource extraction has played a central role in shaping the politics of the new left, and is therefore an appropriate policy sector on which to focus. As previously noted, some scholars have sought to explain the rise of the populist left solely in terms of resources rents (Weyland, 2009; Mazzuca, 2013). For some scholars, the assertion of state control over natural resources is central to understanding the left turn (Rosales, 2013). Furthermore, national control over these key sectors – resource nationalism – is noted to be a "long-standing" demand of civil society movements (Kohl & Farthing, 2012: 225). The importance of natural resources is also supported by the prominence given to this area in the election platforms, as set out in Table 3.3 above. While a focus on resource extraction might be expected in the electoral offering of any presidential candidate in these countries, the similarity between the offerings in the three cases selected is striking.

The programmes and inauguration speeches of all candidates reveal a high degree of resource nationalism, offering to exert more state control over key strategic industries. Beyond asserting the role of the state with regard to natural resources, the promises of all presidents overlap on a number of related points. All of the candidates vowed to increase the productivity of the respective key industries of gas (Bolivia), oil (Ecuador), and mining (Peru). Along with signalling a clear intention of continuing, even increased, exploitation of these resources, all of the programmes for government commit to increased protection for the environment, particularly of protected areas and national parks. A final common element related to resource extraction emphasised by all the candidates is their prioritisation of the fight against poverty and inequality, implying the need for continued resource extraction in order to generate sufficient funds to achieve this aim.

In the light of these similarities, and taking into account the literature on left populism and policy switching, if economic considerations were paramount, we would expect the same or similar

outcomes in this area. However, although Correa and Morales largely adhered to their promises in this area, Gutiérrez and Humala for the most part failed to deliver.

Accordingly, this thesis will consider the broad approaches to this issue taken by Humala in Peru and Morales in Bolivia. Humala is widely considered to have gone back on specific commitments regarding mining (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012), in which sector his tenure has been one characterised by continuity (Monge, 2012). On the other hand, the move by Evo Morales to assert state control over Bolivia's hydrocarbons industry within months of taking office established his left populist credentials (Mayorga, 2008), even if some have questioned whether it can truly be characterised as a 'nationalisation' (Arze & Gómez, 2013). A detailed examination of the policy initiatives by both presidents in this area, nonetheless, will further unpack switching by pinpointing contradictions and discontinuities which deepen our understanding of the forces at work. This area offers the ideal testing-ground for assessing the ongoing influence of mobilised social movements and left populist presidents.

In order to obtain increased explanatory leverage over the area of resource extraction in the governments of Evo Morales and Ollanta Humala, this research will carry out a within-case study of the most important socio-environmental conflict that occurred during their respective presidencies. Levels of socio-economic conflict are acknowledged to be particularly high in the Andean region (Bebbington, 2012), with both countries witnessing large numbers of these conflicts each year (Grompone & Tanaka, 2009; Kohl & Farthing, 2012; Arce, 2015). From this wider sample, I have selected two conflicts that had a significant impact on the implementation of national policy on resource extraction. These conflicts provide a lens through which to observe national policy, and also the interactions between government and civil society during the presidencies of Morales and Humala.

In Peru, the Conga Mines project was forecast to be the biggest of its type in the history of the country. Fears about water usage and pollution, however, led to strong resistance on the part of local communities (Monge, 2012). While on the campaign trail, candidate Humala visited the region and made explicit promises to prioritise 'water over gold' (Poole & Renique, 2012: 5). Having acceded to power, however, Humala backed the project and called a state of emergency to deal with protesters, triggering a political crisis and the resignation of his prime minister (Monge, 2012). The conflict has been described as "emblematic" (Ibid: 385; Gómez, 2013), marking the end of Humala's "much touted 'left wing' flirtation with social and political reform" (Poole & Renique, 2012: 5).

The conflict over the proposed highway through the Isiboro-Secure Indigenous Territory and National Park (TIPNIS) has similarly been described "emblematic" (Silva, 2017: 101), and is viewed as a "defining political moment" (Achtenberg, 2011: 3) in the government of President Morales of Bolivia. While the project itself was not directly extractive in nature, it is widely believed that one of the chief purposes of the highway would be to facilitate continued exploration for oil (Ibid). Resistance from indigenous residents of the area was met with violent repression by police forces, resulting in widespread public protest and international condemnation (Mayorga, 2014). The political crisis that followed saw two ministers resign, the dissolution of the so-called 'Unity Pact', and the realignment of the government's social base (Achtenberg, 2013). TIPNIS was to have "lasting resonance" in Bolivian politics (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 18).

The design of this thesis provides for a mixture of control and variation. The cases selected for comparative analysis allow for controls at a number of levels: within-region (Andes), within-country (Ecuador), and within-policy area (natural resources). However, these cases also allow for significant variation: within-presidency variation generally (Gutiérrez), within-policy areas but across presidencies, and across-policy areas within the same presidential unit. The next section will outline the methodologies this thesis will employ to test its central hypotheses.

3.3 Methodology

The data for this thesis was collected during fieldwork conducted in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru. The central data was collected via semi-structured interviews with decision-makers in government, civil servants and advisors, social movements, non-governmental organisations and wider civil society. A total of 108 subjects were interviewed. An overview of the interview subjects is set out in Table 3.5 below, and further information regarding interviewees and interviews are set out in the Appendix. The purpose of the interviews was to investigate the role of civil society in pressuring government to implement policy initiatives that were promised during the electoral campaign through primary data obtained from first-hand accounts by important actors. Through the interviews I wanted to identify the most significant policy demands of social actors, and the methods they used to attempt to ensure that these issues were implemented by the incoming president. Furthermore, I wanted to gain insight into the political calculus of government actors in deciding whether – and to what extent – to transform those demands into policy. As Aberbach and Rockman note, interviewing is important "if one needs to know what a set of people think, or how they interpret an event or series of events, or what they have done or are planning to do" (2002: 673).

To collect the interview data for this thesis, I carried out three separate periods of fieldwork over a total period of four months. The initial period was conducted in Ecuador and Peru between July and

August 2015. During this time I conducted a series of interviews with key figures from government and civil society regarding the influence of civil society on the decision by presidents Gutiérrez, Correa and Humala to broadly adhere to or abandon their mandates. The interviews carried out during this period of fieldwork primarily used open-ended questions in order to allow sufficient flexibility to pursue unexpected lines of inquiry. I employed a 'snowball sampling' technique to identify and gain access to other key actors. The majority of the interviews were conducted via face-to-face meetings, which is considered the "ideal" format (Braun & Clarke 2013: 79), although some follow-up interviews took place over Skype. All interviews were digitally recorded and stored in a secure place in order to protect the personal data of interviewees.

In Ecuador I met with leaders of indigenous and peasant movements, prominent members of NGOs and activists, from whom I collected rich data on the demands of civil society, the process of articulation that occurred between sectors to bring pressure to bear on both the Gutiérrez and Correa governments, and details of how the relationship with the state was managed. From government, I interviewed serving and former ministers and vice-ministers, senior civil servants, and political advisors. Through those interviews I garnered important data on the impact of civil society on policy formation, and in particular the dynamic and difficult relationship between government and social actors. In Peru, I interviewed a similar profile of actors, however due to time and logistical constraints the sample was smaller than that of Ecuador. In both countries I also carried out interviews with academic and media commentators, who provided an impartial view on the influence of civil society on government and policy. During this period of fieldwork I also gathered primary and secondary material not readily available in Europe.

Analysis of the data collected during the initial period of fieldwork was carried out during the months following my return. The interviews for each country were analysed thematically by organising the data into frequently occurring themes and sub-themes. In Peru these included concerns over mining and extractive industries, political corruption, media control and bias, socio-environmental conflict, and the influence of corporate interests over the policy agenda. In Ecuador themes included concerns over oil and mining, socio-environmental conflict, food sovereignty and agribusiness, the changing status of social movements, and the rising influence of corporate interests.

A second period of fieldwork was conducted in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru during August of 2016. In order to prepare for this second period, I carried out detailed research into the governments, policy areas and conflicts chosen as my cases. In particular, I identified key social and political actors for interview, and began the process of establishing or extending networks to gain access to them. Furthermore, in the light of previous fieldwork, I amended and updated my interview guide,

adapting it to the relevant actors and contexts. In particular, the questions were more specific and focussed on the relevant policy area or socio-environmental conflict. In addition, I used close-ended versions of some of the earlier open-ended questions based on the previous experience in establishing attitudes and responsiveness, as advised by some scholars (Aberbach & Rockman, 2002: 674). To minimise the risk of bias from snowball sampling, I elicited opposing views from interviewees, as recommended (Beamer, 2002).

During the second period of fieldwork I conducted interviews with key social and political actors involved in the specific policy areas and conflicts selected for study. Interviews were predominantly conducted in face-to-face meetings, and in the interviewee's native language unless otherwise requested. In some specific cases, however, detailed follow-up questions were put to actors previously interviewed by email or via Skype calls. During the interviews, key points regarding relations between government and civil society were consistent, increasing the reliability of the study. Interviewing a variety of sources also allowed for triangulation.

A third visit to Peru and Bolivia took place in July of 2018, during which a small number of additional and follow-up interviews were conducted. An overview of all interviews conducted during the three sessions of fieldwork is presented in Table 3.5 below, and a comprehensive list of the interviewees is set out in Appendix 1.

With regard to the issue of access, unsurprisingly the group of interviewees that proved the most challenging to access were political actors, and in particular those serving in government at the time of interview. As a result, a number of interviews were conducted with former members of government who may have had a critical view of its performance. Nevertheless, interviews were conducted with serving members in Ecuador, along with several former government members; and in Peru, where the end of President Humala's term in office presented opportunities for enhanced access. The most difficult environment in which to access members of government was Bolivia where, despite repeated written and verbal requests, only one serving politician agreed to be interviewed (albeit one that was highly important for this thesis). Nevertheless, the 'government side' is represented via documentary data sources, including plans, speeches, laws and official statements. A separate issue was encountered with regard to the case study on the presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez in Ecuador. As a result of the decade-long gap since Gutiérrez's departure from office, locating and accessing former members prepared to discuss that issue was challenging. As a result, that case study relies predominantly on documentary and archival sources.

In order to avoid issues of bias that can occur with elite interviews, I adopt the technique of using multiple sources, often referred to as "triangulation" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Furthermore,

interview data was buttressed by data from direct observation, published reports and archives, manifestos, speeches, pamphlets, government decrees, laws and regulations, newspaper and magazine reports, providing for the "optimum solution" for triangulation (Davies, 2001: 78). Official documents, laws, decrees, plans, speeches, and regulations were mainly sourced online, though some were sourced during periods of field work. Several social movement communiqués were physically presented during interviews with movement activists, but others were sourced via online portals.

Newspaper reports were sourced via a mix of searches on the Lexis/Nexis database, which accounts for the bulk of the international news sources; while national news reports were sourced via searches on newspaper websites. Due to the fact that many newspaper websites in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia do not allow for extensive archival searches, the range of sources was somewhat limited. As a result, the main sources in each of the three countries are: El Universo (Ecuador); La Republica (Peru); and La Razón (Bolivia). With regard to social mobilisation, these sources were complemented by referring to the Chronologies of Protest produced by the Latin American Council of Social Science (CLACSO), and published in its Social Observatory of Latin America (OSAL) magazine. Additionally, archival research was carried out in the library of the Simon Bolivar Andean University in Quito, Ecuador of its collection of the defunct political magazine, Tintají. While this magazine was openly left-leaning, it served as a counter-point to the business-friendly English-language sources available via Lexis/Nexis.

The entirety of the interview data collected was analysed in late 2016. Thematic analysis was repeated, with the data organised into three broad areas: (a) observations and opinions relating to the election campaign of the individual president (including some commentary about their political backgrounds); (b) observations, personal experiences, and opinions relating to the general behaviour of the president in office, as manifested in the implementation of policy; (c) observations, personal experiences, and opinions relating to the specific electoral promise being studied in that case. The interview data was also supplemented by books, journals and reports by scholars working in these countries, most of which is written in Spanish, and much of which was obtained during periods of field research.

Table 3.5: Overview of interviews conducted

Interviewees	Ecuador	Peru	Bolivia
Political Actors	10	7	3
Political Advisors/Civil Servants	3	2	2
Social Movement Activists	5	6	6

General Civil Society	7	10	8
Academics	9	8	7
Journalists/ Pollsters	5	1	1
Business Organisation Leaders	3	3	2
Total	**42**	**37**	**29**

The interview data was principally utilised in three ways. Firstly, in order to empirically establish or verify questions of fact. In circumstances where interviewees made factual claims, significant efforts were made to 'triangulate' and substantiate these claims by reference to other interviewees, newspaper reports, broadcast media or online videos. Where such triangulation was impossible, interviewees' accounts are not strongly relied on for inferential purposes, but nevertheless contribute to the building of an overall picture of events. Secondly, to add depth and richness of the study by providing descriptive data from actors often directly involved in the events being studied. Thirdly, to present the opinions of actors closely associated or involved with the events being studies, while allowing for bias.

Finally, with regard to how interview data was gathered, subjects were selected via a mix of purposive and snowball sampling. The vast majority of interviews were carried out via face-to-face meetings, as recommended in the literature. A very small number of interviews were conducted via telephone or Skype, and only as a last resort due to the unavailability of a subject. Consideration was also given to ethical guidelines for qualitative interviewing. Elites are acknowledged to be atypical interview subjects. According to Ostrander, elites are "used to being asked what they think and having what they think matter in other people's lives" (1995: 143). Nevertheless, as Lancaster notes, these assumptions may be misleading, noting that such dynamics are context-dependent (2017: 97). One such context is location in what is known as the developing world. On this basis, and bearing in mind DCU guidance on this issue, I had recourse to my own knowledge and experience of local cultural norms, and also to ethical standards operative in those contexts, such as those provided by local universities[2].

To mitigate these factors, potential interviewees were typically written to in Spanish asking them for consent to interview. Such communications were accompanied by a letter signed by the Head of DCU School of Law and Government (translated into Spanish) explaining the aim of the study and the purpose for which the interview data would be used. Where this was not possible, a copy was handed over during the meeting. All interviews were conducted in Spanish unless English was

[2] For example, see these Ethical Research Guidelines set out by the Catholic University (PUCP) in Lima, Peru: http://files.pucp.edu.pe/posgrado/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/22165437/Norma-%C3%89tica-ESCPOS.pdf.

requested by the interviewee. The aim of the study and purpose of the interview were again explained verbally at the commencement of each interview, and consent to recording was sought and obtained. In rare cases where interviewees had specific requests regarding anonymity, those requests were respected, and digital copies of those requests have been preserved.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has established the set out the manner in which this thesis will test the hypothesis formulated in the previous chapter, namely that variation in levels of civil society mobilisation leads to variations in switching by left populist presidents in Latin America. This chapter outlines the research design and methodologies that will be utilised to test this hypothesis. This thesis adopts a comparative case study approach, which is suitable for the chosen research topic. Three countries in the Andean region of South America – Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia – are selected using an MSSD with a view to maximising both variation and controls. Within these countries, four left populist presidents from the universe of cases are selected – Lucio Gutiérrez, Rafael Correa, Ollanta Humala, and Evo Morales – and their selection is justified in terms of their electoral platforms. This chapter then outlines the approach taken to these cases, which vary across their units of analysis, with comparison taking place both across and within cases, and over time.

This chapter sets out the chosen methodologies. The main source of data upon which this thesis relies are qualitative semi-structured elite interviews with a broad range and large number of political and social actors, conducted during three periods of field work in the selected countries. Steps were taken to strengthen the validity and reliability of the interview data through extensive documentary and archival research. This data was systematically analysed and organised under thematic headings. The chapter concluded by setting out the expected outcomes of this research on the basis of our analysis of this data. The next chapters will study the cases selected in order to evaluate the outcomes against these expectations.

Chapter 4: Ecuador - The Presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will analyse the truncated presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez, a former army colonel. Gutiérrez was elected on a left populist platform (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 27; Becker, 2015: 86), and has been widely classified as a 'populist' or 'neopopulist' (Weyland, 2003; de la Torre, 2015). Elected in late 2002, Gutiérrez appeared to offer the fulfilment of a number of civil society demands, including politico-institutional and economic reform (Andrade, 2005: 98). Not only did Gutiérrez employ an anti-system discourse which attacked elites and Ecuador's "pseudo-democracy" (de la Torre, 2015: 113), his candidacy was supported by a coalition of left-wing social and political actors including unions, social movements, and political parties (Quintero, 2005: 125-6; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 154). The key alliance was with Pachakutik (PK), the political instrument of the country's most powerful social movement, CONAIE (Ibid). A Gutiérrez presidency appeared to offer the end of neoliberal economic policies (Andrade, 2005: 98) and the re-founding of the state (de la Torre, 2015: 113)[3].

According to the literature, however, Gutiérrez 'switched' and reneged on key campaign promises (Silva, 2009; Collins, 2014). While there is widespread agreement that Gutiérrez can be classified as a 'switcher', this outcome is accounted for in different ways. The literature on populism is confusing, with Conaghan noting that Gutiérrez followed a "familiar script" in morphing into a "conservative neopopulist" (2011: 261), while for Montúfar the switch came about when Gutiérrez abandoned populism (2008). Others attribute the switch to political factors such as congressional opposition (de la Torre, 2015; Levitsky & Loxton, 2013), but Philip and Panizza note that Gutiérrez made accommodation with the establishment (2011: 88). In the literature on switching, Campello attributes Gutiérrez's shift to economic factors such as capital flight and "sustained currency pressures" (2014: 268). Weyland combines both approaches, concluding that Gutiérrez accepted "the confines of Ecuador's new economic model" but maintained political populism (2003: 1109).

This chapter will address these shortcomings in three ways. First of all, it will analyse the performance of the Gutiérrez administration across four of the broad policy areas previously identified: politico-institutional, economic, natural resources, and social. Furthermore, they mirror the categories utilised by Quintero in his analysis of the 2002 presidential election (2005). Secondly, this chapter will not confine itself to policy introduced at the start of the president's term, but rather

[3] Gutiérrez stated: "We are going to depoliticise the state and combat corruption in order to re-found Ecuador" – AFP, October 4th, 2002.

will consider the foreshortened administration in its entirety. Finally, the chapter will analyse the social and political forces brought to bear on the presidency and its responses to those pressures.

4.2 Overview: The Gutiérrez Candidacy

Lucio Gutiérrez came to prominence via his exploits in the military, and in particular as one of the leaders of the junta that ousted President Jamil Mahuad on January 21, 2000, alongside CONAIE (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 149). Having been imprisoned for his role and later pardoned, Gutiérrez formed the Patriotic Society Party (PSP), a political vehicle viewed in both structure and ideology as a "military party" (Montúfar, 2008: 276). Gutiérrez's background as a soldier and coup leader forged his image as "political hero" prepared to sacrifice himself for the people (Ibid; Burbano, 2002: 7). According to Alberto Acosta, following the coup Gutiérrez appeared as a "great leader"[4], with a political trajectory that reminded many of Hugo Chávez (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 153)[5]. It was a resemblance that Gutiérrez was initially happy to encourage[6], at home and abroad (Lluco, 2004: 34).

More significant was the formal alliance forged between the PSP and PK, which was approved by a national congress in July of 2002 (Ibid: 20). This electoral alliance was supplemented by support from CONAIE and other movements, the leftist Democratic People's Movement (MPD), unions and small business organisations (Quintero, 2005: 125). Due largely to the presence of these actors, many commentators classified Gutiérrez as 'leftist', even if the candidate scrupulously avoided such terms[7]. This was the logic employed by the political magazine *Tintají*, which backed Gutiérrez based on the "social forces" he represented (2002:2). The support of PK was vital to Gutiérrez's passage into the second round (Hernández, 2004: 10). As Dávalos notes, Gutiérrez benefited from the "enormous prestige" of the indigenous movement (2006a). Nevertheless, this support only came about when PK failed to agree on its own candidate due to internal divisions (Becker, 2015: 85).

The discourse employed by Gutiérrez during the campaign was ideologically diverse and changeable (Hernández, 2004: 10; Ortiz, 2003; Montúfar, 2008)[8]. During the first round Gutiérrez favoured an anti-system discourse that targeted corrupt bankers and traditional political parties dubbed the 'partyarchy' (Ibid: 274). In policy terms, the candidate opposed the rigorous payment

[4] Author interview (AI): Alberto Acosta (See Appendix for detailes of interviewees).
[5] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[6] "He has shown me the way," Gutiérrez said of Chávez – NYT, November 22nd, 2002.
[7] In a speech to the Harvard Club in New York, Gutiérrez stated: "I do not define myself ideologically, and I am not a populist, but rather popular." – NYT, November 22nd, 2002.
[8] AI: Alberto Acosta.

of external debt, dollarisation, privatisation, and a '*paquetazo*' of neoliberal reforms (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 155). Gutiérrez asserted the need to prioritise the payment of the 'social debt' to the country's excluded over external debt payment (Sotillo & Franco, 2002). Internationally, Gutiérrez opposed the renewal of the lease for a US military base in Manta, and ratification of the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (Ibid). For Burbano this combination of anti-system rhetoric, anti-neoliberal policies, and articulation of ethnic, popular and military support heralded a new political project (2002: 7).

As Quintero notes, there is agreement among scholars that the tone and the content of Gutiérrez's discourse shifted between the first and second rounds (2005: 30). For some, this change was reflected in the candidate's image, as he exchanged his uniform for a business suit (Hernández, 2003; Montúfar, 2008). Beyond optics, there was a softening of rhetoric and moderation in content as Gutiérrez vied with Alvaro Noboa, Ecuador's richest man, to capture the middle ground. Some have pointed to this moderation as evidence of the 'switch' to follow (Montúfar, 2008). Certainly the degree of moderation seemed to extend beyond the typical effect of the run-off vote (Burbano, 2002: 9), with scholars attributing the shift to the influence of "power groups", such as oligarchic sectors, media, the US government, and international financial organisations (Quintero, 2005: 30; Lluco, 2004: 22).

These misgivings related in part to a series of meetings undertaken by Gutiérrez following his first-round victory. The candidate met with large landowners, oil company chiefs, and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, who concluded that the ex-colonel "does not appear so radical" (Sotillo & Franco, 2002). The most significant meetings took place in the US, during a visit by the candidate to New York and Washington in October 2002 (Becker, 2015: 86). Gutiérrez's trip coincided with a summit organised by civil society organisations to challenge neoliberalism and the approval of the FTAA (Ibid). Nevertheless, Gutiérrez took meetings with foreign banks[9] and international financial institutions at which he made clear his openness to foreign investment (Ibid). To the IMF, Gutiérrez vowed that Ecuador would meet its international commitments, but sought a reduction in debt payments in order to raise public spending (Lucas, 2002). The candidate was also quick to reassure international and Ecuadorian businesspeople as to the lesser role his leftist coalition partners would play[10].

These meetings gave PK sufficient cause for concern that they dispatched prominent member Nina Pacari to the US, but her report was that Gutiérrez's actions were merely a step in the electoral

[9] Universo, October 31st, 2002.
[10] Ibid.

process (Becker, 2015: 86). As Lucas notes, with Noboa eschewing coalitions with other sectors, there was an opportunity for Gutiérrez to shore up broad-based support (2002). Thus Gutiérrez also held meetings with associations of journalists, teachers and environmentalists (Sotillo & Franco, 2002). Furthermore, during his US visit Gutiérrez placed the blame for Ecuador's financial problems on "corrupt bankers" in front of an audience of Ecuadorian businesspeople that included some of those very bankers[11]. Overall Gutiérrez attempted to frame his government project as a broad church that would encourage cross-sector participation and rule by consensus (Lucas, 2002). Some took a positive view of this approach, noting that Gutiérrez was the only candidate capable of unifying diverse actors (Ibid). Others noted an apparent absence of "ideological substance"[12], and viewed his desire to "satisfy the whole world" with concern (Becker, 2015: 91).

Furthermore, the Gutiérrez campaign never presented a formal plan for government in advance of his eventual triumph (Hernández, 2004; Quintero, 2005: 126). This absence was due in large part to an inability by PK and PSP to agree on a detailed policy platform (Lluco, 2004: 22). This failure may not have been entirely coincidental: journalist Gerard Coffey was present when Gutiérrez failed to attend a scheduled meeting with CONAIE that was intended to solidify the alliance[13]. In the view of some this lack of formalisation allowed Gutiérrez make promises without the need to deliver (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 156; Dávalos, 2006a). Even when a formal agreement was finally signed between PK and PSP on October 25, 2002, it came five days after the first round when Gutiérrez's bargaining position was considerably enhanced. The broad parameters for government agreed upon – fighting corruption, combating poverty and personal insecurity, strengthening productivity and competitiveness in the economy, and the depoliticisation of the Supreme Court (Lluco, 2004: 10) – were progressive, but also vague.

Gutiérrez's most detailed proposals came after victory in the second round (Quintero, 2005). The difficulty thus arises as to how to judge the nature and extent of his 'switch'. While the literature on switching is not explicit on this point, the nature of the concept is that a president deviates from promises during the campaign. While account will be taken of the "plan for government" set out after his triumph in terms of fine detail, such post-facto statements cannot represent the basis for determining a switch. Therefore in terms of establishing a baseline this research will have recourse to secondary literature, including contemporaneous newspaper reports. The comprehensive analysis provided by Rafael Quintero (2005) is particularly useful.

[11] Ibid.
[12] AI: Betty Tola.
[13] AI: Gerard Coffey.

In terms of social policy, the campaign put significant emphasis on the transformation of the education system. The vision of a modern system included offers of teacher training and structural reform of third-level (Ibid), with Gutiérrez promising to dedicate 30 per cent of the national budget to education[14]. In the area of health the campaign promised to widen coverage and access through both public and private systems (Quintero, 2005: 127), later presented as a form of universal health insurance[15]. Social security reform was to be achieved through the strengthening of the state institution IESS, along with improved retirement pensions and other social welfare protections (Ibid; Sotillo & Franco, 2002). A comprehensive plan for the provision of housing was also announced, which would involve a combination of funding from central government and supports at local level (Ibid). There were also plans to extend rights, and to construct a pluri-cultural society (Becker, 2015).

In economic terms, the campaign foresaw a sustainable and fair model based on human capital. Diversification into agro-industry, tourism and technology was promised, and the state was to have a renewed regulatory role (Quintero, 2005: 127). Other promises were targeted at rural areas, with agriculture forming a "central axis" of Gutiérrez's plan (Sotillo & Franco, 2002). In particular, the proposals sought to enhance production by small and medium farmers in order to achieve food security. These aims would be supported by substantive reforms to the tax and tariff systems, and the provision of public credit (Ibid). Nonetheless, Gutiérrez's discourse was "confusing"[16], with some items from the first round later rolled back, such as support for dollarisation (Ibid; Lluco, 2004: 34-35). Gutiérrez vowed not to prioritise external debt over social development (Quintero, 2005: 127), but softened prior rhetoric on renegotiation[17]. Opposition to the FTAA was justified on the basis that Ecuador was poorly prepared (Saltos, 2002: 13), while a vow to avoid a '*paquetazo*' of cuts and price hikes was re-stated (Ibid). While concessions were made to privatisation, strategic areas like oil and energy were to be exempt (Quintero, 2005: 128). Proposals regarding that sector instead focussed on the renegotiation of contracts, increased production and pre-sales of oil reserves (Ibid: 127).

The campaign also offered a range of political reforms, including a referendum on convoking a constituent assembly to produce a new constitution (Ibid: 128). Other key elements involved taking the justice system, along with the electoral and constitutional tribunals, out of the hands of the political parties and placing them under the control of civil society (Ibid); and a plan to reduce the number of deputies in Congress (Saltos, 2002: 12; Saint-Upery, 2002: 9). The campaign also talked

[14] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[15] Ibid.
[16] AI: Alberto Acosta.
[17] Universo, October 4th, 2002.

about increasing citizen participation. Much was made in the second-round campaign of a fight 'to the death' against corruption, which was presented as a means to fund increased social spending[18]. Measures outlined included penal reform to allow for life sentences, a crackdown on tax evasion, and the creation of an independent 'fourth power' to oversee judicial and political corruption (Quintero, 2005: 128).

In summary, there is consensus that the tone and content of the Gutiérrez campaign moderated considerably between the first and second rounds, causing concern among his leftist allies (Saltos, 2002; Barrera, 2004). It is difficult to maintain that this foreshadowed a 'switch,' as some have claimed (Quintero, 2005: 32). Furthermore, Gutiérrez renewed his commitment to reform by signing an agreement with PK between the first and second rounds. Therefore, even with the less radical offerings of the second round as a baseline, the mandate for change was clear. Gutiérrez's campaign offerings represented a significant break with the status quo, and were interpreted widely as a "radical change" of path (Pachano, 2009: 269). This was certainly the expectation among social movement activists and leftists that had "closed ranks" behind Gutiérrez, and who viewed his win as the "second triumph" of the 21st of January (Becker, 2015: 90). Others sounded a note of caution about granting Gutiérrez a "blank cheque", noting the need for the indigenous movement to both participate in government but also to pressurise the president "so that he does not switch" (Lucas, 2002). The next sections will analyse the extent to which Gutiérrez made good on these promises across the four broad policy areas outlined: social, economic, and natural resources, and politico-institutional reform.

4.3 Social Policy:

This section will analyse the government's social policy in the areas of education, health, housing and social welfare. According to Burbano, the government attempted to give equal expression to the interests of social actors and the business community (2002: 10). In this line Gutiérrez characterised the ruling coalition as a government of national unity, with "honest" businesspeople managing the economy and movements setting social policy[19]. For some this plan contained an inherent contradiction (Ibid; Saint-Upery, 2002), resulting in the government itself becoming 'disputed terrain' between coalition members (Barrera, 2004: 280; Lluco, 2004: 27; Lucas, 2003a: 6). It was also an approach that drew criticism from within PK as replicating the "traditional" disconnect between social and economic policy[20]. While this internal dispute was ultimately

[18] During the campaign, Gutiérrez mentioned figures between $12 and $15 billion in additional investment from cleaning up Ecuador's corrupt image – AFP, October 21st, 2002.
[19] AFP, November 25th, 2002.
[20] Pais, November 28th, 2002.

resolved with the withdrawal of PK, the government's social policies were the constant focus of civil society mobilisation. An analysis of this area reveals a degree of progress, but also broken promises and an overall failure to prioritise social issues (Lluco, 2004: 33).

Education Reform

Education was a key plank of Gutiérrez's platform. In interviews following his triumph[21], the president-elect promised to comprehensively overhaul the education system. Among the measures announced were increased wages and training for teachers; the harmonisation of curricula between public and private schools; and a focus on English and technology from pre-school onwards[22]. As part of a cross-cutting theme of de-politicisation, Gutiérrez promised to staff the Ministry of Education with professionals not affiliated with any political party including the MPD, which had ties to the National Union of Educators (UNE)[23]. Perhaps the most eye-catching statement was the promise to dedicate 30 per cent of the national budget to education[24], a commitment the president repeated in his inauguration speech[25]. Gutiérrez made good on a promise to PK by naming Rosa Maria Torres as Education Minister. Torres was one of four frontline PK ministers, which also included the historic appointment of Ecuador's first indigenous ministers, Nina Pacari (Foreign Affairs) and Luis Macas (Agriculture) (Lluco, 2004). The impact of these symbolic gestures was diluted somewhat by the system of mixing ministries between PSP and PK, (Barrera, 2004: 279; Zaldumbide, 2007). Nonetheless, there appeared to be cause for belief that the president would respect his mandate, with many in civil society interpreting these signals as indications that would rule together with unions and social movements[26].

Prior to his inauguration, Gutiérrez had signalled the need to cut public spending due to a stated shortage of resources, but committed to exempting education, health and social welfare[27]. These warnings were made real by the signing of a "hard" letter of intention with the IMF within weeks of taking office (Andrade, 2005: 105). According to Andrade, the terms of this letter effectively negated the notion of increased state involvement in the provision of education, health and credit (Ibid). At the very least it committed the government to cuts in public spending (Hurtado, 2006: 102-103), making it hard to fulfil campaign promises. This did not stop Torres from outlining an ambitious plan for reform that included quality universal primary education, teacher training, a

[21] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.
[26] AI: Pablo Iturralde.
[27] AFP, January 4th, 2003.

national literacy campaign, and a stronger role for the ministry (Lucas, 2003a: 6). Nor did it prevent Finance Minister Mauricio Pozo from promising PK members that surplus gains from higher oil prices could be used for "social investment" (Ibid). In this way PK and in turn CONAIE were persuaded to continue to support the government, at the cost of losing the "most radical" indigenous federation, the Confederation of Peoples of Kichwa Nationality (ECUARUNARI) (Becker, 2015: 94).

This tenuous accord was put under significant pressure, however, by a strike by teachers' union UNE[28]. The dispute related to pay, with teachers seeking a raise of 60 dollars per month following what they alleged were months of fruitless negotiations (Lucas, 2003a: 6). The immediate reaction by government highlighted its internal divisions, with Gutiérrez, Pozo and Interior Minister Mario Canessa attempting to blame Torres for the failure to deliver on its promises (Lucas, 2004b: 8). The minister meanwhile assembled a team of education experts to try to mediate the strike (Lucas, 2003a: 6). The dispute dragged on for four weeks, and included threats of hunger strike and of unspecified reprisals by the president[29]. The agreement eventually committed to increasing teachers' salaries by 20 dollars over six months, along with an investment of $11.8 million in education during 2003[30].

Despite the agreement to increase teachers' salaries, the process had been bruising, with the government opening negotiations by offering a five-dollar rise[31]. Furthermore, the teachers were to strike again just six months' later when the government failed to make good on the second raise[32] (considered an "embarrassing example" of the president's unreliability[33]). The period between strikes saw significant internal upheaval, with the dismissal of Torres in July. The Minister alleged she had come under pressure to sanction an agreement with an Israeli technology company on unfavourable terms for the country (Lucas, 2003c). True or not, the dismissal would herald the end of plans for radical educational reform. Later attempts to introduce an Education Law to modernise the education system along neoliberal lines stalled in the legislature[34], and no significant reform was achieved.

Torres' replacement, Otto Moran, lasted mere months before resigning due to a corruption scandal. Roberto Passalaigue took over in time for the re-eruption of the teachers' strike[35]. The dispute was

[28] Universo, May 20th, 2003.
[29] AFP, June 6th, 2003.
[30] Universo, June 12th, 2003.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Universo, December 9th, 2003.
[33] IHS, December 10th, 2003.
[34] Hora, April 2nd, 2004.
[35] IHS, December 18th, 2003.

finally resolved when Gutiérrez ignored the advice of Pozo and the terms of the IMF letter (Lucas, 2004a: 6) by accessing the Economic Stability, Social Investment and Reduction of Debt Fund (FEIREP), a mechanism earmarked to pay down debt (Andrade, 2005: 105). The strikes lasted eight weeks, and while the teachers ultimately gained concessions, they were extremely hard-won. Furthermore, figures show that in contrast to the rhetoric of the government's first weeks, overall investment in education fell from $638m in 2003 to $464m in 2004 (Acosta, 2005), in line with the terms of the IMF letter (Hurtado, 2006: 103). Nevertheless, following the initial cuts in 2003, rates of state investment in education did creep back up during 2004, reaching the highest levels in over a decade (Ibid: 126).

Healthcare Reform

The dynamic observable in education was mirrored in other areas of social policy. At his inauguration, Gutiérrez committed to pursuing universal healthcare[36], albeit in an unspecified time frame. In interviews given after the second round, the president-elect talked about implementing a policy of universal health insurance – an idea developed by Vice-President Alfredo Palacio, a cardiologist by profession (Zaldumbide, 2007: 10) – to solve the issue of only 20 per cent of the population having access to healthcare[37]. Yet the IMF letter was interpreted by public sector unions as the first step in cuts to public spending (Crandall & Jenga, 2004: 94). Thus although the medical workers' strike that began within weeks of his inauguration was over wages unpaid by the previous government[38], the signing of the letter meant Gutiérrez did not enjoy the honeymoon period typically afforded to new presidents. Measures such as the reinstatement of a freeze on medicine prices bought him little credit[39].

Instead strikes and protests by social actors became a regular feature of the Gutiérrez presidency, with social issues frequently at their core. The breakdown in relations with public sector unions led to the departure of the MPD from the governing coalition in July 2003, a month before PK (Lucas, 2003d). In the health sector in particular, while the medical staff went back to work following their initial action, further strikes would follow in July and December 2003, and April and November 2004. As one commentator notes, although Gutiérrez appeared committed to fulfilling the terms of the IMF letter, the level of social pressure generated by those efforts made achieving this difficult (Zambrano, 2003: 8).

[36] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.
[37] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[38] AP, December 20th, 2002.
[39] IHS, January 3rd, 2003.

Although health workers would eventually gain some concessions (Andrade, 2005: 105), the reality remained far from a universal healthcare system. Instead the government pursued policies largely in line with the conditions of the IMF letter by rationalising public services, while taking pragmatic political decisions on a case-by-case basis when faced with significant civil society mobilisation. This led to a health policy which was devoid of any coherence (Ortiz, 2003: 14), but in which the overall level of investment in services fell steadily. President of the Organisation of Health Ministry Workers (OSUNTRAMSA) Galo Yupangui claimed in April 2004 that the level of public investment in health had been slashed, and alleged that the health system was on the verge of collapse[40]. The figures appear to back up that analysis, with total health spending falling from $323 million in 2003 to $211 million in 2004 (Acosta, 2005: 50).

Labour unions were not the only actors to exert social pressure on the government. Although not formally part of the governing coalition, CONAIE and other indigenous federations had supported an administration that ECUARUNARI president Humberto Cholango characterised as incoherent and insecure (Zambrano, 2003: 8). Yet the same accusation could be levelled at the indigenous movement, which was steadily dividing over the issue of support for the government. The split with ECUARUNARI was followed by another with the Confederation of Indigenous, Peasant, and Black Organisations (FENOCIN) (Becker, 2015: 95). A separate federation, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of the Ecuadorian Amazon (CONFENIAE), remained loyal to the government until May 2004 (Ibid: 103), while another, the Council of Evangelical Indigenous Populations and Organisations of Ecuador (FEINE), supported Gutiérrez until the end of his presidency. In such circumstances, retaining any level of unity across the broader indigenous movement was almost impossible. CONAIE initially attempted to negotiate concessions with Gutiérrez, with some modest success (Ibid: 96). But in August 2003 they split with the government, and by early 2004 that antipathy had turned into open opposition. CONAIE participated in a joint protest by social organisations in January[41], but they failed and deepened the division in the indigenous movement (Ibid: 101).

In a bid for unity, CONAIE launched its own '*levantamiento*' (uprising) in February (Lucas, 2004a: 8-9) that included demands for improved health and education[42]. Both protests were violently repressed (Becker, 2015), with the latter resulting in the shooting dead of an indigenous woman by police[43]. The repression, along with the targeted violence against certain indigenous leaders that preceded it, briefly united the movement and brought the government to the negotiating table (Ibid:

[40] IPS, April 27th, 2004.
[41] Universo, January 22nd, 2004.
[42] Xinhua News Service, February 18th, 2004.
[43] Universo, February 23rd, 2004.

103). The protest was suspended after the government promised to invest $100 million in education and public works[44].

In fact the government issued a series of announcements on social spending while in power. Not all came as a direct result of a protest or strike, although they could be viewed as an attempt to defuse that pressure. Alternatively, they may have reflected a genuine desire to "pay the social debt," as announced by President Gutiérrez in December 2003[45]. That announcement was questioned as the figures revealed a minimal increase in spending, and came with a freeze on private and public sector salaries[46]. However in April 2004 the government announced plans to access FEIREP to fund a $60 million investment in health, education, welfare and housing[47]. President Gutiérrez immediately issued Executive Decree 1618, releasing $20 million from the fund for social spending[48], with a further $20 million following later (WB, 2006: 33). While retrospective analyses revealed that $107 million was available for social spending during the entire government, at the time the release of $40 million was a breach of the terms of FEIREP[49] which limited the amount allowed for social spending to ten per cent (Ibid). This could be considered a move by Gutiérrez to break with orthodoxy and honour his promises.

Housing and Social Welfare

Another feature of the Gutiérrez government would be the high turnover of ministers, either due to corruption scandals (Zambrano, 2003: 8) or to cabinet reshuffles that sought to revive the president's popularity[50]. Together with the tense internal dynamics of the coalition, this highly volatile political situation led to chaotic governance. One aspect was a lack of articulation between ministers with social portfolios (Ortiz, 2003: 14), and also to duplication and confusion, as evidenced by Gutiérrez's launch of a parallel health programme to that of Vice-President Palacio (Zaldumbide, 2007: 10). Arguably hardest hit by these dynamics was the Ministry of Housing, which saw three ministers resign in little over a year (Montúfar, 2006). In spite of the turnover the government did succeed in boosting construction and increasing housing credit (Hurtado, 2006: 127).

[44] AFP, February 19th, 2004.
[45] Hora, December 8th, 2003.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Comercio, April 6th, 2004.
[48] Universo, April 28th, 2004.
[49] Ibid.
[50] IHS, December 18th, 2003.

The Social Welfare portfolio was coveted by PK[51], but Gutiérrez kept it in the hands of the PSP, appointing former military colleagues Patricio Ortiz (Zaldumbide, 2007) and later Patricio Acosta as ministers[52]. The president completed an electoral promise[53] to increase the human development bond (ILDIS, 2003), but the promise to raise retirement pensions was honoured only when retirees occupied the IESS building and staged a hunger strike (OSAL, 2004b: 172-3). Gutiérrez used funds drawn down from FEIREP to provide housing and a food programme (Andrade, 2005: 108). As with the general approach to welfare, the '*combo alimentario*' programme was criticised as clientelistic, with food allegedly diverted to feed participants in pro-government marches[54]. In indigenous territories the government's '*picos y palos*' (picks and shovels) works programme was viewed as an effort to both buy support and sow division (Wolff, 2007: 25; Barrera, 2004: 288). Viewed globally, poverty rates held steady but did not reduce (ECLAC, 2007), although there were signs of improvement during the final year of the government (Hurtado, 2006: 126).

Even when the government managed to draw the sting of social mobilisation, it faced political opposition from opposition parties (Montúfar, 2006: 33). For example, a key IMF-mandated reform was the "rationalisation" of social welfare[55]. Apart from the fact that the reform went against Gutiérrez's campaign pledge, it also faced significant social resistance. In advance of threatened protests by the indigenous movement in June 2004, a presidential decree appointed former CONAIE president Antonio Vargas as Minister for Social Welfare[56]. While the subsequent failure of the march could not be entirely attributable to that move[57], there is no doubt that the Vargas appointment was divisive (Chuji & Shihuango, 2004: 7). Vargas criticised the leaders of CONAIE and ECUARUNARI, who in turn accused Gutiérrez of creating parallel organisations to further divisions (Becker, 2015: 103). Nevertheless, the planned reforms were never implemented, as the omnibus Organic Law for the Economic Rationalisation of the State ('*Ley Topo*') was rejected by Congress[58].

While Gutiérrez's social policy did not satisfy civil society, nor was it to the liking of business. Investors and international financial institutions were often critical of the government's propensity to 'cave' to pressure from civil society[59]. When the IMF credit came up for renewal in April 2004, financial analysts highlighted Ecuador's failure to make the required fiscal reforms[60], and viewed

[51] AP, December 9th, 2002.
[52] Universo, December 19th, 2003.
[53] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[54] Universo, July 23rd, 2005.
[55] Universo, May 18th, 2004.
[56] Universo, May 27th, 2004.
[57] Universo, June 10th, 2004.
[58] Universo, April 9th, 2005.
[59] IHS, October 8th, 2004.
[60] Universo, January 28th, 2004.

the country's political situation as placing "severe constraints" on government[61]. The World Bank was less sympathetic, criticising the government's lack of fiscal discipline and use of FEIREP as a "piggy bank" (2006: 33). Furthermore, as the economy grew during 2004, the government gradually reversed previous spending cuts in education and housing, in turn creating some employment (Hurtado, 2006: 126).

In summary, while Gutiérrez shifted from his transformative promises on social policy in a general sense, the switch was not total. For one thing, wages of teachers and health staff were increased, albeit on foot of strikes and broken pledges. Secondly, the government repeatedly articulated plans to pay the "social debt", even if those promises went largely unfulfilled by the end of its truncated term. Finally, the government fulfilled a promise to increase the human development bond, while its targeted social programmes yielded some success in protecting the poorest sectors (Hurtado, 2006: 126). Nevertheless although social spending was increasing during his final year, Gutiérrez implemented nothing in the way of wealth redistribution (Andrade, 2005: 105). Considering social policy as a whole, the Gutiérrez government kept some promises with regard to housing and social welfare. Additionally, there were tentative signs of increased investment in health and education, with Gutiérrez breaking with orthodoxy to draw down funds from FEIREP. Most of these concessions came on foot of social mobilisation, however, and were preceded by IMF-mandated cuts that damaged Gutiérrez's legitimacy. Furthermore, the progressive elements of social policy fell far short of his election promises, and must be considered on balance to be a switch.

4.4 Economic Policy:

This section will examine key economic policy areas, including spending cuts, dollarisation, banking and tax reform, privatisation, debt service and the role of the state. In the literature, the clearest example of a switch relates to economic policy (Weyland, 2004; Campello, 2014). Academic commentary focuses on two key issues: the maintenance of the dollar as the national currency (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 155), and the implementation of an "IMF-supported austerity package" (Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 138). However, as noted Gutiérrez began to soften his stance on these issues before the second round of voting (Quintero, 2005). The president's prior opposition to dollarisation, which he criticised as favouring bankers and the rich (Lluco, 2004: 34), had been withdrawn immediately following the first round[62], although the candidate would

[61] Latin Finance, May, 2004.
[62] Comercio, October 22nd, 2002.

allege that this had occurred earlier[63]. While this change is indicative of electoral calculation, it is significant only in a wider context.

Austerity Package

More important was the perception that Gutiérrez had introduced a '*paquetazo*' of austerity measures similar to that which he had campaigned against[64]. Yet having visited the presidential palace to meet Gustavo Noboa between rounds of voting[65], it is clear Gutiérrez understood the need for a line of credit to be negotiated following what some described as Noboa's "almost suicidal" spending spree[66]. Also apparent is that Gutiérrez wanted the political price to be paid by the outgoing administration. Following that meeting, Gutiérrez asserted that any required "measures" should be taken by the Noboa government[67], later more explicitly urging the regime to negotiate a $240 million standby loan[68]. Gutiérrez's pleas went unheeded, with Noboa compounding the damage with a "scorched earth" move of selling forward $245 million of oil contracts[69].

Thus when Gutiérrez took power, he may have seen little option but to seek an accord with the IMF, necessitating moves to cut public spending (Weyland, 2004). For others the fact the austerity measures were introduced within days of taking office spoke to the president's Machiavellian nature (Hernández, 2004), echoing comments by presidential rival Alvaro Noboa that Gutiérrez was a "chameleon"[70]. Whatever the details of the calculation made by Gutiérrez, it is clear that he hoped the credit would afford him sufficient "breathing space" (Lucas, 2003e) to shore up his political power. Although the conditions of the IMF letter were indeed draconian[71], their implementation was uneven.

While the austerity measures introduced breached specific promises by increasing the price of fuel (39%) and public transport (38%)[72], those hikes were accompanied by a rise in the poverty bond, a tax on luxury vehicles (10%) and a salary cut for government officials (20%) (Hurtado, 2006: 110)[73]

[63] In an interview prior to taking office Gutiérrez claimed his coalition was "never against dollarisation", stating that as part of the formation of the alliance with PK in July 2002, it had been agreed that the government would respect all international agreements, including the dollar, the Manta base, and signing the FTAA – Redaccion, January 12th, 2003.
[64] Jornada, November 26th, 2002.
[65] Universo, November 8th, 2002.
[66] Euromoney, January, 2003.
[67] Universo, November 8th, 2002.
[68] Jornada, November 26th, 2002.
[69] Euromoney, January, 2003.
[70] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[71] President Rafael Correa called it "the most embarrassing and disgraceful letter of intention in the history of Ecuador" (2014: 118).
[72] Universo, January 20th, 2003.
[73] UPI, February 12th, 2003.

– in an attempt to ameliorate the impacts[74]. Furthermore, the government maintained the state subsidy on cooking gas, albeit on foot of "strong pressure" both from PK and CONAIE (Lluco, 2004: 30). Regarding these key partners, at the start of the government they acknowledged a need to moderate their demands given the country's financial situation, but insisted on transparency and coherence (Saint-Upery, 2002: 10). Thus their main initial preoccupation appeared to be that the measures introduced by Gutiérrez were implemented without consultation[75]. As noted, no further price hikes were introduced by the government, largely due to a rise in oil prices (Acosta, 2005). As a result several commentators have noted that the measures did not amount to a major austerity programme (Wolff, 2007: 25; de la Torre, 2015: 117), with Acosta characterising it as a "fiscal adjustment" (2005: 43).

Thus two commonly cited pieces of evidence – acceptance of the dollar and the '*paquetazo*' – can only be considered partial switches. In other areas of economic policy, such as privatisation, the neoliberal character of the policies pursued by the president are more apparent. Nevertheless, policy in these areas was consistently incoherent, subject to pressures not only from mobilised civil society, but also from traditional oligarchic groups (mainly expressed through political parties) (Hurtado, 2006: 109), the IMF and financial sectors (Hernández, 2004). The interests pursued by these groups were frequently in tension, such as in the area of banking reform, where Gutiérrez paid lip service to both his leftist coalition and the IMF but in the end was unable or unwilling to alter the status quo.

Banking and Tax Reform

In 1999 Ecuador suffered a massive banking crisis that resulted in the ouster of President Mahuad, and the adoption of the US dollar as the currency of Ecuador (Beckerman & Solimano, 2002). The Gutiérrez first-round campaign employed an anti-banker discourse which tapped into a public mood of anger (Montúfar, 2008: 274). In the second-round the candidate promised to extradite the bankers responsible for the crash[76], and to remove regulation of banks from party control by 'de-politicising' the Banking Superintendency[77]. Such moves shored up support from PK, and had broad appeal for those tired of corrupt political parties. Once in office Gutiérrez talked up the need to open the sector to international competition[78], rhetoric sure to appeal to the IMF but unlikely to be popular among domestic power groups.

[74] Gutiérrez's attempt to show solidarity with the poor by jogging to helped to 'sell' the measures – Universo, January 25th, 2003.
[75] Universo, February 2nd, 2003.
[76] AFP, January 15th, 2003.
[77] AFP, October 20th, 2002.
[78] AFP, January 15th, 2003.

In practice, many policies favoured the banking sector. Two of the six-member transition team were bankers[79], and Economy Minister Pozo was the former head of a domestic bank. The promise to pursue extradition was kept on a superficial level when Gutiérrez raised it during a visit to the US, where the bankers were exiled[80]. The matter was given short shrift by the Bush administration, and was not pursued further[81]. Wilma Salgado, the PK appointee as head of the Deposit Guarantee Agency (AGD), claimed to have found the means to recover funds embezzled by the fugitive bankers (Lucas, 2004b: 8). Salgado alleged that rather than pursue the funds, the government allowed her to be harassed[82] before dismissing her from the post (Ibid). Regarding the regulation of domestic banks, the proposal stalled in Congress[83], forcing the government to seek waivers from the IMF[84]. The resignation of Pozo seemed to put an end to the matter: while Pozo was the IMF pick for the post (Acosta, 2005: 51), the installatio of former Central Bank Governor Mauricio Yepez[85] was welcomed by the Association of Ecuador's Private Banks[86].

Regarding tax reform, the picture is similarly incoherent. As president-elect, Gutiérrez had promised to reduce VAT on basic good from 12 to ten per cent[87], and to crack down on tax evasion to boost income to fund public services[88]. The VAT reduction failed to materialise[89], and talk of tax evasion was soon abandoned. Nevertheless, the government introduced a tax on luxury vehicles that had been sought both by student movements[90] and the IMF (Hurtado, 2006: 103). Another example of the government's response to pressure came when Gutiérrez halved a ten per cent tax on industrial users of electricity (with proceeds due to fund power for the poor) following threats by the Social Christian Party (PSC) member and Guayaquil Mayor Jaime Nebot to withdraw congressional support[91]. Business associations also ramped up pressure around taxes and excise duties[92], while the final year of Gutiérrez's presidency was spent locked in legal and public relations battles with foreign oil companies over tax payments[93].

Privatisation

[79] Deutsche Press Agentur, November 28th, 2002.
[80] UPI, February 12th, 2003.
[81] Universo, December 26th, 2003.
[82] Universo, March 31st, 2004.
[83] Economist, January 18th, 2003.
[84] IHS, August 13th, 2003.
[85] Universo, June 1st, 2004.
[86] IHS, June 2nd, 2004.
[87] Universo, November 25th, 2002.
[88] AP, November 25th, 2002.
[89] IHS, January 22nd, 2004.
[90] IHS, January 30th, 2003.
[91] Platt's Power in Latin America, July 2nd, 2004.
[92] IHS, April 30th, 2004.
[93] NYT, February 10th, 2004.

The area of privatisation demonstrates a neoliberal approach by the government. As a candidate Gutiérrez failed to provide specific commitments on this issue. In the first round, Gutiérrez offered little of substance, while giving the impression that he opposed privatising public enterprises (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 155). Nor did the signing of a formal agreement with PK thereafter force the candidate to clarify his position, apart from a commitment to a nationalist vision of the country's oil resources (Ibid; Barrera, 2004: 276). In the days before the second round, Gutiérrez specified that he opposed foreign ownership, but was open to private concessions in certain sectors[94]. Gutiérrez's semantic distinction between ownership and concession would take on more significance once it became clear that appointing private administrators to state companies was a condition of the IMF letter[95]. While this raises the question of whether Gutiérrez was aware during the election that such a letter would be signed, it also makes it hard to determine the extent of his 'switch' in this area.

In any event it did not take long for the tension between Gutiérrez's pragmatism and the visions held by PK and its social allies to surface. By June 2003 PK was calling the government to account for its plans for the privatisation of electricity, oil and water, alleging "dark forces" were influencing the president[96]. Nevertheless, PK did not withdraw its support for the government over the issue. CONAIE took a stronger line at a summit in Quito that month, threatening mobilisations and putting forward a range of demands that included a plebiscite on the issue of the FTAA, the convoking of a constituent assembly, and limits on privatisations (Becker, 2015: 96). To the surprise of many, Gutiérrez acceded to certain demands (Ibid), signing a formal agreement committing the administration to not privatising strategic areas of the state (OSAL, 2003: 165)[97]. Yet by August 2003 both PK and CONAIE withdrew support amid internal tensions, with CONAIE criticising National Secretariat for Planning and Dialogue (NSPD) head Augusto Barrera for promoting the privatisation of state power companies (Lucas, 2003d). The situation would in time widen into a split between the organisations (Sánchez, 2013: 38).

Shorn of support from progressive elements, Gutiérrez opted to rely on a shadowy arrangement with the right-wing PSC (Montúfar, 2006: 28; Becker, 2015: 98). Meanwhile IMF pressure to implement private management at state electricity and telephone companies was building[98]. As a result, prior to the IMF review in 2004 the government sought tenders for management concessions

[94] NYT, November 22nd, 2002.
[95] IHS, February 27th, 2004.
[96] IHS, June 16th, 2003.
[97] Universo, June 25th, 2003.
[98] IHS, August 13th, 2003.

of the state power companies. There were no bidders[99]. The government response was to draft legislation providing more attractive conditions for investors. However, these efforts ran into political opposition from domestic power groups, and socially from an increasingly articulated civil society – the only two sectors capable of bringing down the government (Lucas, 2004c: 6).

The arena for what would be the unfolding battle between the Gutiérrez government and power groups would be Congress which was, according some, "subordinated to corporate interests" (Hernández, 2004: 15). That some legislators such as former coalition members PK and MPD might vote against a bill incentivising private investment was not surprising. But that such measures were also vetoed by the right-wing PSC, as they were in September 2004, was puzzling in particular to foreign investors[100]. Thus despite statements to the contrary, it can be inferred that the vote was a form of "political retaliation" by the normally pro-business PSC[101]. In similar fashion, Congress rejected an omnibus bill containing a variety of reforms ('*Ley Topo*') in April 2005[102].

Left-wing opposition mainly took the protest form. Following the fracture of the governing coalition, CONAIE emerged weakened, only organising one significant mobilisation in February 2004 (Lucas, 2004a). This followed the healing of a rift with indigenous peasant organisation FENOCIN by using opposition to privatisation as frame to articulate action (OSAL, 2004a: 185-6). On foot of that protest Gutiérrez attempted to negotiate directly with CONAIE, offering control of the AGD and even the dismissal of Pozo, but the offer was rejected (Lucas, 2004c: 6). The absence of any significant further mobilisation by CONAIE (Lluco, 2004: 39) suggested it had lost its ability to coordinate actions with other movements (Silva, 2009: 190). Nevertheless if the purpose of allying with PK/CONAIE had been to "neutralise social mobilisation" (Ortiz, 2003: 15), it was only a partial success. Opposition to privatisation would remain a key issue in the ongoing mobilisations that dogged the government, but would not cause its ouster (Hurtado, 2006: 119).

Debt Service

Perhaps the most significant area of economic policy related to debt service. While Gutiérrez shifted his discourse between the first and second rounds, his stance was never radical. Although academic commentary asserts that Gutiérrez opposed the payment of external debt (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 155), in fact no presidential candidate advocated a default[103]. Instead Gutiérrez talked about

[99] IHS, February 27th, 2004.
[100] Platt's Power in Latin America, October 8th, 2004.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Universo, April 8th, 2005.
[103] AFP, October 19th, 2002.

exploring a swap of part of the debt for social investment[104], an idea he elaborated on in his inauguration speech with frequent references to paying the "social debt"[105]. External debt was "killing the dreams" of millions of children in Ecuador, the incoming president affirmed[106]. Expanding on the theme, Gutiérrez promised to seek a "creative solution" to the problem, citing Germany in 1953[107]. Nevertheless in interviews with foreign press prior to the second round, he stated simply that the debt would be paid[108].

The president faced a series of financial problems on taking power. Having defaulted on debt payments in 1999, Ecuador was unable to borrow from the markets, and the adoption of the dollar further limited monetary flexibility. The debt burden inherited by the government was considerable, with the country facing estimated payments of $2.3 billion in 2003[109]. When Gutiérrez took office analysts were predicting a default[110], an eventuality staved off by funds from the World Bank and IMF[111]. Ecuador's creditors included not only banks and Paris Club countries, but unpaid public sector employees[112]. The government also inherited the FEIREP mechanism, which decreed that 70 per cent of oil income be used to repurchase public debt, with only ten per cent available for health and education spending (WB, 2006: 33). Finally, the ruling coalition faced internal tensions on the issue. CONAIE were pushing for a moratorium on foreign debt payments, a possibility swiftly ruled out by PSP with the consent of PK[113].

In spite of this limited "wiggle room" the government made some modest gains in this area (Rivera Velez & Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 138). Having signed the IMF letter in early 2003 and withstood considerable social pressure, later that year Gutiérrez announced plans for increased spending and a reduction of debt payments as a percentage of GDP (from 34% to 32.6%)[114]. An extension of this plan was to seek relief from the institutional lenders who had praised the government's fiscal discipline and dedication to buying back debt[115]. But while the IMF agreed to late repayment of $50 million[116], petitions for debt forgiveness were dismissed by the World Bank[117]. Furthermore, the government's promises of largesse went largely unheeded by social actors, as by then the

[104] IHS, October 21st, 2002.
[105] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Ibid.
[108] NYT, November 22nd, 2002.
[109] AP, December 20th, 2002.
[110] Euromoney, January, 2003.
[111] AFP, February 7th, 2003.
[112] AP, December 20th, 2002.
[113] Universo, December 13th, 2002.
[114] IHS, December 10th, 2003.
[115] IHS, April 30th, 2004.
[116] Universo, May 1st, 2004.
[117] AP, February 2nd, 2004.

government had largely lost credibility[118]. Even though Ecuador managed to negotiate bilateral debt relief with Germany[119], Spain and the UK (OSAL, 2004a: 187), the sums were minor. In terms of debt negotiation, it was a case of too little, too late.

Instead an image was established of a government prioritising the interests of creditors over the national interest (Coragio, 2004: 8; Acosta, 2005: 53). The aforementioned examples aside, there appears to be substance to that view. As noted, the government inherited the FEIREP mechanism, which by law required 70 per cent of state earnings from oil transported via the controversial Heavy Crude Oil Pipeline (OCP) be dedicated to the payment or repurchase of public debt at market prices (WB, 2006: 33)[120]. While the Gutiérrez government did not create this "unique" situation (Correa, 2014: 112), it put the system into operation, leading to the artificial appreciation of bonds which in many cases doubled in value (Acosta, 2005: 51). Furthermore, the president passed executive decrees designed to increase the amount of funds flowing into FEIREP (Correa, 2014: 113), increasing bond prices and benefiting creditors, many of whom were domestic elites (Acosta, 2005: 51).

Additionally, under the terms of the letter of intention signed with the IMF, excess oil earnings above an established baseline were to be diverted into FEIREP (Lucas, 2004b: 8). The limit set on the price per barrel for 2003 and 2004 was $18, but during this period the average market value was $30; a rise to $25 in 2005 reflected an average price of $40 on the global market (Acosta, 2005: 52). As a result of these measures, the fund ended 2004 with a 55% surplus (Ibid), which further inflated the value of bonds (Correa, 2014: 120). According to some commentators this policy had an "enormous cost" for the country (Ibid), including low growth in the non-oil sector, and an increase in unemployment (Ibid; Acosta, 2005: 51), breaking a campaign promise to create jobs[121].

Thus while FEIREP ran a surplus the country had a general deficit, necessitating further borrowing (Acosta, 2005: 51). The FEIREP funds were deposited in a variety of national and international banks, which profited by the difference in interest rates on their lending to the state (Ibid). Among the institutions favoured in this way were Produbanco, former employer of Mauricio Pozo; and Barclays Capital, which would pay for Gutiérrez's stay in the US following his ouster (Ibid; Ruiz & Iturralde, 2013: 52). Meanwhile $538 million of FEIREP funds were used to pay domestic debt at due date, with no external debt paid with those funds (WB, 2006: 33). This use of the funds to finance government liquidity drew criticism from the World Bank, particularly as the practice led

[118] IHS, December 10th, 2003.
[119] Mercurio, March 12th, 2004.
[120] Of the remaining 30 per cent, 20 was to go into a petrol stabilisation fund, with the remaining ten per cent for education and health (WB, 2006: 33).
[121] Universo, November 25th, 2002.

to domestic debt increasing (by $791 million), defeating the purpose of FEIREP (Ibid). It was for these kinds of reasons that PK dubbed Gutiérrez the "president of the business classes" (Becker, 2015: 97).

The area of debt once again demonstrates the malleable nature of the Gutiérrez government in the face of pressure from social actors, domestic elites, and international financial institutions. During the first year of the government, social mobilisation came mainly from unions and followed corporatist lines ending with negotiated settlements (Sánchez, 2013: 37). As frustration built demands were increasingly framed more in economic terms (Silva, 2009). Throughout 2004 efforts were made to articulate demands and actions between unions, indigenous movements, and smaller groups like neighbourhood associations and retirees (OSAL, 2004a). Along with a rejection of privatisations and free trade agreements, external debt service was a key criticism (OSAL, 2004b).

In response, Gutiérrez passed Executive Decree 1918 which allowed FEIREP funds to be transferred to the budget[122]. However, the $110 million accessed went mainly to "pet projects" in the health sector designed to win clientelistic support or to stave off protest (WB, 2006: 33). In November 2004 Gutiérrez tried again, this time talking openly about changing the rules for FEIREP to reduce the portion for debt payment to 30 per cent[123]. This measure was supported by Congress, but opposed by the Economy Minister and the Central Bank, which warned the president against ceding to pressure[124]. The IMF added its voice, praising Ecuador's level of debt service but emphasising the need to respect FEIREP rules[125], and the proposal was shelved.

The Role of the State

In terms of the diversification of the economy, initiatives fizzled out. No substantial technological initiatives were launched, not even the president's plan to reduce public spending by buying "everything" on the internet[126]. In tourism, in spite of claims by PK to have supported ecological initiatives (Lluco, 2004: 30), the era is best remembered for Ecuador's costly hosting of the Miss Universe pageant[127]. As Minister for Agriculture, Luis Macas managed to advance a rural land titling process, providing access to credit (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 157). But following his departure a succession of ministers came and went with dizzying speed[128], the sector was massively

[122] Universo, August 10th, 2004.
[123] Universo, November 19th, 2004.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Universo, February 17th, 2005; Fed News, February 18th, 2005.
[126] Financial Times, December 18th, 2002.
[127] The total cost was estimated at $7.5 million – Hora, July 7th, 2004.
[128] Neither of the successors to Macas lasted more than four months in the post – IHS, February 9th, 2004.

underfunded (Ibid: 158; Acosta, 2005: 50), and the result was a sectoral recession (Ibid). Thus the relative economic stability that existed was highly dependent on record oil prices (Acosta, 2005: 49).

As for the wider issue of an increased role for the state in the economy, the promotion of private concessions for state enterprises appears a clear violation of this principle. However during the campaign Gutiérrez was careful to always leave the door open to foreign investment, even if he failed to protect strategic areas like oil as he had promised (Hurtado, 2006: 113). Living in the grey areas of his election promises, Gutiérrez did not push for Ecuador to sign onto the FTAA, which he had stated would be "suicide"[129]. But the government pivoted hastily into negotiations for a bilateral free trade agreement (FTA) with the US (Coffey, 2003a: 4). Civil society actors saw the move as breaking the spirit of his mandate, and opposition to the FTA would provide another rallying point for mobilisation (OSAL, 2004b).

Nevertheless, elements of the state were strengthened. Regarding centralised planning, some progress was made during the period of "co-governance" with PK (Lluco, 2004). The creation of the NSPD was a step along this road, even if the lack of internal coordination saw Vice-President Palacio given a similar function at the Office of Presidential Planning (Zaldumbide, 2007: 9). Following the departure of PK, however, Gutiérrez staffed the NSPD and other state positions with former military comrades[130]. In fact Gutiérrez's strengthening of the state took two main forms: support for the armed forces, whose salaries were increased with funds from FEIREP (Lucas, 2004c: 6); and the particularistic use of oil rents for cash transfers and targeted social programmes (Andrade, 2005: 108). Surrounded as he was by social and political opponents, Gutiérrez sought support from the state itself (Ibid: 99).

With regard to economic issues, the picture is in general terms one of a switch, if not a smooth or consistent one. It was instead a "chaotic" move to the right (Ramírez Gallegos & Saint-Upery, 2003: 5), with the government's promise to respond only to technical factors soon abandoned (Correa, 2014: 120). Many commentators have pointed to the influence of the IMF but as this analysis revealed, economic policy reflected to a significant extent the influence of local players including private banks, chambers of commerce, domestic creditors, and economic groups tied to the PSC.

4.5 Resource Extraction Policy:

[129] AFP, November 2nd, 2002.
[130] UPI, April 14th, 2004.

These same dynamics can be seen in microcosm in government policy regarding the strategic area of oil. Indeed, perhaps it would be better to say writ large, given the importance of this sector for the Ecuadorian economy (Larrea, 2006). On the campaign trail Gutiérrez projected a nationalist image while avoiding specifics. Nevertheless, the candidate talked of gaining sovereignty from the IMF through pre-sales of oil and the renegotiation of contracts with oil companies (Quintero, 2005: 127). These elements were in line with the nationalist vision of natural resources set out in the agreement with PK, along with a commitment to reactivate the productive economy (Barrera, 2004: 276). Prior to the second round, Gutiérrez undertook to increase oil production to 800,000 barrels per day by way of contracts with private companies[131]. Other elements outlined included a promise to give more autonomy to the state oil company, Petroecuador, so that it might explore new fields; and the possibility of re-joining OPEC, which Ecuador had exited in 1992[132].

The appointment of former colonel Carlos Arboleda as Energy Minister was initially a source of concern to oil companies, who feared that he would adopt the "big-state" approach to resource management traditionally favoured by the military[133]. Instead he would oversee the continuation of the status quo, including declining public sector involvement, limited investment in Petroecuador, elevated contributions to debt repayment, and environmental damage (Larrea, 2006: 66). In the face of stiff resistance from social actors in the guise of the oil workers' union, along with the by now familiar in-fighting between domestic elites and within government, a plan to privatise Petroecuador would ultimately fail, however. While overall policy in this area fell in line with the trend identified above, there was little in the way of coherence and much in the way of conflict.

As with other aspects of government policy, prior to the departure of PK there were some moves to implement elements of the electoral offering, such as efforts to increase production while avoiding the total privatisation of oil fields (Lluco, 2004: 30). There were also attempts to break the traditional dependency on companies from North America and Europe by signing agreements with China[134] and Venezuelan state oil company PdVSA[135]. However such attempts at a multi-polar approach led to significant internal conflict, not only with other parties, but also within the PSP (Hurtado, 2006: 109). What factors can explain this shift in such a key strategic area of the economy which, as noted, has had particular historic significance for the armed forces over the years?

Certainly the terms of the IMF letter strongly militated against any nationalist direction, including commitments to opening up the state company to private investment, and prohibiting forward sales

[131] Comercio, October 29th, 2002.
[132] AFP, January 15th, 2003.
[133] Platt's Oilgram News, January 15th, 2003.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Universo, July 11th, 2003.

of oil (Ibid: 103; Correa, 2014: 117). Due both to those terms and to dollarisation, it was necessary to attract investment that would bring foreign currency into the economy (Villavicencio, 2003: 5). While such considerations clearly influenced policy in the widest sense, they do not account for all of the government manoeuvrings in this area, and in particular the conflict with Petroecuador. Instead domestic power struggles, the influence of economic power groups, and civil society pressure were to have a significant bearing on the policy direction.

Oil Concessions

Shortly after taking power, Gutiérrez announced the opening of 200 oil wells in the Amazon basin for investment[136]. Shortly thereafter, however, the state was forced to cancel an existing tender on four fields due to a lack of bids[137]. To make the offer more attractive, Arboleda planned to move away from service agreements toward a form of joint venture known as "association contracts"[138]. Under these contracts the state would take 40 per cent of the earnings, with the majority going to the private company (Coffey, 2003b: 10). According to union spokesman Fernando Villavicencio, these kinds of contracts are justifiable only in projects that involve risk by the company, such as the exploration of new fields (2003: 1). In this case, however, the contracts were offered for the five main productive wells of Petroecuador, along with refineries, terminals, and pipelines, which some estimated would take $11 billion out of state coffers over 20 years (Ibid).

In the view of nationalist sectors within PSP, as well as unions and social movements, these contracts would make a gift of state resources to private interests (Larrea, 2004: 74). The strongest resistance to the measure came from within Petroecuador, both from directors and workers. The company's management team was made up of appointees of PK and PSP, although the president of the country is its titular head (Zambrano, 2003b: 4). It was reported that management opposed private investment in the industry[139], but in fact the issue was not foreign investment as such, but the terms on offer (Ibid: 5). The presence of his own appointees did not prevent Gutiérrez from sacking four of the five-member board (Coffey, 2003b: 10). The Federation of Oil Workers (FETRAPEC) called a strike which led to fuel shortages and queues at petrol pumps[140]. The government militarised installations and threatened to replace strikers with private contractors (OSAL, 2003: 164).

[136] Universo, March 14th, 2003.
[137] IHS, April 28th, 2003.
[138] Platt's Oilgram News, December 22nd, 2003.
[139] IHS, June 9th, 2003.
[140] Universo, June 15th, 2003.

The government's handling of the strike was considered "symptomatic" of its switch to favouring economic and geopolitical powers (Moreano, 2003: 2). Days after the strike began the government entered negotiations with union leaders and reputedly reached a compromise, only to subsequently repudiate the deal (Villavicencio, 2003: 4). The immediate upshot of this was to extend the strike by a further week which, according to Fernando Villavicencio's firsthand account, was welcomed by the government as a political opportunity (Ibid)[141]. What is certain is that the government began to attack the union in the press in order to publicly delegitimise workers it describe as "privileged"[142] (Moreano, 2003: 2). Most strikingly, Arboleda accused the strikers of having sabotaged the oil pipeline[143]. On foot of this accusation, the government summarily fired 30 workers, issuing charges for vandalism and terrorism against several union leaders, including Villavicencio[144].

Nevertheless the strike forced the government to suspend the association contracts and open bidding on service contracts to boost crude production. This retreat by government was not well received by oil companies (Villavicencio, 2003: 5), who wrote to the president protesting the unfavourable terms on offer[145]. Despite the government sweetening the deal by offering to have Petroecuador take responsibility for prior environmental damage[146], no company made a bid on the tender and it was eventually cancelled. While this change of policy was characterised in the business press as an instance of Gutiérrez caving in to civil society pressure[147], it begs the question why, having removed the leadership of both the management board and unions at Petroecuador and put the country through a damaging strike, the government so quickly abandon its plan for association contracts?

For some the association contracts that stood to most benefit foreign oil companies and satisfy the IMF were not the chief concern of the government. Instead they note the threat posed by management and union leaders to "juicy" ancillary contracts for products such as gas, diesel and gasoline – traditionally the purview of local economic power groups (Coffey, 2003b: 10). The PSC in particular were closely linked to these contracts, with the Febres Cordero family involved in asphalt, lubricant and gas businesses (Villavicencio, 2003: 6). Attempts by nationalist interests to eliminate intermediaries by signing agreements with other state oil companies, such as that signed with PdVSA to import gas, met with resistance even though it promised to save the state money (Coffey, 2003b: 10). The contract was duly abandoned in favour of renewing a deal with Chilean

[141] Villavicencio claims that Gilmar Gutiérrez, brother of the president and high-ranking member of PSP, stated during negotiations that "it suits us if the strike continues to generate an atmosphere of social chaos and commotion in order to dissolve Congress and the courts, or at least to create a crisis in cabinet and change some ministers" (2003: 4).
[142] Platt's Oilgram News, June 18th, 2003.
[143] Platt's Oilgram News, June 17th, 2003.
[144] Universo, August 5th, 2003.
[145] IHS, November 3rd, 2003.
[146] Platt's Oilgram News, December 22nd, 2003.
[147] IHS, June 17th, 2004.

company Trasfigura, whose legal representative was also an advisor to Arboleda (Coffey, 2003c: 9).

The OCP Pipeline

Evidence of this dynamic favouring domestic over transnational interests can be found in other areas. A key concern for oil policy at the time of Gutiérrez's victory was the OCP, due to begin operations in 2003 (Villavicencio, 2003). OCP was an initiative of several private oil companies[148], part of the "progressive denationalisation" of the industry (Larrea, 2006: 66). The initiative was supported by the IMF and formed a central component of FEIREP, whereby 70 per cent of the state's proceeds from the pipeline – estimated at 18 per cent of the total (Coffey, 2002: 4) – was to be used to pay external debt[149]. To be profitable, OCP required a minimum of 250,000 barrels per day, but typical output from the companies involved was 160,000, leading oil companies to pressure Gutiérrez to route light crude from Petroecuador via OCP (Villavicencio, 2003: 6). In the opinion of some, OCP was designed as a mixed crude pipeline with the expectation that the state would begin to use it, even though it would result in losses due to transport costs[150] and oil degradation (Ibid).

The government did not accede to the wishes of the companies, particularly as the state was indemnified from losses by "ship-or-pay" contracts signed by the consortium[151]. In fact the government moved to decouple FEIREP from OCP via a decree which allowed heavy crude transported via the state-owned Trans-Ecuadorian Oil Pipeline System (SOTE) to go to the fund (Correa, 2014: 113). This measure angered the consortium companies as it further reduced crude flowing through OCP, leaving them "scrambling" to increase production[152]. That however was the stated purpose of OCP, and an example of the government keeping a promise to strengthen sovereignty. The beneficiaries of the measure were creditors, as increased flows into FEIREP – along with the completion of OCP – pushed up bond values (Ibid). The government further amended FEIREP via Decree 1238 to redefine "heavy" crude, allowing more oil to fall under the system (Ibid; Acosta, 2005: 52). Coinciding with a boom in oil prices, the measures favoured economic groups via the financial system, in turn reviving Ecuador's private banking sector (Andrade, 2005: 109).

[148] The companies involved were Argentine Techint, AGIP from Italy, Perenco from France, EnCana from Canada, Occidental from the US, Repsol from Spain, and Petrobras (Ruiz & Iturralde, 2013: 48).
[149] The Noboa government changed the spirit of the mechanism by passing a law allowing FEIREP to be used to purchase internal debt also (Correa, 2014: 113).
[150] According to Villavicencio, the annual difference in cost to the state was over $45 million (2003).
[151] Petroleum Economist, September, 2004.
[152] NYT, February 10th, 2004.

The Reform of Petroecuador

Beyond these specific issues, others pointed to the desire of domestic power groups – said to include the PSC and chambers of commerce – to assume control of Ecuador's oil industry (Moreano, 2003: 2). These actors had long insisted that oil activity would be better managed by them than the state (Zambrano, 2003b: 4). Like previous administrations, the Gutiérrez government fell into line. In the first instance, rather than empowering Petroecuador to expand into new fields, the government cut its budget by $350 million (Ruiz & Iturralde, 2013: 55). Rather than reform, this was a continuation of an existing policy of "economic asphyxiation" (Zambrano, 2003b: 4). This financial neglect was allied to a delegitimising discourse against workers, both during and after the strike (Petras & Veltemeyer, 2005: 158). In March 2004 Gutiérrez declared a state of emergency in the sector and dismissed 20 senior employees to allow for the restructuring of Petroecuador, allegedly due to corruption and theft[153]. The president was on a path none of his predecessors had dared to take (Moreano, 2003: 2).

Along with the planned restructuring, Gutiérrez threatened Arboleda's job[154] and overrode his decision to impose a minimum 35 per cent state take on production[155]. Instead Gutiérrez re-launched the bid with no lower limit, opening the door for joint ventures on even more favourable terms. Gutiérrez further issued a decree to allow oil company employees to take seats on Petroecuador's board without any cooling period, appointing a Petrobras executive as president[156]. By July 2004 the government was discussing plans to part-privatise Petroecuador in the mixed ownership model of the Brazilian oil company[157].

Resistance this time came from political opponents, including within PSP (Hurtado, 2006: 109). Democratic Left (ID) deputy Jorge Sánchez issued a constitutional challenge to the contracts[158], leading Attorney General José Maria Borja to cancel the bidding[159]. Arboleda resigned amid rumours of PSC pressure[160]. On Borja's advice Gutiérrez sought to reform the law before proceeding with a tender process[161]. The Hydrocarbons Bill reinstated the minimum state take and was supported by the PSC[162]. Indeed, some saw the law as a "PSC project" to gain entry to fields

[153] Universo, March 1st, 2004.
[154] Ibid.
[155] Platt's Oilgram News, March 10th, 2004.
[156] IHS, May 3rd, 2004.
[157] IHS, July 8th, 2004.
[158] Universo, April 13th, 2004.
[159] Petroleum Economist, May, 2004.
[160] Ibid.
[161] IHS, June 17th, 2004.
[162] Hora, June 21st, 2004.

controlled by Petroecuador (Ibid: 107). Opposition came from a bloc of over 30 legislators named the 'Patriotic Front for the Defence of Oil,' who wanted to see the state company properly funded[163]. The group included members of PSP, among them the president's wife[164]. The bill was voted down and although the president resubmitted the reform[165], it was ultimately withdrawn[166].

Despite this setback, the government pressed on with plans for Petroecuador, seeking closer ties with Brazil. Having appointed a former executive as president of Petroecuador, and met with Petrobras officials, new Energy Minister Eduardo López held the company up as a "model"[167]. However even in the business media there were doubts as to the feasibility of the plan given the government's low legitimacy[168]. The situation was not helped by allegations by the Civic Corruption Control Commission (CCCC) that López's family business was availing of ancillary contracts to provide services to Petroecuador[169]. As with other IMF-mandated reforms, the government tried to change the law to allow private operators into Petroecuador fields via the '*Ley Topo*'[170]. However the measure foundered on divisions in Congress and in spite of the support of the PSC, it was defeated.

That Gutiérrez responded to pressure from the US and the IMF is clear from the repeated attempts to allow for more foreign involvement, along with his refusal to rejoin OPEC despite pressure from Energy Minister López[171]. However the government did not back away entirely from engagement with China (Lucas: 2004d: 2). Furthermore, the government resisted pressure from transnational oil companies regarding OCP and moved to close a legal loophole allowing oil companies to claim a rebate of VAT[172]. Although there are fewer examples of policy that prejudiced domestic groups, the PSC did not gain as much control over oil resources as it desired (Ibid). The management of FEIREP favoured the private banking sector (Hurtado, 2006: 125), but the government also made some moves to access those funds. The government responded to civil society pressure (in particular the oil workers' strike), although it later sought to weaken the organisations involved through both discourse and repression.

Viewing the government's approach to policy for the oil sector as a whole, it is clear that it failed to live up to the statist approach many expected. Nonetheless elements of the campaign offer were

[163] Platt's Oilgram News, June 18th, 2004.
[164] Hora, June 21st, 2004.
[165] Universo, June 24th, 2004.
[166] Universo, July 16th, 2004.
[167] IHS, July 8th, 2004.
[168] Ibid
[169] Universo, July 9th, 2004.
[170] Universo, March 20th, 2005.
[171] Xinhua News Service, January 20th, 2005.
[172] Universo, August 2nd, 2004.

bland enough to allow for an argument that no switch had occurred. For example, the government could also be said to have honoured a commitment to increase oil production, achieving record outputs and GDP growth in 2004 of 7.6% (Hurtado, 2006: 123), even if the figures fell short of the ambitious target set. The increase was achieved through private companies responding to high oil prices while production at Petroecuador fell consistently[173]. Overall government policy in this strategic area can be classified as a partial switch that, as in other areas, seemed to leave no one satisfied (Lucas, 2004d).

4.6 Politico-Institutional Reform:

This section will analyse the government's approach to politico-institutional reform, a key election promise. With regard to government policy in the social, economic and extractive areas, it is arguable that those cases were attributable to some extent to the financial situation the president inherited. But according to the prevailing narrative, Gutiérrez's decision to accept the confines of the country's market model was deterministic (Weyland, 2003: 1109). The choice of a banker linked to the neoliberal system as Economy Minister and the IMF letter led inevitably to the introduction of an economic *paquetazo*, it is argued. Attendant cuts to social spending in turn put the president at odds with his government partners (Conaghan, 2011: 264), pushing the administration ever further from the campaign offer and cementing his reputation as a switcher. Others point to institutional factors such as an opposition-dominated Congress that ruled out any possibility of changing this narrative (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013: 120).

However another interpretation centres on the prospect of political reform held out by Gutiérrez during the election campaign. Like Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, it was in regard to political reform that Gutiérrez was most explicit while campaigning, and most strongly pursued in power. Along with the centrepiece claim of fighting corruption, Gutiérrez vowed to reduce the number of deputies in Congress[174], depoliticise the justice system[175], and group together the Attorney General, Banking Superintendent and Procurator General to create a 'fourth power' of the state[176]. On the campaign trail, Gutiérrez characterised the proposed reforms as "re-founding" the state, including a constituent assembly to write a new constitution (Quintero, 2005: 128). Anticipating congressional opposition, Gutiérrez threatened to call a referendum on the issue[177] and talked of bringing supporters onto the streets to face down opposition[178].

[173] Petroleum Economist, September, 2004.
[174] Universo, November 24th, 2002.
[175] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.
[176] Ibid.
[177] AFP, October 28th, 2002; AP, December 27th, 2002.
[178] Guardian, January 16th, 2003.

That these reforms were not enacted did not stem from their total abandonment by the government. In fact it appears that this area is an example of Gutiérrez not switching, as efforts were made to introduce elements of the programme set out above on repeated occasions. For some commentators it was the timing of those attempts that was the more proximate cause of their ultimate failure than the content (Montúfar, 2006). Why then did the slow, cautious path to reform that worked for Chávez not yield similar success for Gutiérrez? According to some commentators, the correlation of forces was not as favourable to switching in Chávez's Venezuela as in the case of Gutiérrez's Ecuador (Lucas, 2003b: 9). In order to understand the situation, it is necessary to consider the fluid make-up of the Gutiérrez government. Montúfar identifies three phases of the administration: the consociational, the traditional, and the authoritarian (2006: 35).

The Consociational Phase

The first phase involved three groups: PSP, PK/CONAIE, and 'honest bankers' (Echevarría 2006: 89). The fact that each group was weak led to what Echevarría calls an unconscious attempt at consociationalism, making Gutiérrez the central figure with the casting vote (Ibid: 88). Others characterised the first phase as an attempt at a government of national unity[179], but questioned whether the sum of such divergent parts could realistically hold (Saint-Upery, 2002: 11). Gutiérrez presented himself and the government as putting the national interest first, asserting that his only ideology was his country[180]. He further evinced a desire to bring disparate parties to the table, calling for a 'Grand National Dialogue' to union and business leaders, and former presidents[181]. The government also instituted dialogue committees with social movements, which drew huge participation[182]. This desire to be the bridge between economic and social actors is characteristic of military leaders in the region, Hernández notes (2004: 14).

This tone was carried into the president's inauguration ceremony, which was attended by presidents of the left like Hugo Chávez and Fidel Castro, and of the right like Alvaro Uribe of Colombia[183]. Gutiérrez declared himself to be of both the left and the right[184]. Yet upon taking office, talk of substantive political reform took a backseat to economic and security concerns (Ortiz, 2003: 14), with the exception of a quixotic attempt to take the oath of office in front of "the people" and not

[179] Gutiérrez described his government in these terms – AFP, November 25th, 2002.
[180] Guardian, December 4th, 2002.
[181] AP, December 24th, 2002.
[182] AI: Rosa Rodriguez.
[183] Universo, January 16th, 2003.
[184] Gutiérrez said: "If sharing and being supportive, if fighting against corruption, social injustice and impunity, is to be left-wing, then I am left-wing! If generating wealth and encouraging production is to be right-wing, then I am right-wing!" – Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.

Congress[185]. Gutiérrez referred often to his plans for a referendum on political reform, which served a dual purpose of gaining legitimacy and putting opponents on the defensive (Ibid)[186]. Nonetheless, it was December 2003 before any plans to enact political reforms would be mooted – in this case to reduce the number of deputies in Congress. By that stage PK had departed and the government's credibility was "severely damaged" by the perceived failure to keep its promises[187]. On this occasion the president withdrew the proposals, displaying the inconsistency for which he became renowned (Hernández, 2004: 16).

The first six months of the new administration were dominated by intense power struggles, beginning with lengthy negotiations of cabinet roles (Lluco, 2004: 11) and a fruitless quest for legislative support (Hernández, 2004: 13). PK Coordinator Lluco describes chaotic attempts by business associations and investors to gain access to the new president (2004: 26). According to former Deputy Interior Minister Virgilio Hernández, the economic team took precedence over political and social aspects of the government (2004: 12). Lluco believes Gutiérrez prioritised an inner circle and notes an increasingly authoritarian style (2004: 32). NSPD head Augusto Barrera asserts that after a stormy first cabinet meeting, no formal measure for dialogue between the coalition partners was established (2004: 277). Instead the government was formed with little consultation with the main movements (Becker, 2015: 91), while informal channels were opened to bankers, business representatives, and specific indigenous factions, mainly CONFENIAE (Lluco, 2004: 27-28; Ortiz, 2003: 14).

The response from PK was to seek to modify the economic programme and vainly attempt to remove Pozo (Echevarría, 2006: 90). Added to this was pressure from civil society in the form of strikes by public sector unions, and the critical if less active role of CONAIE (Crandall & Jenga, 2004: 94). Instead of a unified pursuit of political reform, according to Echevarría each constituent element of the coalition began fighting for individual goals, leaving the government prey to experienced political players (2006: 92). Lucas puts it more bluntly, claiming that PK and the MPD did not know how to pressure effectively for their demands (2003b: 9), highlighting the absence of a properly articulated plan for government (Ibid; Barrera, 2004; Echevarría, 2006). The result was a severe weakening of the government's legitimacy (Ibid: 90) and with the departure of PK ending the first phase without any substantive reform.

[185] Universo, January 9th, 2003.
[186] Universo, February 19th, 2003.
[187] IHS, December 10th, 2003.

Instead the government prioritised its signature promise of fighting corruption. Upon his inauguration Gutiérrez reiterated the commitment[188], stating that if he turned out to be corrupt the people had the right to execute him[189]. Gutiérrez issued calls for an international anti-corruption front and cut government salaries, a move some saw as "delivering" on anti-corruption promises[190]. On taking office Gutiérrez declared the fight against corruption to be a "state policy" via Executive Decree 122[191], creating an anti-corruption body tasked with writing a national plan. The plan failed to materialise, however, due to the departure from government of Augusto Barrera, the body's intended chief[192]. The government introduced a new system of procurement for state contracts overseen by the CCCC, and ratified the UN Convention against Corruption [193] but failed in attempts to have bankers extradited[194].

Although the government fulfilled some promises in legislative terms, in practice it quickly acquired a reputation that gave the lie to such achievements. From the earliest stages of the government many criticised the award of state jobs to family members and military friends as nepotistic (Zaldumbide, 2007: 7). Within the first three months of the administration it had lost two senior members of the president's party – Housing Minister Nelson Álvarez and Gutiérrez's brother-in-law and head of a state social fund, Napoleon Villa — to corruption scandals[195]. While Gutiérrez claimed the scandals were invented by exiled bankers[196], the allegations would not end there. Former military colleague and Social Welfare Minister Patricio Acosta was placed on a corruption list and denied a visa by the US State Department, leading to his resignation[197]. Furthermore, the president himself would in time come under investigation for alleged misuse of public funds[198].

The Traditional Phase

None of these dynamics were improved during the second phase of what Montúfar calls "traditional" politics (2006: 35). This phase centred on a covert alliance with the PSC (Montúfar 2006: 23) and by extension powerful business and financial groups (Lluco, 2004: 27). This

[188] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2003.
[189] Irish Times, January 16th, 2003.
[190] UPI, February 12th, 2003.
[191] Universo, December 26th, 2003.
[192] Ibid.
[193] Universo, February 19th, 2003.
[194] Universo, December 26th, 2003.
[195] AP, April 7th, 2003.
[196] AFP, March 14th, 2003.
[197] Universo, May 28th, 2004.
[198] By June 2004 the media had highlighted 16 separate accusations of corruption against the government, including Gutiérrez – Universo, June 7th, 2004.

arrangement left the president at the whim of the largest party in Congress. For some this outcome was not happenstance but rather a tactic employed by the PSC, based on the view that winning power outright was not achievable (Montúfar, 2006: 36). Gutiérrez conceded later that the agreement had involved access to the "juiciest contracts" in the oil and telecommunications sectors in return for providing "political stability" (Ibid: 28). For some commentators, this kind of political "blackmail" meant that it was not necessary for the PSC to win the presidency in order to exercise power (Ibid: 29; Andrade, 2005: 111).

Unsurprisingly this arrangement proved far from stable. Conflicts soon emerged between the PSC and government over control of the state companies, with accusations of corruption flying in both directions. Energy Minister Carlos Arboleda resigned following pressure by Febres Cordero, who also alleged government corruption at telecommunications company Pacifictel[199]. Febres Cordero pointed to the overweening influence of the military on government decisions[200], an accusation not without substance (Montúfar, 2006: 26)[201]. In turn the government accused the PSC and Febres Cordero's family of pursuing private interests in Pacifictel, the oil sector, and "any state institution where there is money"[202]. Nonetheless when Gutiérrez forced out senior employees at Petroecuador and Pacifictel[203] due to alleged nepotism or corruption, he replaced them with former military colleagues[204].

During this phase the government stepped up moves against civil society, particularly the indigenous movement. As Montúfar notes, human rights abuses against perceived enemies, including social organisations, was a constant feature of the administration (2006: 24). To a repertoire of threats, surveillance and imprisonment was added a strategy of clientelism designed to divide the indigenous movement (Ramos, 2005: 30). From the outset the government favoured particular factions (Lluco, 2004: 27), and the appointment of discredited former CONAIE president Antonio Vargas (Becker, 2015: 84) as minister sowed further discord (Chuji & Shihuango, 2004: 7; Ramos, 2005: 30). Following the breakdown of relations with CONAIE, Gutiérrez moved to take control of the Council for the Development of Nationalities and Peoples of Ecuador (CODENPE), issuing Executive Decree 1833-A to give the president power over its configuration (OSAL, 2004b: 174) [205]. The move was opposed by CONAIE, and condemned as promoting clientelism and

[199] Universo, April 16th, 2004.
[200] UPI, May 4th, 2004.
[201] In spite of this close relationship with certain members of the armed forces, there were significant factions of the military establishment that were unhappy with the effect that this favouritism was causing in public opinion (Lucas, 2004c: 6-7).
[202] Universo, April 16th, 2004.
[203] Universo, July 20th, 2003.
[204] UPI, April 14th, 2004.
[205] Hora, October 21st, 2003.

division (Chuji & Shihuango, 2004: 7). Nonetheless the tactics were effective, precipitating the rapid neutralisation of the movement (Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 16). As Becker notes, the Gutiérrez presidency left the indigenous movement "crippled" (2012: 117).

The uneasy alliance with the PSC finally came to an end amid further claims of corruption and political calculation. Commentators cited a desire by opposition parties to take advantage of the government's weakness following poor results in regional elections as the cause of the breakdown, although Gutiérrez claimed efforts to recover debts from defaulting bankers were behind it (Montúfar, 2006: 29). The upshot was that the PSC joined with ID and PK to launch impeachment proceedings against Gutiérrez (Ibid). The stated reason for impeachment was the use of public funds to promote the governing party at the election, chiefly relating to offering jobs in return for votes (Ibid).

The Authoritarian Phase

This conflict gave rise to the final phase of the Gutiérrez government. In response to the impeachment threat, the president began to openly buy the votes of independent legislators and deputies from other parties (Ibid: 30). More significantly, Gutiérrez forged alliances with two "personalist parties" (de la Torre, 2015: 116). The Ecuadorian Roldosista Party (PRE) was led by the ousted and exiled former president, Abdala Bucaram. The Institutional Renewal Party of National Action (PRIAN) was headed by banana magnate Alvaro Noboa, defeated by Gutiérrez in 2002. With the support of this unusual coalition, and in spite of calls by social movements for protests against Gutiérrez[206], the impeachment process fell three votes short of a majority (OSAL, 2004c: 182).

The aftermath of the failed impeachment process saw Gutiérrez revive radical elements of his election platform relating to political reform. The president called on Congress to seek ways to depoliticise state institutions, including the Supreme Court[207]. Within weeks the new governing coalition had taken control of both the Constitutional Tribunal (TC) and Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE), removing PSC and ID appointees and replacing them with members of the PRE (Montúfar, 2006: 30). The president began talking openly of suspending Congress to convoke a constituent assembly[208], and threatened to send the petition for a referendum directly to the TSE if Congress blocked proposed reforms[209]. Shortly thereafter and on the president's request, Congress voted by

[206] Universo, November 9th, 2004.
[207] IHS, December 2nd, 2004.
[208] Universo, November 16th, 2004.
[209] Universo, November 29th, 2004.

a simple majority to remove all but four of the 31 Supreme Court justices who, Gutiérrez alleged, were controlled by "corrupt bankers" linked to the PSC[210].

While opponents decried the move as unconstitutional[211], Gutiérrez presented it as a blow to the oligarchy[212]. Commentators were sceptical, viewing the reforms as the price to be paid to the PRE and PRIAN (Ibid). Both parties were seeking increased power over the TSE, with the PRE also intent on annulling corruption charges against Bucaram (Ibid). Yet it would be simplistic to say that Gutiérrez was merely dancing to the tune of his new partners (Tintají, 2004: 2). For example, after appointing PRE and PRIAN associates to the Supreme Court, Gutiérrez proposed that the reforms of the judiciary be put to a referendum, much to their displeasure[213]. Others viewed events as a move by the president to destroy the influence of political rivals, in particular the PSC, something not attempted since the return to democracy (Ramos, 2005: 32). Certainly the opposition was fragmented following the impeachment vote, while antipathy toward the PSC was possibly the sole unifying factor in the new governing coalition (Ibid: 29).

In this line Gutiérrez launched a number of attacks on the PSC and Febres Cordero (Ibid: 32). The president threatened to have the AGD pursue his brother Agustin for debts owing from the bank collapse[214], and alluded to a possible commission of investigation into human rights abuses during Febres Cordero's term as president[215]. The power struggle was not confined to the political realm, with business actors and chambers of commerce aligning with the PSC in opposition to the governing coalition[216]. Indeed the president of the Federation of Chamber of Commerce called it a coup[217] and vowed to derail the government's plans by pulling its members out of FTA talks with the US[218]. But as Ramírez Gallegos notes, the business community in Ecuador is very divided (2005: 15). The conflict over public institutions furthered this schism, setting off a power struggle between oligarchic groups (Ramos, 2005: 15).

With traditional political parties hobbled and business elites divided, the main threat to the president's plans came from civil society (Ibid: 25). As noted however, the once-powerful indigenous movement was divided on foot of a mix of internal conflict and government tactics. CONAIE president Leonidas Iza lamented that the movement had "never been weaker" (Becker,

[210] AP, December 10th, 2004.
[211] The removal of a Supreme Court judge required a constitutional amendment approved by 75 per cent of Congress.
[212] AP, December 10th, 2004.
[213] AP, December 15th, 2004.
[214] AP, December 10th, 2004.
[215] Universo, November 30th, 2004.
[216] Comercio, November 30th, 2004.
[217] NYT, December 18th, 2004.
[218] AP, December 10th, 2004.

2015: 96). While elements of the movement were opposed to the government[219], other federations like CONFENIAE and FEINE were active supporters. CONAIE was unable to resolve these divisions, instead opting to keep its distance from what it deemed an oligarchic struggle (Ramos, 2015: 32). The government deepened divisions through a series of counter-protests timed to coincide with opposition mobilisations (Montúfar, 2006: 33-34). Additionally the government formed *Cero Corrupcion* (Zero Corruption) – ostensibly a citizen group but considered by many as "shock troops" to dispute public spaces, reducing the legitimacy of opposition protests (Ibid). Despite calls by political parties for social actors to mobilise, there was no initial reaction (de la Torre, 2015: 134).

Frustrated at the lack of mobilisation, political parties tried to articulate opposition with civil society, but results were mixed (Ramos, 2005: 40). While PSC Mayor of Guayaquil Jaime Nebot organised a sizeable march[220], its political impact was negligible (Ibid). Alternatively the Quito Assembly, headed by ID Mayor Paco Moncayo, sought to coordinate political and social action in a sustained fashion (Montúfar, 2006: 41). Among the actions were a legislative blockade and the huge March for Democracy which brought over 150,000 onto the streets – although some 20,000 were government supporters (OSAL, 2005a: 158-159). Ultimately however the assembly was unable to consistently mobilise numbers of an order to trouble Gutiérrez (Ramos, 2005: 25). The failure of the Quito Assembly was attributed to its overt links to the discredited parties (Ibid: 67) who some believed were using the march as a "smokescreen" to bring the government to the table (Quito, 2005: 8). But while the political actors may not have wanted to topple the government, the forces they mobilised would not prove easy to control.

The anti-oligarchic discourse employed by Gutiérrez also led to an upturn in the president's popularity, albeit from a low base[221]. Furthermore, as Montúfar notes, this discourse proved useful in altering the correlation of forces among opposition parties (2008: 295). Pressing home his advantage, Gutiérrez stuck with his plans to depoliticise the courts and other institutions. The president sent proposals to Congress to reduce Supreme Court membership from 31 to 16, with the judges to be chosen by civil society organisations[222]. The TC and TSE would be put in the hands of an independent electoral organisation, while the Comptroller would be named by the president[223].

[219] ECUARUNARI in particular were highly critical.
[220] Universo, January 27th, 2005.
[221] The Economist reported that Gutiérrez's approval rating rose from the low teens to over 20 per cent – January 29th, 2005.
[222] AP, January 21st, 2005.
[223] Ibid.

On the face of it Gutiérrez had revived election promises to take state institutions out of the hands of parties, representing a significant break with the existing order[224].

Unlike on other occasions, Gutiérrez seemed intent on following through, publically pressuring Congress to pass the reforms. Some viewed the moves as part of an authoritarian concentration of power (Ramírez Gallegos, 2005: 14; Montúfar, 2006: 2). In particular it was noted that the proposals would corporatise the judicial system and place it under the control of the president (Ibid: 32). However the president was also coming under pressure to resolve the crisis. At home the deposed Supreme Court continued to meet in Quito's Catholic University[225], while 4,000 judiciary workers went on strike to demand the removal of the new court[226]. Protestors charged Gutiérrez with packing the court with his own supporters, while CONAIE continued to call for his resignation[227]. Meanwhile IMF Director Rodrigo de Rato visited Ecuador to urge more economic reforms[228], a goal which would be facilitated by the new institutional arrangements[229]. UN special envoy Leandro Despouy chose to blame Congress[230], while the US embassy expressed its concern with the impasse[231].

The president had little option but to act, and circumstances appeared favourable given the weakness and division among political and social opponents. The realignment of forces brought about by Gutiérrez's manoeuvres was of a temporary nature, however. Even as Gutiérrez pressed ahead with his plans, his own governing coalition was disintegrating. As Ramos notes, the PRE and PRIAN kept their own counsel, and in the face of the mooted referendum did not communicate their plans to Gutiérrez (2005: 41). First to break ranks was PRIAN, who voted down the president's choices for attorney general[232]. As Gutiérrez reacted by proposing the sacking of the new Supreme Court and the appointment of new judges by an electoral college, he found himself blocked by the PRE[233]. With the president still threatening a referendum and the legislature reduced to violent conflict[234], the Supreme Court announced a pardon for Bucaram, who returned from exile within days[235].

[224] Gutiérrez himself described the reforms as "the most far-reaching in the last 50 years" – Ibid.
[225] NYT, December 18th, 2004.
[226] AP, March 16th, 2005.
[227] IHS, February 16th, 2005.
[228] Universo, February 18th, 2005.
[229] Economist, January 29th, 2005.
[230] AP, March 18th, 2005.
[231] Economist, January 29th, 2005.
[232] Universo, March 23rd, 2005.
[233] Universo, March 28th, 2005.
[234] AP, March 31st, 2005.
[235] Universo, April 2nd, 2005.

Bucaram's arrival generated a sense of "moral indignation" among citizens, in particular the middle classes (de la Torre, 2015: 119), heralding the start of a new stage of contention. Gutiérrez continued with his plans for restructuring the courts by submitting a new proposal to Congress, refusing to permit parties to appoint judges by simple congressional majority (OSAL, 2005a: 161)[236]. Nonetheless, the president appeared to be staking his political survival on support from outside the formal system, mainly from the armed forces and public demonstrations (de la Torre, 2015: 120). Gutiérrez's plans to 'take the streets' by means of counter-marches (Ibid) yielded initial success, as the government survived two protests organised by the Quito Assembly, both of which turned violent (OSAL, 2005a: 161-162). Furthermore, the military high command publically affirmed its support for the Constitution in the face of calls from Quito mayor and former general Moncayo to abandon the president[237]. However this outward unity disguised internal division arising from the politicisation of the military during the government's term (Ramos, 2005: 74).

This disunity would be put to the test when following a failed Quito Assembly protest[238], citizens from the middle classes took to the streets to chant "*que se vayan todos!*" ("Everyone out!") (OSAL, 2005a: 162). The protests were not organised by any movement (Becker, 2015: 106), but rather via internet, phone, and the small independent Radio La Luna (de la Torre, 2015: 121-122). The mobilisations took place mainly at night as the participants worked during the day, and used symbolic gestures like banging pots and pans (Ramírez Gallegos, 2005). While the catalyst for the protests was indignation with political corruption, neoliberal economic policies were also rejected (de la Torre, 2015: 125). Initially dismissed as '*forajidos*' (outlaws) by Gutiérrez (Becker, 2015: 106), the movement's unconventional conformation and tactics confounded the president. When Gutiérrez announced a state of emergency the military command physically stood behind him[239], but lower ranks failed to follow orders (Ramos, 2005: 74). With the military unwilling to enforce martial law, Gutiérrez was forced to lift the emergency decree within a day (Ibid).

Nevertheless during this period the president managed to dissolve his new Supreme Court[240], a move subsequently confirmed by Congress[241], aligning Gutiérrez once again with the PSC and others that recently sought to impeach him. Still Gutiérrez insisted on his intention of depoliticising the court, casting himself as an honest servant doing battle against elites[242]. These political manoeuvres did not quell the demonstrations, at which no politicians were permitted (OSAL,

[236] AP, April 13th, 2005.
[237] AP, April 6th, 2005.
[238] AP, April 13th, 2005.
[239] AP, April 15th, 2005.
[240] Ibid.
[241] Deutsche Presse Agentur, April 18th, 2005.
[242] NYT, April 18th, 2005.

2005a: 162). Unable now to call on the military, and despite robust economic growth and a further rise in his apprroval ratings, Gutiérrez was vulnerable. These facts would not protect him, nor ultimately would his supporters whose arrival by bus from the provinces was blocked by thousands of anti-government protesters (Ibid: 164). Under these conditions, legislators voted to impeach the president on the dubious grounds of abandonment of his post even while he was physically in his office (Becker, 2015: 107). Gutiérrez had no option but to leave, fleeing by helicopter to exile in Brazil (OSAL, 2005a: 164).

In summary, in spite of the ultimate failure of his efforts in the area of political reform, it is clear that Gutiérrez made considerable efforts to fulfil a key electoral promise. The president's realignment of key institutions, however unconstitutional in manner, took them out of the hands of traditional parties. Furthermore, his efforts to place these institutions under the control of a non-partisan body were in line with his electoral promises. Looked at over an extended time frame, it is asserted that Gutiérrez did not switch on this key electoral promise

4. 6 Discussion

Three key points emerge from this discussion of the presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez. First, Gutiérrez is commonly portrayed in the literature as an example of a left populist who switched early in his presidency. Indeed, many have located the point at which Gutiérrez switched at mere weeks into his term, with the signing of a letter of intention with the IMF. This image was influenced by the predominant focus in the scholarly literature on switching that views it solely in relation to economic policy. However, by analysing the entirety of his presidency across a range of broad policy areas, this chapter reveals a picture that is less clear-cut. Thus this chapter demonstrates that the exclusive focus on economic policy employed by the policy switching literature is insufficient to adequately capture the dynamics of the Gutiérrez presidency generally.

Second, looking at the dynamics of the Gutiérrez presidency as a whole highlights the need to unpack the concept of switching further still. Rather than a straightforward early switch, Gutiérrez's was in fact a 'chaotic' switch during his first years in power. While the overall trend in economic policy was at odds with his election promises, some progress was made in terms of social policy, particularly during the 'consociationalist' period of coalition with PK. Additionally, there were notable deviations from the overall tendency toward neoliberal continuity, such as overriding the World Bank's FEIREP mechanism in an attempt to demobilise social actors. What is more, the policy switching literature fails to capture the president's late attempt to 'switch back' and revive his electoral pledge for deep political reform, including the depoliticization of state institutions.

Thus this chapter shows that the policy switching literature needs to avoid classifying presidents as simply 'switchers' and 'non-switchers'. Instead, presidents can switch backwards and forwards across different policy areas and indeed in the same policy area over time.

Thirdly, this chapter reveals that the pact with PK/CONAIE provided Gutiérrez with both support and a degree of legitimacy by association[243]. It also ensured that Gutiérrez was largely spared sustained mobilisations by the indigenous movement at the commencement of his term. Even when opting to maintain the dollar and agree terms with the IMF, this analysis shows that the president maintained the support of many social actors, who viewed the measures as necessary to deal with the economic legacy of the previous government. More generally, the space afforded by the pact saw the overall policy direction privilege particularistic interests, albeit unevenly. This situation led eventually to a breakdown with social actors who had come to view power as a "double-edged sword" (Becker, 2015: 93). That departure saw Gutiérrez draw closer to domestic elites, but not by way of a formal pact. Instead Gutiérrez worked to accentuate existing divisions among social movements and elites, a gambit which proved ultimately unsuccessful. Gutiérrez's attempt to 'switch back' was met with sustained protests from a broad range of social actors, triggering still-powerful opposition parties to impeach in a textbook case of societal accountability (Smulovitz & Peruzzotti, 2000). In short, Gutiérrez's relations with social movements help to explain the chaotic and uneven nature of his policy switching across his presidency as a whole.

4.7 Conclusion:

This chapter examined the foreshortened presidency of Lucio Gutiérrez in Ecuador, who is generally cited as an example of an early switcher. An overview of Gutiérrez's campaign reveals that he promised substantive reforms, albeit without providing specifics. This chapter proceeded to analyse Gutiérrez's presidency as a whole, across four broad policy areas. The findings reveal that Gutiérrez responded directly to shifts in the correlation of forces, abandoning and resuscitating elements of his electoral platform to ensure political survival. Ultimately, it was an attempt to switch back to his original platform that led civil society and elites to unite and oust him from power. As this chapter discusses, this chapter's findings challenge the traditional approach to switching and point to the need to examine more closely the influence of social and elite actors.

[243] AI: Alberto Acosta; and Cristian Castillo.

Chapter 5: Ecuador – Rafael Correa and Policy Switching

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will analyse the presidency of Rafael Correa of Ecuador, who was first elected in 2006 in the context of a decade of "persistent social and political unrest" (Bernal, 2014: 448). Correa was an 'outsider' with no established political party (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013: 162; de la Torre & Ortiz, 2016: 4) who projected an ambiguous anti-system discourse that attacked the political classes (Lucas, 2007: 59). Correa's campaign offering was identifiably leftist, vowing to put an end to the "long and sad night" of neoliberal economics (Conaghan, 2007a: 77). Nevertheless, the candidate struggled to gain support from movements or parties of the left, leading some to portray his candidacy as a weaker version of Gutiérrez's four years earlier (Lucas, 2007: 58).

In spite of these challenges, Correa triumphed thanks to a decision to not run legislative candidates, and a range of 'populist' spending promises (Conaghan, 2008; Freidenberg, 2008a). While some have pointed to the more favourable economic conditions inherited by Correa (Campello, 2013), the new president faced perhaps more daunting challenges than his predecessor. The president's lack of legislative support and weak social base threatened a continuation of the executive-legislative stalemate that plagued Gutiérrez (Conaghan, 2007b: 827). Thus the prospects of Correa fulfilling his radical campaign promises appeared slim. Instead, Correa is classified in the literature as a 'non-switcher' (Campello, 2013; Johnson & Ryu, 2010), substantively making good on promises of fundamental political, economic and social reform.

This chapter will assess the extent to which Correa can be considered a non-switcher. It will argue that pressure from mobilised and articulated civil society was instrumental in providing a vulnerable president with both the means and will to make good on a broad set of policy demands. Furthermore, it will show that where similar levels of social pressure were not present or declined, switching in those policy areas was more likely. This chapter will examine the interactive relationship between Correa and civil society in Ecuador using two major election pledges, with a viewing to testing these hypotheses. In this way, the chapter will also 'unpack' switching in both cases by analysing this behaviour in separate policy areas over an extended time period.

The chapter will first provide an overview of the 2006 general election that brought Correa to office, and establish key campaign promises. The next sections will analyse two offerings: the constituent assembly, and a new agricultural system based on food sovereignty. The first area can be considered, broadly speaking, an example of a 'non-switch' and the second a 'switch'. The analysis

in the discussion section adds further to our understanding of switching, and reveals that pressure from mobilised and articulated social movements was instrumental in the realisation of key demands. However, as movements weakened due to internal divisions and delegitimisation by Correa, the policy direction veered steadily away from the government's electoral platform.

5.2 Overview: The Correa Candidacy

Rafael Correa was unknown to the Ecuadorian public until his appointment as Finance Minister by caretaker president Alfredo Palacio in 2005. Prior to taking the role, Correa – who holds a PhD in Economics from a US university – was a faculty member at a prominent private university, and had informally advised then Vice President Palacio on issues of dollarisation and oil[244] (Becker, 2015: 116). Correa's term was marked by controversy and conflict, in particular between the new minister and local power groups that felt threatened by his opposition to neoliberalism (Lucas, 2007). Correa's plan to dismantle the much-criticised FEIREP procedure and redistribute the funds was acceded to by Palacio, but the president was less enamoured of some of his minister's more radical plans.

Particular pressure was brought to bear on Correa by the heads of majors private banks and chambers of commerce over plans to review the country's debt obligations and reveal the identity of bondholders (Ibid: 40). As a result, a network of civil society organisations was moved to call on Palacio to defend his minister (Ibid: 40-41). In particular, Correa was supported by former '*forajidos*,' along with parts of CONAIE and other "radical" sectors (Muñoz, 2014: 180). Correa was also critical of international financial institutions like the IMF and World Bank (Conaghan, 2007a). The final straw for Correa's tenure came with his attempts to formalise economic relations with Venezuela via gas commercialisation contracts, traditionally jealously guarded by local elites (Lucas, 2007: 48). Palacio's failure to support his plans saw Correa resign after just three months.

Within weeks Correa commenced his candidacy for the presidency. Initially Correa sought the nomination of Pachakutik (PK) at its conference in September 2005 (Ibid: 71). This, for Augusto Barrera – a leading member of PK who went on to form part of the '*politburo*' of Correa's government – was a "logical" alliance to link past anti-neoliberal struggles with a fresh electoral candidate[245]. However, although CONAIE initially supported Correa's candidacy[246], divisions between PK and CONAIE and doubts about Correa saw them select an internal candidate, former minister Luis Macas (Becker, 2015: 120). Nevertheless, efforts to formalise relations between

[244] Interview with Rafael Correa, New Left Review, September-October 2012.
[245] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[246] Universo, September 24th, 2005.

Correa and PK continued, with a mooted joint-ticket with Macas collapsing over Correa's insistence on being the presidential candidate[247] (Ibid; Lucas, 2007: 78). Correa denied this version, blaming PK's hostile attitude[248]. Nevertheless elements within PK from coastal regions, led by Gilberto Talahua, continued to press for Correa up to the first round of voting (Ibid: 83), sowing further division within PK (Becker, 2015: 121).

Instead in early 2006 Correa founded Alliance for a Proud and Sovereign Homeland (PAIS) with "leftist political operatives and intellectuals" (de la Torre & Conaghan, 2009: 341) and personal contacts (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 90). Around the same time several prominent members like Barrera and Betty Tola left PK to join PAIS (Becker, 2015: 121). As Barrera notes, PAIS began as an entirely electoral movement aimed at the 2006 elections[249], although it did have support from civil society groups (Bernal, 2014: 449). In contrast to other 'electoral vehicles', PAIS produced a comprehensive plan for government. Furthermore, the programme it set out, according to Alberto Acosta (one of the movement's architects), was more coherent and radical than other such parties[250]. The content of the document – subtitled "The First Big Step in the Radical Transformation of Ecuador" – included input from a range of social and political actors (PAIS, 2006b)[251]. A review of the contents of the plan reveal that its offerings can be classified as left populist under the framework outlined in Chapter 2.

According to Vega, the plan proposed a "new way of doing politics" in Ecuador (2013: 103). The text purported to synthesise ideas and proposals from the "length and breadth" of the country (PAIS, 2006b: 10). It celebrated Ecuador's ethnic diversity, and projected a collective vision, explicitly rejecting the idea of "messianic leaders" (Ibid: 9). The overarching message was transformation[252], promising to implement a series of alternatives to neoliberalism, many of which originated in civil society. Among the "dreams" mentioned are participatory democracy, the pluricultural state, decentralisation, food sovereignty, environmental sustainability, and the solidarity economy (Ibid). However the plan also puts heavy emphasis on the concepts of modernisation, efficiency and ethics which, according to Dávalos, appealed to the "moralising" vision of the middle classes that ousted Gutiérrez (2016: 260). Vega notes that the plan is careful to avoid identifying itself with any strand of leftism, leaving the text open to "diverse interpretations" (2013: 105).

[247] Universo, May 25th, 2006.
[248] Interview with Rafael Correa, New Left Review, September-October 2012.
[249] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[250] AI: Alberto Acosta.
[251] AI: Ricardo Buitron..
[252] According to Vega, the text uses the word 'revolution' 28 times, 'change' 33 times, 'reform' 31 times, and 'transformation' 24 times (2013: 104).

According to Acosta, the plan consciously synthesised proposals that had emerged from civil society in the preceding years of anti-neoliberal contention[253]. Thus there was a programmatic continuity between the Correa candidacy and those struggles. Others view this dynamic less sympathetically. As Dávalos points out, early iterations of this document failed to recognise the central role of the indigenous movement in those struggles (2006c)[254]. Dávalos accuses PAIS of the "ontological invisibilisation" of the movement and the appropriation of its demands (Ibid), a view shared by some within the movement (Becker, 2015: 125). Furthermore, due to the failure to link with PK, there was no substantive organisational continuity between PAIS and these movements[255]. Former Communications Secretary Monica Chuji noted a level of internal complexity within PAIS even in its early stages, with actors drawn from civil society alongside businesspeople personally connected to Correa[256].

The plan for government put together by PAIS provides the baseline for assessing Correa's electoral offering. While the document passed through a number of iterations[257], the substance of the programme did not alter substantively. Furthermore, the document was widely disseminated, particularly among members of the PAIS electoral base (Vega, 2013: 103).

The 2006 elections presented a crowded field of candidates in a context of a keen anti-political mood which some characterised as a "legitimacy crisis" (Conaghan, 2008: 49; Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 88). The election followed the routing of the traditional political party system in 2002 (Freidenberg, 2008a: 26), leaving the field open for outsider or anti-system left populist candidates (Echevarría, 2007). Correa's first-round campaign attempted to tap into this mood, concentrating on a key social movement demand for a constituent assembly to 're-found' the country (Conaghan 2008; Echevarría, 2007: 29; Becker, 2015). While the plan set out by PAIS did not propose the dissolution of Congress, it insisted on the need for an assembly with 'full powers' to achieve a "democratic revolution" (PAIS, 2006b: 19).

After enjoying some early success, Correa's candidacy appeared to stall following the failure to formalise an alliance with PK/CONAIE (Lucas, 2007: 97). Devoid of any significant social or political support – only the small Socialist Party endorsed his candidacy (Conaghan, 2007a)[258] –

[253] AI: Alberto Acosta.
[254] The version from May 2006 contains three references to the indigenous movement, but in general terms and without naming CONAIE. The most explicit reference is to "indigenous resistance" (PAIS, 2006a: 6).
[255] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[256] AI: Monica Chuji.
[257] The author has sourced three versions: one dated May 12th, 2006 totalling 44 pages; another dated November 22nd, 2006 totalling 77 pages; and a third version dates November 26th, 2006 – the day of the run-off vote – totalling 73 pages.
[258] In terms of social organisations, Correa only received support from small movements such as Jubilee 2000, National Democratic Action and the Bolivarian Alfarist Movement (Recalde, 2007: 20).

Correa's chances of making the run-off vote appeared slim. The turning point in the campaign came when Correa announced that PAIS would not run any candidates in the concurrent congressional elections (Conaghan, 2007b; Freidenberg, 2008a). This move resonated with sections of the urban middle classes (Lucas, 2007: 97; Dávalos, 2016), particularly those who like Correa himself had been active in the '*forajidos*' movement (Echevarría, 2007).

The move captured both media attention and public legitimacy, sweeping Correa into the second round with 23 per cent of votes – albeit behind Alvaro Noboa, whose clientelistic tactics garnered him a 27 per cent share (Conaghan, 2007b). While PAIS did not run its own congressional candidates in the major cities, it was pragmatic enough to forge alliances to support shared candidates with other parties in rural areas (Lucas, 2007: 97, 112). Furthermore, while the move was presented as distancing PAIS from the corrupt party system, many of its members in coastal areas in particular were old-style political 'fixers' with past ties to other parties (Freidenberg, 2008a: 29)[259].

The literature is in agreement that Correa changed his approach between the first and second rounds of voting (Lucas, 2007; Recalde, 2007). Some changes were cosmetic, with Correa softening his image and tone (Ibid; Freidenberg, 2008a; Conaghan, 2007b)[260]. Nevertheless, there were changes in policy offerings also. Internationally, Correa backed down[261] on a threat to fund social programmes by defaulting on foreign debt payments that had "alarmed Wall Street and Washington"[262]. On the domestic front, attempts to win over the urban poor that failed to back Correa in the first round (Lucas, 2007: 102) saw the campaign focus on 'bread and butter' issues, offering to double the poverty bond, and increase social spending, credits for small businesses, and housing (Recalde, 2007; Conaghan, 2007a)[263]. A further element was a door-to-door canvassing drive called '*Socio PAIS*' ('PAIS Partner') which used the incentive of social welfare increases to register voters (de la Torre & Conaghan, 2009: 342). By the second round, the programme had registered two million voters[264].

Correa also attempted to win over the 17 per cent of voters in rural and indigenous zones that had backed Lucio Gutiérrez's brother Gilmar (Conaghan, 2007b: 827). The 20 seats in Congress secured by PSP surprised many. Among them were Correa and his advisors, who felt that they had failed to draw sufficient attention to the reforms set out in the plan for government (Recalde, 2007: 21). In

[259] AI: Pablo Andrade.
[260] IPS, November 1st, 2006.
[261] Ibid.
[262] AP, October 22nd, 2006.
[263] Universo, November 25th, 2006.
[264] Universo, November 29th, 2006.

the aftermath of the first round, Correa attributed the success of the PSP in rural areas to "sound agrarian policies" (Lucas, 2007: 124), consisting chiefly of subsidies (Conaghan, 2007a). The increased emphasis on rural development in the second round is evidenced by the campaign's offer of services like housing, education and credits targeted at rural areas[265].

The campaign also featured "state of the art" publicity that made extensive use of technology (Conaghan & de la Torre, 2008: 272). Less noted, however, was the sizeable budget for purchasing air time (de la Torre & Conaghan, 2009: 342). While both Noboa and Correa exceeded spending limits set by the TSE, Noboa had significant personal wealth. Less clear was where the estimated $2.7 million (Ibid) spent by Correa's campaign came from. Lucas notes the support of both Isidro Romero Carbo, Coca-Cola's national representative with links to the Nobis consortium[266]; and head of the Supermaxi supermarket chain Ronald Wright[267] (2007: 112). Apart from those names, PAIS was reluctant to share information about donors[268].

The mix of modern and traditional methods led de la Torre and Conaghan to label this a "hybrid campaign" (2009). However, the campaign could also be described as 'hybrid' in the way it brought together actors from across the ideological spectrum. As with the Gutiérrez candidacy, which attempted something similar but more openly, Correa was aided in this by running against Noboa in the second round. Correa presented a coherent plan, and represented a clear alternative to Noboa's traditional vision (de la Torre & Conaghan, 2009: 340; Recalde, 2007: 20).

Furthermore, in spite of this apparent left/right divide, there was disquiet among economic elites regarding Noboa and his potential for harnessing the state for his own particularistic ends (de la Torre, 2015: 148). Meanwhile Correa increasingly distanced himself from 'corporatist' alliances, including social movements (Muñoz, 2014: 184). This strategic re-positioning by PAIS lends credence to the view that economic elites favoured Correa as a more effective bulwark against social movement activism (Dávalos, 2006b). There is evidence that first-round votes in coastal regions that went to the PSC and PRE went to Correa in the run-off (Muñoz, 2014: 184), facilitated by

[265] Further evidence is provided by a comparison of the different versions of the plan for government: the version from late November 2006 contains 25 versions of the word "rural", while the earlier version from May 2006 contains less than ten.
[266] Newspapers reported that Romero Carbo had donated $50,000 to PAIS in advance of the first round - Universo, September 28th, 2006.
[267] Comercio, September 24th, 2006. Wright is also reported to have made donations to other candidates in the 2006 election - Wikileaks Cables, August 8th, 2008.
[268] The names of Wright and Romero Carbo were published as they had donated over $20,000 to the campaign - Universo, November 18th, 2006. The other name published was that of Antonio Saman, an agro-exporter - Universo, September 19th, 2006.

PAIS' recruitment of traditional political operatives[269]. This pragmatism is characterised by Echevarría as 'populism' (2007: 32-33).

Facing Noboa unarguably allowed Correa to obtain the backing of the country's organised social actors, something he had hitherto failed to do. Nevertheless, it was far from uncritical support. During the Palacio government, social movements had effectively set the electoral agenda through a series of huge protests (Lucas, 2007). The mobilisations of November 2005 and March 2006 united civil society behind issues like the constituent assembly, nationalisation of hydrocarbons, and opposition to an FTA with the US (Ibid: 77). In response, Palacio increased the state take of oil and suspended FTA negotiations[270]. Reports of the demise of Ecuador's social movements following the Gutiérrez government appeared premature.

It can be assumed that Correa and his team were aware of this influence: not only from the repeated attempts at formalising relations with PK/CONAIE, but also from their adoption of issues such as opposition to the FTA[271], along with a promise to re-negotiate oil contracts to further increase the state take[272]. Authors have pointed to the tardiness of Correa's support for these key demands (Lucas, 2007: 60, 68; Becker, 2015: 117), with some of the view that the move was "opportunistic" and done to win the support of movements (Ibid). Many social actors remained wary of Correa, pointing to his nascent authoritarianism and heavy use of electoral marketing (Lucas, 2007: 67).

Nevertheless, movements had an affinity with Correa's progressive policies[273], and given the choice between Noboa and Correa, there was no contest (Ibid: 123). Despite trailing Noboa in polls conducted days before the second round, Correa triumphed with 57 per cent of the vote. As Conaghan notes, votes from rural and indigenous provinces were crucial in accounting for this outcome (2007b: 827). Due both to the importance of their votes, but in particular to their impact on the PAIS policy agenda, Acosta considers that social movements exerted more influence on Correa than on Gutiérrez[274]. Given the experience of the Gutiérrez government, some believed that the question of whether that influence would continue after the election depended less on Correa than on the ability of movements to sustain the momentum behind their agenda (Dávalos, 2006b; Becker, 2013b).

[269] AI: Pablo Andrade.
[270] Oil Daily, November 27th, 2006.
[271] Universo, November 27th, 2006.
[272] AFP, October 22nd, 2006.
[273] AI: Severino Sharupi.
[274] AI: Alberto Acosta.

In this chapter, we will examine two broad election promises made by the Correa campaign: the convoking of a constituent assembly, an issue on which Correa did not switch; and the establishment of a new agricultural system based on food sovereignty, which was in the end a switch. The chapter will trace their evolution from election promise to political reality, paying particular attention to the interactions between civil society, economic elites, and government.

5.3 A Non-Switch: The Constituent Assembly

This section will analyse the promise of the Correa presidential campaign to convoke a constituent assembly with 'full powers' to re-write the constitution. This section will reveal that a broad front of civil society actors mobilised behind this proposal, and that the pressure this exerted on both government and other political actors was a key ingredient in its completion. Nevertheless, it will also reveal that internal divisions within the opposition bloc facilitated manoeuvres by government to hasten its demise. Finally, this section will examine the relations between the government and civil society, noting underlying tensions and a gradual distancing as power shifted toward Correa.

According to Julio Echevarría, Rafael Correa faced a choice on taking power between confronting both traditional and emerging political forces (PSP and PRIAN), or seeking a pact with Congress that would allow limited reforms to existing institutions (2007: 34-35). The former path, warned Echevarría, risked instability and even the country's democracy; the latter path would ensure a "sharp fall in legitimacy" for the government (Ibid). Initially, Correa's government appeared to attempt to take both paths at the same time, perhaps due to internal incoherence, or in response to serious questions from social movements (Lucas, 2007: 185). Whether by accident or design, this manoeuvring unleashed a period of institutional conflict that left Correa not only unscathed, but strengthened.

An Uneasy Alliance

The initial prospects for the incoming president did not look good. Correa faced a legislature made up of parties whose aim was to "torpedo" any reform that sought to alter the rules of the game (Muñoz, 2014: 185). Just days before Correa's inauguration, however, PAIS managed to alter the correlation of forces by forging an informal alliance with PSP (along with the 'populist' PRE) (Ibid). While such an alliance raised doubts among social actors as to whether Correa would follow his predecessor's path and switch (Lucas, 2007: 183), the agreement gave Correa – without legislators of his own – a *de facto* majority in support of a referendum on a constituent assembly

(Ibid)[275]. The principal architect of the deal, Interior Minister Gustavo Larrea, argued that it provided a route to the referendum which avoided institutional confrontation (Ibid). Correa agreed, aggressively defending the move and berating hecklers at his inauguration ceremony (Ibid: 185), noting that the referendum had been secured "without a single stone being thrown"[276].

Such certainty was not to last, however, and Correa would later apologise for branding some civil society actors "infiltrators" (Ibid: 186)[277]. In fact, Correa and his government would come to lean heavily on civil society support in the months to follow, but it would remain an uneasy alliance. The misgivings of social actors were not confined to the deal with PSP, but also included the make-up of Correa's cabinet. The president's assertion in his inauguration speech that he had chosen the country's "finest men and women"[278] to lead his government was challenged by movements, who pointed to what they viewed as their questionable credentials (Ibid: 184)[279]. Some feared the government was a "friend's club" for Correa (Ibid: 186), a suspicion borne out by figures showing a higher percentage of ministers personally known to the president than in the Gutiérrez government (Zaldumbide, 2007: 17). Nevertheless, the cabinet appeared more coherent (Ibid: 18), and movements placed their hopes in the ministers with strong ties to social struggles (Lucas, 2007: 188-9)[280].

These misgivings and mutual suspicions were soon overwhelmed by the threat to the constituent assembly, which was not only a key election promise but a central demand of movements. As Quintero notes, the demand for a constituent assembly was formulated by the indigenous movement as far back as 1990 (2007: 73). This uneasy pact would continue until the Constitution was approved almost two years later.

In spite of the doubts engendered by his cabinet and inauguration speech (Lucas, 2007: 180), the new president was clear in his intention to press ahead with a 'full powers' constituent assembly. On his first day in office Correa signed Decree 002 convoking a plebiscite on the issue[281]. Yet this action contains its own contradictions. Having apparently secured the votes in Congress in support

[275] Along with the 24 PSP deputies and 6 from PRE, the remaining support came from the centre-left ID-RED (12), MPD (3), PK (6), Socialist Party (1) and one from the Nuevo Pais movement (Lucas, 2007: 183).
[276] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7imSsuzth8.
[277] Ibid.
[278] Inauguration speech, January 15th, 2007.
[279] Some, such as Trajano Andrade (Transport) and Carlos Vallejo (Agriculture) were viewed with suspicion due to membership of political parties; others like Ana Alban (Environment) and Isabel Salvador (Tourism) for their alleged pro-business leanings.
[280] In particular Alberto Acosta (Energy) and Ricardo Patiño (Economy) were viewed positively by social movements.
[281] Universo, January 16th, 2007.

of the measure[282], Correa nevertheless chose to avoid the legislature by directing the TSE to arrange the referendum. Decree 002 cited a constitutional provision allowing for matters of "transcendental importance" to bypass Congress[283], with Correa refusing to negotiate the "dignity" of the country[284].

Some speculate that Correa was pushed into this move by "moral pressure" and mobilisations across the country (Quintero, 2007: 53). Similarly, in spite of the agreement with PSP, Correa was quick to distance himself from Gutiérrez at a personal level, labelling him a "traitor" and a "viper"[285]. The impression that Correa was highly sensitive to accusations of 'politics as usual' is borne out by his angry rejection of rumours of a pact with the "partyarchy" during his inauguration ceremony[286]. Nevertheless, there was substance to the rumours, with the agreement giving PSP power of appointment over key public offices[287]. Most notably, PSP appointed Jorge Acosta, a close confidant of Gutiérrez (Muñoz, 2014: 188), as head of the TSE. Furthermore, it was alleged that the agreement with PSP allowed for the dilution of the assembly's powers, a red-line issue for social actors (Ibid: 187). PAIS continued to try to ride two horses, maintaining the agreement while seeking to appease social movements.

Much of this detail was to be obscured by the power struggle that ensued, however. If social movements were fixed on a 'full powers' assembly using mobilisations as a means of pressure, right-wing actors were similarly determined to defend their interests in the form of their power quota in Congress (Ibid). The result was an "intense struggle" between the two principal powers of the state (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 91).

Mobilising for 'Full Powers'

This new phase began when TSE head Acosta referred the matter of the plebiscite back to Congress, allegedly angering Correa[288]. In spite of the supposed pro-assembly majority, the parties in Congress proceeded to take weeks to consider the issue. At this stage, even staunch defenders of the status quo like PSC were resigned to a constituent assembly, but opposed the idea of 'full powers' (Muñoz, 2014: 186). Thus the main focus of the political parties centred on the form that the assembly would take (Ibid). Gutiérrez in particular attempted to lay claim to the proposal as

[282] In his speech, Correa refers to the issue as "practically" resolved. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7imSsuzth8.
[283] Article 104(2) of the 1998 Constitution.
[284] Universo, January 15th, 2007.
[285] ANSA, January 17th, 2007.
[286] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l7imSsuzth8.
[287] In particular, the PSP was allowed to nominate the head of the TSE and the Comptroller General.
[288] Interview with Jorge Acosta, Plan V, May 10th, 2015. Available at: http://www.planv.com.ec/historias/perfiles/el-hombre-que-abrio-sin-querer-la-caja-pandora/pagina/0/1.

unfinished business from his foreshortened presidency[289], talking openly of his desire to lead the assembly[290]. According to Muñoz (Ibid), it was this determination by PSP to control the process that prevented Congress from approving a weak assembly subjugated to legislative oversight.

The government meanwhile was attempting to keep other parties on board[291], with Correa responding to demands from social movements by granting them equal status to parties[292]. Shoring up support with movements at that time was crucial, as the government threatened Congress that it would go it alone and establish an *ad hoc* tribunal to organise the plebiscite[293], a move which was rejected as unconstitutional[294]. The government appeared vulnerable at that time, and although scholars have noted that Correa called for protests (Conaghan, 2008: 51), there was no guarantee the call would be heeded. Scholars would later point to Correa's uncompromising leadership style and unwillingness to negotiate (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 110)[295], but at this stage his administration had no choice but to seek support from social actors (Silva, 2009: 194). As Dávalos notes, given that PAIS had no legal power due to its decision not to run congressional candidates, the constituent assembly became a matter of political survival (2016: 260).

Arguably, the literature overemphasises Correa's power to mobilise, casting movements as pliable accomplices. As Lucas outlines, social actors were far from uncritical of PAIS, and in fact it was moves by the government like the agreement with PSP that convinced CONAIE of the need for mobilisation (2007: 201). Nor was the indigenous movement alone in fearing that the government would, by accident or design, allow traditional parties to control the assembly. Muñoz (2014: 186) names a series of organisations – including other indigenous federations, trade unions, peasant organisations, retirees, small business associations, and newly formed citizen groups – that shared these concerns.

Accordingly, 5,000 members of unions, civil society organisations and left-wing political movements responded to Correa's call to protest outside Congress, forcing the abandonment of its session[296]. The ongoing pressure predicted by Correa was increased by the involvement of CONAIE, which assembled over forty social movements in Quito under the banner of the "National Front for Constituent Power" (Lucas, 2015: 37). Declaring themselves in a state of "permanent mobilisation," the movements announced their goal to "promote and defend" the 'full powers'

[289] Universo, January 17th, 2007.
[290] IHS, January 19th, 2007.
[291] Ibid.
[292] AFP, January 21st, 2007.
[293] AFP, January 30th, 2007.
[294] Universo, February 13th, 2007.
[295] AI: Simon Pachano.
[296] Universo, January 30th, 2007.

assembly (CONAIE, 2007a), which they described as the "tool of the Ecuadorian people" (Lucas, 2015: 38). In the media, leaders made it clear that further delays by Congress would prompt a national protest by a broad front of movements[297]. That same day Congress finally approved the plebiscite for a constituent assembly when legislators from the PSC and PRIAN abandoned the session[298], with Larrea crediting the protests for the achievement[299].

Yet it is clear that the movements also sought to pressurise the Executive, demanding that Correa suspend negotiations with Congress and proceed to honour his campaign promises (CONAIE, 2007a). These movements reiterated the call for 'full powers', with some also demanding direct representation at the assembly (Muñoz, 2014: 186). This demand was dismissed by Larrea, who claimed it would lead to "chaos" (Ibid: 187). This attitude was cause for further suspicion between movements and government, even though the precise form such direct political expression might take was unclear (Ibid). In spite of the approval of the referendum, Correa presciently noted that the fight was just beginning[300].

Institutions in Conflict

Further complicating matters, the approval by Congress came with important qualifications. Firstly, the amended statute demanded that any future assembly respect the "popular will" as expressed at the 2006 elections[301]. This amendment was designed to ensure that the assembly could not dissolve Congress, which would continue to function in parallel (Ibid). In other words, the powers of the assembly would be limited. CONAIE and its members made clear their dissatisfaction with the proposal (Ibid: 188). While this clause ran contrary to the demands of civil society, the amended statute muddied the waters by granting a separate demand, removing the onerous requirement to collect signatures in order to nominate candidates to the assembly (Ibid). Finally, the statute was marked urgent and exhorted Correa to remit the resolution to the TSE to convoke the assembly "without delay"[302]. It appeared that the government had switched on this crucial campaign offering, adhering to its letter but not its spirit in return for a congressional majority (Ibid).

Yet in the aftermath of the agreement, and with popular pressure rising, Correa sought to sidestep its terms, stating that most voting districts in the October elections had returned a majority of null

[297] Universo, February 13th, 2007.
[298] Ibid.
[299] AFP, February 13th, 2007.
[300] AP, February 14th, 2007.
[301] Universo, February 13th, 2007.
[302] Ibid.

votes, and promising to respect *that* mandate[303]. Thus, when the Executive remitted the text for the referendum to the TSE, it made no mention of the 2006 elections[304]. Larrea blithely dismissed the omission, noting that the assembly would need to interpret what was meant by the "popular will"[305]. Nevertheless, with the TSE headed by a prominent PSP member, and made up of appointees from the major parties that opposed calling the referendum[306], a return to executive-legislative stalemate appeared likely.

Instead a series of unforeseen events led Ecuador's democratic institutions into a state of outright conflict. Having convened a meeting of the TSE on March 1st, Jorge Acosta recused himself, citing 'personal reasons'[307]. With the session seemingly deadlocked it was adjourned, meaning that under electoral rules the referendum could not proceed on April 15th as planned[308]. However, after the withdrawal of the PSC and PRIAN delegates, Acosta convened a further session at which a motion to call the referendum without referring Correa's text back to Congress was approved by four votes to one[309]. Acosta and the other delegates then appeared on a nationwide television broadcast to announce that the referendum would proceed on April 15th. In that announcement, Acosta explicitly cited the 'urgent' designation of the statute by Congress as the basis for the decision[310].

The move took the major political parties by surprise. Even though some media initially viewed it is a "PSP manoeuvre"[311], it soon became clear that Gutiérrez's party had not expected the announcement. Although Acosta asserted that he was legally bound to maintain the text of the referendum question, his erstwhile PSP colleagues immediately accused him of corruption and betrayal[312]. Congress brought a challenge to the legality of the text to the Constitutional Tribunal (TC), threatened judicial proceedings against the four TSE delegates, and – with PSP now back in the ranks of the opposition (Ibid: 189) – purported to remove Acosta from his post for impeding the referendum[313]. Acosta rejected the move, citing Article 130 of the Constitution which states that TSE members may only be removed on foot of a judicial order[314].

---

[303] Universo, February 28th, 2007.
[304] Universo, March 1st, 2007.
[305] Ibid.
[306] An early report of the TSE session reported that Acosta (PSP), along with the delegates of PSC and PRIAN, favoured remitting to Congress; only the PAIS/PS delegate, Hernan Rivandeira, favoured calling the referendum immediately. The session was then reported as suspended for a lack of quorum - Universo, March 1st, 2007.
[307] Universo, March 2nd, 2007.
[308] Ecuador's electoral rules stated that a referendum had to be called at least 45 days in advance.
[309] Along with Acosta and Rivandeira, the motion was also supported by ID and PRE - Universo, March 2nd, 2007.
[310] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QTCOL1qKfXU.
[311] Universo, March 2nd, 2007.
[312] ANSA, March 2nd, 2007.
[313] Universo, March 7th, 2007.
[314] Ibid.

Furthermore, Acosta announced the suspension of the 57 legislators who had voted in favour of his dismissal[315], citing Article 155 of Ecuador's Law of Elections which prohibits interference with the state's electoral organisms (Ibid: 52)[316]. In fact, under that law the TSE enjoyed sweeping powers over the state's institutions during an 'election period,' a clause that was triggered when the Congress approved the referendum (Ibid: 190). That government Communications Secretary Monica Chuji appeared well-versed in these intricacies during a press conference that same day[317] lends credence to the view that the political parties had been led into a trap of their own making (Ibid: 189).

Whether or not Acosta's actions were coordinated by the government as some alleged[318], Correa moved swiftly to take advantage by having Larrea order the police to enforce the ruling[319]. By the following day over 300 police officers surrounded the Congress and refused entry to the suspended legislators[320]. Furthermore, members of social and indigenous movements began to mobilise in support of the measure (Lucas, 2007: 213). The scene was set for confrontation when the deposed legislators insisted they would attend the next session of Congress on March 13th to take their seats[321].

So it proved on an explosive and violent day. A broad front of social movements organised to defend the buildings of key institutions. Elements of the indigenous movement (FEINE) and unions gathered at the TSE offices, while CONAIE members positioned themselves outside the TC headquarters[322]. MPD and PAIS members gathered outside Congress, where an estimated 600 police were deployed[323]. Nevertheless, amid chaotic and violent clashes, 18 legislators from PRIAN and PSP forced their way into the chamber[324]. During a confrontation between the sergeant-at-arms and PRIAN members, one deputy was injured. Outside the building, clashes between pro- and anti-government supporters led to further injuries, while two opposition legislators were fired upon by an unknown gunman. Congress President and PRIAN member Jorge Cevallos' attempts to include the ousted deputies failed, and the session was abandoned[325].

---

315 Ibid.
316 AFP, March 7th, 2007.
317 Universo, March 7th, 2007.
318 Acosta denies any outside influence, noting that Congress did not have the power to remove him without a judicial order - Interview with Jorge Acosta, Plan V, May 10th, 2015.
319 Larrea asserted that the country was facing a moment of "serious tension" but added that "it was not provoked by us" - Universo, March 8th, 2007.
320 IPS, March 8th, 2007.
321 AFP, March 8th, 2007.
322 Universo, March 13th, 2007.
323 Ibid.
324 Universo, March 14th, 2007.
325 Ibid.

The result of these "violations" of the rule of law and institutionalised democracy was that the Executive ended up mediating between Congress and the TSE (Freidenberg, 2008b: 95). The role benefited Correa, allowing him to separate from Gutiérrez and propose an "extra Congress" made up of legally delegated substitutes (*suplentes*)[326]. Meanwhile Larrea made an outward show of calling for the restitution of the ousted legislators to facilitate dialogue[327], while working "behind the scenes" to weaken and delegitimise opposition to the assembly (Conaghan, 2008: 52). At the same time social and indigenous movements gradually took control of the streets of Quito and other cities[328], with Humberto Cholango threatening a national uprising if the ousted legislators continued trying to regain their seats[329].

Correa Ascendant

Throughout these events public support for Correa and the assembly continued to grow[330], further strengthening the government's hand. By maintaining a calm attitude and insisting that the decision to suspend the legislators was not a government one[331], Correa appeared presidential. By contrast, the already discredited legislature fell further in public esteem, with polls showing that only 15 per cent approved of its handling of the situation (Lucas, 2015: 53).When Cevallos swore in a group of *suplentes* that had been "smuggled" into the building at night[332], and who proceeded to support the government – an example of corruption, according to some[333] – the die was cast. Analyst Jorge León noted that the referendum process was far from legal, but it enjoyed high legitimacy[334]; and in this case, legitimacy proved more important than legality (Dávalos, 2016: 261).

With the political parties gravely weakened, the entities whose interests they traditionally represented – private banks, business associations, chambers of commerce, and the Guayaquil elites (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 92) – felt threatened by Correa and his agenda[335]. Their concern related both to the posture and ideology of the new government. While PAIS began to distance itself from social movements during 2007, it also held the traditional power groups at arm's length (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 90). It did not align with the powerful banking lobby either, even

[326] ANSA, March 14th, 2007.
[327] ANSA, March 16th, 2007.
[328] Pais, March 14th, 2007.
[329] Universo, March 13th, 2007.
[330] According to a poll by CEDATOS, Correa's approval rating rose to 70 per cent, the highest for a sitting president since the return to democracy in 1979 - IHS, March 21st, 2007.
[331] Interview with Correa at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UAgWSFf8250.
[332] IHS, March 21st, 2007.
[333] AI: Julio Clavijo.
[334] ANSA, April 7th, 2007.
[335] Wikileaks Cables, March 30th, 2007.

making efforts at regulation of the sector, albeit with little success thanks to erstwhile support in Congress (Ibid: 92-93; Muñoz, 2014: 193).

In economic terms, PAIS had signalled its intent to revive the role of the state, a historic demand of civil society movements[336]. The new government formulated a national development strategy, and launched micro-finance and credit initiatives (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 93). Spending was increased on education, health, housing and social welfare by way of emergency decrees which saw announcements run ahead of state capacity to provide services (Ibid: 99). Furthermore, subsidies on petrol and cooking gas – historically defended by social movements – were maintained (de la Torre, 2015: 150). Thus while the government showed little interest in allying with social movements as its popularity rose, programmatic linkages remained. Furthermore, ongoing opposition from elite interests to structural reform increased the sense of confluence between movements and government (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 92). PAIS would continue to rely on supportive civil society mobilisation to secure the referendum in the face of ongoing opposition attempts to "derail" it (Silva, 2009: 193).

This trenchant opposition from elite interests began to adopt new forms as Congress lost influence. A cable from US Ambassador Linda Jewell in the aftermath of the calling of the referendum summarises the main players and their methods[337]. The document details systematic efforts by head of Guayaquil Bank (and future presidential candidate) Guillermo Lasso to coordinate a response from the business community. In particular, Lasso met with the major chambers of commerce, which agreed to participate. The strategy involved challenging Correa on principles rather than interests, and sought to use publicity to influence opinion, citing a radio spot comparing Ecuador with Venezuela. Guayaquil Chamber of Commerce (GCC) also used publicity, but had the aim of "provoking a strong reaction by Correa" during his weekly radio show[338].

As the ambassadorial cable makes clear, however, elite actors also took more direct political actions[339]. Both Lasso and the GCC met with opposition leaders like Gutiérrez, Alvaro Noboa and PSC's Jaime Nebot. On the assumption that the constituent assembly would be approved, business actors began to identify candidates to support, with a view to putting "a lot of money" behind them[340]. Furthermore, unnamed business leaders sought to have the US actively intervene in opposition to Correa.

[336] AI: Esperanza Martínez.
[337] Wikileaks Cables, March 30th, 2007.
[338] Ibid.
[339] Ibid.
[340] Ibid.

While the cable throws light on the battle for control of the constituent assembly, it also reveals internal vulnerabilities within these elite groups. Both Lasso and the GCC noted that deep rifts existed between Noboa, Nebot and Gutiérrez, despite promises to co-operate[341]. Divisions were also noted between the Quito and Guayaquil business communities, a long-standing trend acknowledged by senior functionaries from Ecuador's largest chambers of commerce at interview[342]. The document also reveals the inability of business to respond to the new situation, and frustration at the lack of access to the new government. By contrast, within weeks of taking power Correa met with individual companies from key sectors to establish channels of communication, with representative bodies notably absent[343]. This dynamic of bilateral meetings with select companies would persist in the years ahead (Muñoz, 2014: 190), nurturing divisions within the business sector[344].

The ineffectiveness of the strategies adopted by Correa's opponents was highlighted by the results of the ensuing elections in 2007. The referendum result saw 82 per cent favour an assembly with 'full powers', which in turn re-legitmised Correa (Freidenberg, 2008b: 96). Unlike the business sector, civil society remained largely united behind the goal of achieving radical change via the constituent assembly. The sense of confluence with the government persisted, as did mobilisation that sought at once to support and pressurise the government. A notable example came on May 1st when, in an unprecedented move, Correa was invited by labour unions to lead the traditional workers' day march (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 92). The presence of the president and other ministers was symbolically significant, and turned the march into a demonstration of support for the constituent assembly[345].

This informal broad front of government, leftist political movements and civil society organisations would persist – with some exceptions[346] – into the constituent assembly process. In the immediate term it helped the government's coalition *Acuerdo PAIS*[347] to win 80 of the 130 seats available in the assembly (Mejía & Polga-Hecimovich, 2011: 106). As scholars have noted, this outcome was due "in no small part" to the support of indigenous movements (Becker, 2011: 49). Nonetheless, overcoming Ecuador's traditional regional divide between highlands and coast (Pachano, 2006)

[341] Lasso's view that Gutiérrez was willing to work with anyone but "only on his terms" is telling - Ibid.
[342] AI: Juan Carlos Díaz Granados; Eduardo Cadena; and Roberto Aspiazu.
[343] Universo, February 2nd, 2007.
[344] AI: Juan Carlos Díaz Granados; Eduardo Cadena; and Roberto Aspiazu.
[345] Universo, May 1st, 2007.
[346] Muñoz notes the depature prior to the assembly elections of two key ideological allies – RED and Polo Democratico – as well as misgivings by social movements (2014: 192)
[347] Acuerdo PAIS encompassed Alianza PAIS, Nuevo Pais, and National Democractic Alternative (Freidenberg, 2008b: 99).

was a "revelation"[348], and such a strong, consistent vote share was historic (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 89).

Aside from the issue of the assembly, the government also took steps to honour other key election promises in terms of social spending. The cumulative effect of these moves contributed to the unprecedented popularity enjoyed by Correa[349]. While the provision of these basic services reached a key sector of the electorate, the short-term impact of those measures – with the possible exception of the doubling of the Human Development Bond – was minimal (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007). What was of vital importance was that the government was perceived as keeping its electoral promises; as Silva notes, Correa "made a show" of doing so (2009: 193).

Important though these issues undoubtedly were, the one that would ultimately determine the public view of the government was the constituent assembly (Ellner, 2012: 101). Failure to make good on this promise could have seen Correa hobbled like his predecessor Palacio, who was unable overcome political roadblocks to bring it about (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 89; Bernal, 2014: 448). Furthermore, the conflict-ridden process of approving the referendum – and the way in which it not only deflated political opposition, but also led cautious social movements to rally behind the government – arguably garnered PAIS a level of legitimacy that would extend far beyond that moment. For a government that used polls and focus groups to "constantly measure" its popularity and tailor its policy agenda accordingly (de la Torre, 2015: 150), that advantage would not be easily squandered.

Nonetheless, while the achievements of the government in sidelining Congress and pushing through the referendum answered many criticisms, doubts among social movements remained (Lucas, 2015: 55). As the process of politico-institutional re-founding began, it appeared that those doubts were both justified and mutual. As Ortiz notes, even at that early stage Larrea was questioning the value of social participation (2008: 17). According to Ramírez Gallegos, true articulation between PAIS and movements was viewed by the former as "unnecessary and potentially conflictive" (2010: 91). The suspicion that the government's rhetoric was intended to legitimise the institutions it was creating rather than the actors accompanying the process persisted (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 101).

A Promise Honoured: The Constituent Assembly

[348] AI: Santiago Ortiz.
[349] Opinion polls at the time gave Correa an approval rating of over 80 per cent (Ramírez Gallegos & Minteguiaga, 2007: 89).

These doubts were seemingly assuaged by the assembly itself, however, with many social actors satisfied by both the process and its outcome[350]. Even though movements had little in the way of direct representation (Lucas, 2015: 95), under the stewardship of Alberto Acosta the assembly introduced innovations that permitted significant citizen and civil society participation (Bernal, 2014: 450)[351]. Furthermore, movements arrived at the assembly prepared to contest not only the traditional 'social' sphere, but also economic and institutional issues[352]. Social organisations began the process united behind key transversal demands (Lucas, 2007: 225), and showed a willingness to go beyond their traditional methods of "social pressure" by sending permanent advisors, lobbying delegates, and mobilising at key moments (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 93).

Nevertheless, there were indications that the relationship between government and civil society might not continue as before. Firstly, the deliberative purpose of the assembly was undermined by its politicisation at Correa's hands (Bernal, 2014: 450). Having on its first day put Congress "in recess" (Freidenberg, 2008b: 102) thereby keeping to the letter of a pledge by Gustavo Larrea not to "dissolve" it[353], the assembly began issuing laws, drawing criticism from political opponents and civil society (Bernal, 2014: 451). This aspect reveals another side of the constituent assembly process, one that for some was the true priority of PAIS: the destruction of its right-wing enemies[354], and the concentration of power in the Executive (Dávalos, 2016). Per this view, the government used the process to "eradicate" its political opponents from state institutions, and grant itself undue legislative powers (Ibid: 195).

Dávalos goes further still, naming another government objective: to demobilise and weaken social movements, referring to the constituent assembly as a space designed by PAIS to "absorb social energy" (2016: 263). Some support for this view can be found in the assembly and its aftermath. As delegate Monica Chuji noted, internally the government controlled the assembly process tightly[355]. According to Esperanza Martínez, the biggest threat to the demands from civil society came not from right-wing groups, but from personal interventions by Correa[356]. As an illustration of the worsening relations between movements and government, Correa was not asked to participate in 2008's May Day parade (Muñoz, 2014: 198). Furthermore, while the assembly period was one

[350] AI: Luis Andrango.
[351] AI: Esperanza Martínez; and Augusto Barrera.
[352] Ibid.
[353] Universo, November 23rd, 2007.
[354] AI: Santiago Ortiz.
[355] AI: Monica Chuji.
[356] Martínez notes workers' rights and the labour movement were severely impacted, pointing to an executive decree by Correa which abrogated the right to strike - AI: Esperanza Martínez.

of heavy mobilisation[357], data from the Andean Centre for Popular Action (CAAP) reveals that levels declined sharply after the ratification of the new Constitution (Sánchez, 2013: 43).

It was certainly the case that movements emerged from the constituent assembly less united. Yet there were also internal reasons for this. A key issue related to their approach to PAIS. While some decided that they could best achieve their goals by working with the government (Becker, 2011: 50), others like CONAIE stressed the need for a "mobilised social force" to ensure desired changes were realised (Ibid: 49). These divisions were evident in the campaign to ratify the draft Constitution, with movements struggling to carve out a position that was neither for nor against the government, such as the 'critical yes' promoted by indigenous movements, or the null vote called for by fringe organisations (Ibid; López & Cubillos, 2009: 15). Movements like CONAIE tried to support the project while denying Correa a "blank cheque" (Becker, 2011: 59)[358], but to little avail. With the Constitution approved by 60 per cent, Freidenberg's analysis was that a blank cheque had indeed been written (2008b: 104).

In conclusion, Correa's administration began life as a vulnerable minority government with no legislative representation. As such it was highly dependent on support from civil society for its political survival. In the words of former Environment Minister Daniel Ortega, civil society provided stability to the government during its first two years[359]. Social actors also played a crucial role in the process of convoking a constituent assembly, both supporting and pressuring the government into enacting its signature election promise. Their presence endowed a neophyte government with legitimacy hard-won over years of struggle (Acosta, 2013: 10). Nevertheless, as this analysis has revealed, PAIS had its own reasons for desiring the assembly. Furthermore, as statements at his inauguration revealed, Correa harboured misgivings about the influence of social actors. As movements became less articulated and PAIS grew in power, that influence declined. The following section will consider a separate policy initiative over a longer time frame to further analyse this dynamic.

5.4 A Switch: Food Sovereignty Policy

This section will analyse the government's policies relating to food sovereignty. It is acknowledged that under Correa, Ecuador became "one of a handful of countries that has attempted to institutionalise food sovereignty" (Clark, 2016: 189). Following significant contributions by

[357] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[358] The phrase also used by FENOCIN president Pedro de la Cruz on signing an agreement with Correa during the electoral campaign - Ecuador Inmediato, September 20th, 2006.
[359] AI: Daniel Ortega.

peasant and indigenous movements at the constituent assembly (Becker, 2015: 178), food sovereignty was enshrined in the Constitution, and later in legislation (Ibid; McKay et al., 2014). Nevertheless, there is consensus in the literature that progress in translating these norms into reality was disappointing (Ibid; Giunta, 2014; Clark, 2016). This view was echoed by Correa, who repeatedly referred to an outsanding "debt" to the agrarian sector[360]. This phrase was repeated by government functionaries at interview some years after its initial use[361], pointing to the fact that this policy area represents an example of a 'switch'. Analysis reveals that apart from some limited attempts at reform, little has changed in government policy in this area (Carrión, 2013).

An Uneven Commitment

The earliest version of the plan for government promises to implement a rural and agricultural policy based on food sovereignty (PAIS, 2006a). While more detail was added in later versions, the essence of the proposal remained consistent. Although the text does not specifically define 'food sovereignty', it details elements that mirror accepted definitions[362]. The concept emphasises local control over food production, and is associated with small farmers and organic methods. For example, the Nyéléni Declaration adopted by the 2007 Forum on Food Sovereignty defines it as the right of peoples to "healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods" (Nyéléni, 2007). Furthermore, what is of most relevance to this study is what PAIS understood by the concept. As elsewhere, the plan's agrarian proposals were drawn largely from civil society; designed, in the eyes of some, to win over social movements[363]. The concept of food sovereignty was adopted by peasant and indigenous movements as an alternative to the neoliberal global food system (Clark, 2016: 183). Thus in its essence food sovereignty represents a radical break with the dominant agrarian system.

Among the elements included in the plan were: diversifying production based on peasant and indigenous communities; providing access to credit and training; reducing 'agro-toxins' and promoting organic farming; breaking the monopoly of intermediaries via direct commercialisation; sovereignty over biodiversity; and prohibiting the use of GMOs (PAIS, 2006b: 41-50). An additional element concerned land redistribution, a long-standing demand of Ecuadorian movements (McKay et al, 2014). As indigenous leader Humberto Cholango stated, in the eyes of

[360] Telegrafo, January 28th, 2012.
[361] AI: Betty Tola; Daniel Ortega; and Cristobal Lagos.
[362] The most commonly cited definitions have emanated from civil society (McKay et al, 2014). Both the Via Campesina Declaration on Food Sovereignty, 2001 and the Nyeleni Declaration, 2007 define the concept as the right of 'peoples' to define their food and agricultural systems, and emphasise sustainability (Ibid).
[363] AI: Esperanza Martínez.

rural movements there could be no food sovereignty without land[364]. In this area PAIS committed to land distribution and titling; to support both individual and communal tenure; to address a historic grievance by distributing good-quality land; and to implement a progressive system of property tax, described as "indispensable" for eliminating poverty (PAIS, 2006b: 41). Finally, the plan promised the withdrawal from FTA negotiations with the US, a key demand of rural movements (Ibid: 13).

During the campaign Correa entered an agreement with a front of rural social movements known as the '*Mesa Agraria*' ('Agrarian Committee')[365], conformed by FENOCIN and the National Federation of Farm Workers and Free Indigenous Peoples of Ecuador (FENACLE) (Giunta, 2014: 1210). The agreement included commitments to protect national food production, reactivate the rural sector through increased state funding, and "democratise access to land" (Ibid: 1212)[366]. According to FENOCIN president Pedro de la Cruz, these elements amounted to a defence of food sovereignty, which he described as the "flagship" of the movement[367]. Furthermore, de la Cruz emphasised that the support of the *Mesa Agraria* for Correa's candidacy was conditional on the realisation of these demands[368]. The contribution of member organisations to mobilising support for Correa was important both during the electoral campaign[369] and in the conflict over the constituent assembly[370].

When campaigning in rural areas, Correa talked of abandoning the FTA which, he stated, would inflict misery on peasant farmers[371]. The candidate emphasised financial issues like minimum prices for staple crops, and proposed creating a fund of $300 million to provide credit to small and medium producers[372]. Correa outlined his intention to promote agricultural production in order to reduce Ecuador's dependence on food imports[373]. Prominent PAIS member Alberto Acosta spoke about fomenting an "agrarian revolution", while stopping short of endorsing FENOCIN's call to limit the size of land holdings[374]. This circumspection added to misgivings among movements, with the presence of individuals linked to agri-business within PAIS of particular concern (Lucas, 2007). Some social leaders are of the opinion that even at this stage Correa was forging alliances with economic elites[375].

[364] Universo, January 13th, 2009.
[365] Ecuador Inmediato, September 20th, 2006.
[366] Ibid.
[367] Ibid.
[368] Ibid.
[369] ANSA, October 17th, 2006.
[370] ANSA, January 31st, 2007.
[371] Universo, November 12th, 2006.
[372] Ibid.
[373] IHS, November 24th, 2006.
[374] Universo, December 3rd, 2006.
[375] AI: Severino Sharupi.

These doubts were not banished by the appointment of Carlos Vallejo as Agriculture Minister, as evidenced by catcalls at Correa's inauguration (Lucas, 2007: 184). Not only was Vallejo a former PRIAN member, but represented the powerful flower-exporting sector (Rosero, 2011: 83)[376]. Among Vallejo's first acts was to pour cold water on a key rural movement demand, stating in regard to "a second agrarian reform, as some social sectors have demanded, I say no"[377]. Instead the minister favoured a "readjustment" of abandoned land to boost production, exports, and internal consumption[378]. Nevertheless when the initiative was launched, it was dubbed an "agrarian reform"[379] in some quarters. The plan was limited to the redistribution of tracts of idle land, the number of which Vallejo described as "very small"[380]. Furthermore, Vallejo ruled out large-scale expropriations, and reassured agribusiness interests[381]. Rural social movements were not placated by such measures. During a large mobilisation supporting the constituent assembly, CONAIE president Luis Macas presented a mandate to government that included "comprehensive agrarian reform" (Lucas, 2007: 210).

The National Agricultural Plan published by Vallejo in May 2007 fell far short of such substantive change. Vallejo promised an investment of over $300 million in the agricultural sector, with a view to raising its GDP contribution. The minister talked up progressive themes like sustainability, equity, and food security[382] (a distinct and less radical concept)[383], but failed to consult with rural movements (Rosero et al, 2011: 67). Furthermore, the details revealed an overarching focus on production, science and technology, and increasing the variety of products for export[384]. The plan placed significant emphasis on cash crops like banana, cacao, sugar cane and African palm.

Furthermore, the minister saw great potential for the production of bio-fuels (ethanol and bio-diesel)[385], an idea championed by Correa[386]. The use of land for bio-fuel production is considered a threat not only food sovereignty but also food security, as it reduces the acreage dedicated to sustenance crops (Runge & Senauer, 2007). Although the plan for government mentioned bio-ethanol, it had expressly subjugated its production to the availability of land for food (PAIS, 2006b:

[376] According to Gortaire, the appointment of Vallejo was "the first disappointment" for rural movements - AI: Roberto Gortaire.
[377] Hora, January 16th, 2007.
[378] Ibid.
[379] IHS, January 19th, 2007; and Universo, February 22nd, 2007.
[380] Universo, January 17th, 2007.
[381] Ibid.
[382] Developed by the UN, it is defined as access to "sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet dietary needs for a productive and healthy life" (FAO, 2006).
[383] Universo, May 9th, 2007.
[384] Universo, May 10th, 2007
[385] Ibid.
[386] IHS, December 13th, 2006.

46). The issue then was whether bio-fuel would be produced in a sustainable manner. This did not appear the case in Vallejo's plan that gave 'star' billing to African palm and sugar cane, due to the potential for bio-fuels[387]. As Ramírez Gallegos and Minteguiaga note, the plan tended to "privilege agri-business and large-scale mono-cropping ... relegating the agenda of food sovereignty to a secondary level" (2007: 94).

Nevertheless, PAIS at this time was a heterogeneous political movement, and this diversity was observable in agricultural matters (Rosero, 2008). Vallejo's vision sought to achieve rural development by means of supply chains linking small-scale family agriculture to large agro-industrial corporations (Ibid); and via "flexible" crops like African palm, which could be used not only for food production, but also for wood and bio-fuels[388]. This vision clashed with the model of food sovereignty championed by others in PAIS that sought to prioritise organic production for local human consumption (Ibid).

These tensions came to light around demand for the cancellation of FTA negotiations with the US. As Hidalgo notes, the prospect of such an agreement was seen by rural movements as a grave threat to their livelihoods, given its potential to flood the market with cheap foreign produce (2013: 37). Significantly, however, the FTA was not a purely rural issue. Resistance to the agreement became a rallying point for many social actors, allowing indigenous and *campesino* movements to articulate with urban consumer organisations, NGOs, small farmers and fishing collectives (Ibid: 38). This unity of purpose resulted in powerful mobilisations that paralysed the country during the Palacio government, placing issues of sovereignty firmly on the policy agenda (Lucas, 2007: 68).

The matter appeared resolved when Correa met with the John Negroponte of the US State Department in May 2007 to inform him of Ecuador's decision to reject the agreement[389], stating that it would "destroy" small farmers[390]. Nevertheless, agro-exporters stood to profit handsomely from the FTA, and were not prepared to meekly accept this decision. These actors, represented by the Chamber of Production, held a series of meetings with government during the autumn of 2007, attempting to pressure officials into reopening negotiations[391]. At one meeting Vice-President Lenin Moreno appeared to acquiesce to the demand, prompting Correa to swiftly declare the FTA "as sunk as the Titanic"[392].

[387] Universo, May 10th, 2007.
[388] AI: Francisco Rhon.
[389] Universo, May 10th, 2007.
[390] Washington Post, October 1st, 2007.
[391] Universo, October 23rd, 2007.
[392] Ibid.

This uneven approach can be seen on other issues. For example, in April 2007 the government signed an agreement with Brazil to jointly produce bio-fuels[393], even though according to PK member Alfredo Luna it would "undermine Ecuador's food sovereignty"[394]. Other moves were aimed at supporting small farmers, such as the scheme to import urea and sell it at half the usual price[395] to producers with less than 20 hectares (Clark, 2016: 196). The diffusion of this petroleum-based fertiliser, however, contradicted promises of organic production (Ibid). Steps to either negotiate or impose price controls on basic staples such rice, corn[396], flour and milk[397]; and to introduce tariffs on a range of over 500 products including food, reflect a tendency toward state regulation rather than food sovereignty (Román, 2013). Little wonder that some have described the implementation of agrarian policies as "unfocussed" (García, 2014: 415).

The position of the National Secretariat for Planning and Development (SENPLADES) "oscillated" between the distinct concepts of food sovereignty (which revolves around local control of food production (Nyéléni, 2007)) and food security (which centres on access to sufficient food supplies (FAO, 2006)) (Rosero et al, 2011: 88). Evidence of this indecision is found in the National Development Plan, 2007-2010 (SENPLADES, 2007). The text refers more often to food security than to food sovereignty[398], and at times appears to use them interchangeably. For example, a section entitled 'Food Sovereignty' uses that term just once, while dwelling extensively on food security[399], which it defines as "access at all times to the food we need to live active and healthy lives" (Ibid: 178). At another point productivity, tariffs, commercialisation, credit and rural development are associated with the term 'food sovereignty' (Ibid: 266), but only in the appendix is it linked to the agency of peasant organisations, access to land, and land titles (Ibid: 307). More controversial elements from the Plan for Government such as agrarian reform and the use of "agro-toxins" (re-named "agro-chemicals") are rarely mentioned.

Thus we can see that the policies of the Correa government with regard to food sovereignty in the period preceding the constituent assembly were inconsistent. While paying more attention to the rural sector than previous administrations – three separate plans were produced during its first months[400] – it was difficult to detect initiatives coherent with food sovereignty. In fact, there were many aspects of policy in this area that appeared to contradict the concept. These potential sources

[393] AP, April 4th, 2007.
[394] IPS, September 28th, 2007.
[395] BBC Worldwide, April 14th, 2007.
[396] Ibid.
[397] IHS, January 3rd, 2008.
[398] A cursory examination reveals approximately 30 references to 'food security,' compared with around 20 for 'food sovereignty'.
[399] This term is used 11 times in this section.
[400] BBC Worldwide, July 16th, 2007.

of tension between government and rural social actors were overtaken by the battle over the constituent assembly. Not only did rural movements play a crucial role in that victory, they were also influential within the assembly itself (Becker, 2011). As these movements were aware, the process of writing the Constitution presented a rare "political opening" for food sovereignty (Ibid: 49; Peña 2016: 223).

A Political Opportunity

Several scholars and interviewees noted that the correlation of forces at this time was favourable to civil society, and to rural social movements in particular (Becker, 2011: 49; Giunta, 2014: 1201; Lucas, 2015: 158)[401]. Nonetheless, the historic role of indigenous and peasant movements in resisting neoliberal reforms and formulating alternatives in the years preceding the assembly was also key (Ibid; Silva, 2009: Becker, 2011). As Martínez notes, these sectors of society have traditionally offered "alternative and sustainable economic models and practices" (2014: 140).

Among these alternatives was the indigenous concept of '*sumak kawsay*'[402], or 'good living'. This principle was adopted as a framework by Assembly President Alberto Acosta (Becker, 2011: 50), who saw it as a means of critiquing the market-based development model (Acosta, 2008: 38). Indeed the presence of Acosta, with his ties to indigenous and environmental movements (Lucas, 2015: 147), was another boon to social actors. A further concept that would prove central was the 'solidarity economy', which also emerged from civil society. This concept heavily influenced the first NDP and Correa's economic plan, which he stated would re-orient the economy toward "the welfare of all Ecuadorians in an equitable and efficient manner"[403]. Acosta's vision of the concept encompassed a dynamic relationship between the state, markets and society; the redistribution of wealth (i.e. land); and the destruction of monopolies (2008: 39-40). The presence of these concepts in the new Constitution allowed rural actors to frame food sovereignty as transforming the agrarian sector (Ibid: 43)[404], thereby enabling links with a wider group of social actors (Peña, 2016: 223).

If framing was important to the attempts to enshrine food sovereignty in the Constitution, so too was the articulation of demands between social actors. Tensions had long existed between the major indigenous and *campesino* movements CONAIE, FENOCIN and FEINE, but they had a tendency to unite in the face of common threats (Becker, 2015: 78). Relations had been damaged by the alliance with Gutiérrez and its collapse (Ibid: 101), and rural organisations arrived at the assembly

[401] AI: Roberto Gortaire.
[402] *'Buen vivir'* or 'good living'.
[403] Universo, April 2nd, 2007.
[404] AI: Roberto Gortaire.

with unresolved differences (Rosero, 2008). Nor was the issue of food sovereignty of equal significance to each organisation. While CONAIE listed food sovereignty among its demands in a proposal to the assembly (2007b), it was not the priority that it was for the '*Mesa Agraria*' (Rosero et al, 2011: 88).

FENOCIN in particular took the lead on this issue. Beforehand its president Pedro de la Cruz outlined the need for an "agrarian revolution", which he linked to ideas of solidarity economy and land ownership[405]. With regard to unity, de la Cruz predicted that on "important issues" like food sovereignty, CONAIE would lend its support[406]. So it would prove, with the combination of their respective forces and methods exerting sufficient pressure to help achieve shared goals (Becker, 2015: 178; Clark, 2016: 192). FENOCIN believed in working within the governing coalition, with de la Cruz elected to the assembly on the *Acuerdo PAIS* ticket (Becker, 2011: 50). His appointment as head of the Committee for Work, Equity and Social Inclusion (*Mesa Seis*) – responsible for the area of food sovereignty – gave FENOCIN significant influence. Pressure from within was augmented by symbolic acts like "Food Sovereignty Fairs," where small farmers exhibited seeds and produce; and alliances with other organisations (Rosero et al, 2011: 89; Giunta, 2014: 1213).

In contrast to the soft power of the *Mesa Agraria*, CONAIE relied on more traditional means to pressure the government from the outside. As data from the CAAP reveals, the period of the constituent assembly witnessed indigenous organisations mobilising around issues of land and water (Sánchez, 2013: 45). For example, in March 2008 CONAIE (along with ECUARUNARI and CONFENIAE) mobilised over 20,000 members in Quito[407]. Following the march, representatives presented a 'mandate' addressed to Correa which contained a list of demands that included a "profound" agrarian reform that encompassed food sovereignty and the "democratisation" of land (CONAIE, 2008)[408].

Alongside these methods, the assembly committees organised public forums to seek proposals from civil society (Bernal, 2014: 450). Delegates from '*Mesa Seis*' held meetings across the country, generating participation from indigenous, peasant, youth and women's organisations (Rosero et al, 2011: 90). The direct participation of representatives of large landowners like agricultural chambers or cattle-ranchers associations was minimal, due to their ties to discredited political parties (Ibid: 88). Although these representative bodies were absent from the assembly, individual agri-

[405] Interview with Pedro de la Cruz, December, 2007; available at: http://www.institut-gouvernance.org/es/entretien/fiche-entretien-70.html
[406] Ibid.
[407] Ecuador Inmediato, March 11th, 2008.
[408] Ibid.

businesses – like supermarket chain Supermaxi[409], and the private food corporation PRONACA[410] – intervened in the writing the Constitution (Ibid). These corporations are generally considered the most powerful players in the Ecuadorian agri-business sector[411], and are known to be commercial allies (León & Yumbla, 2010).

Lucas further notes the influence of the agri-business sector on advisors to the assembly, opposition delegates, and members of the governing coalition (2015: 149)[412]. Lucas details the "constant pressure" brought to bear on delegates, spanning a spectrum from planted media stories to direct pressure, even threats (Ibid: 158). Nevertheless, as noted, PAIS from its initiation contained divergent currents. Two key government figures that opposed food sovereignty and advocated rural development by way of commercialisation via large agro-industrial companies were Vallejo and Social Development Minister Nathalie Cely (Rosero et al, 2011: 88). Vallejo had ties to flower exporters[413]. Cely, who was a university classmate of Correa's and considered highly influential[414], had founded business consultancy Stratega that advised agribusinesses[415]. Cely was said to be particularly close to the powerful Nobis Group that has important agro-industrial interests[416].

The divisions on agrarian issues were personified by Correa, evidenced by issues like the status of GMOs (Ibid: 91). During the assembly's deliberations, Correa interceded via his weekly radio show to pronounce his opposition to the outright ban on GMOs then being considered[417]. Citing a "brilliant" presentation by independent scientists, Correa affirmed that "no country in the world prohibits GMOs" but rather regulates and controls them (Lucas, 2015: 152). Correa insisted that a ban would risk the country's food security and cautioned against "excessive enthusiasm". This prompted a response from social organisations, but also from within *Acuerdo PAIS*, with assembly delegate Ana Maria Larrea affirming that the entry of GMOs would be contrary to food sovereignty (Ibid: 153).

In the view of many rural social actors, this placed Correa in conflict with Alberto Acosta (Rosero et al, 2011: 91). Nevertheless, when a draft of the food sovereignty article approved by '*Mesa Seis*'

[409] Supermaxi is part of the 'La Favorita' group controlled by the Wright family, who are known to have contributed to Correa's presidential campaign - Wikileaks Cables, March 30th, 2007.
[410] While titled the 'National Food Processor', PRONACA is a private company that forms part of the Bakker group of companies which has interests in various aspect of the food industry. The Bakker family are said to maintain a "low political profile" - Wikileaks Cables, March 30th, 2007.
[411] AI: Esperanza Martínez; Richard Intriago; Pablo Ospina; and Roberto Gortaire.
[412] This is supported by revelations from the Wikileaks Cables, which note that the strategy of the business community was to identify assembly delegates that it would support - March 30th, 2007.
[413] AI: Roberto Gortaire.
[414] Comercio, July 3rd, 2011.
[415] Stratega website: http://www.stratega.com.ec/quienes-somos.html.
[416] AI: Pablo Andrade.
[417] Enlace Radial 71, May 31st, 2008. Available at: https://archive.org/details/Enlace71.

was surreptitiously replaced with a watered-down version, a conversation between Correa and Acosta settled the matter in favour of a wording which guaranteed access to land for peasants, and contained a declaration that Ecuador would be "free of GMOs" (Ibid: 90). The latter wording avoided the spectre of an outright ban. Furthermore, Correa favoured a clause which would grant discretionary powers to suspend the declaration in exceptional circumstances (Lucas, 2015: 155).

Faced with direct and indirect pressure from the business sector, and divisions within the governing bloc, the unity of purpose of indigenous and peasant movements proved crucial to determining the final text. The first draft was criticised as weak, with social organisations maintaining that it failed to regulate agri-business (Rosero et al, 2011: 90). Proponents defended the text as the best that could be achieved given the political friction around the issue (Ibid). FENOCIN member Luis Andrango took a lead role in bringing together representatives of the major social organisations to produce a stronger text known as the "Quito consensus" (Ibid: 91).

The Constitution approved in 2008 reflected many key demands of these organisations, and in turn the promises made during the election. Article 281 established food sovereignty as a "strategic objective and obligation of the State" to ensure the achievement of "healthy and culturally appropriate food" for all. The article further commits the state to: strengthening organic production methods; providing credit to small and medium producers; supporting the development of networks of producers and consumers; and preventing monopolies and speculation. Article 282 builds on the offer to provide peasants with access to water and land by prohibiting '*latifundios*' and the concentration of land; and mandating the establishment of a fund to enable equitable access for peasants to land that fails to fulfil its "social or environmental function". Finally, Article 401 declares Ecuador free of GMOs, but allows for their introduction if both president and national assembly deem it appropriate.

Rural social movements were generally satisfied with the outcome and process of the constituent assembly[418]. Regarding the text, it was seen by some as a "light" proposal that failed to resolve critical points like land reform and GMOs (Rosero et al, 2011: 92). Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that the text was a compromise between progressive forces and traditional power groups, including those within PAIS (Giunta, 2014: 1216). The hope of social actors was that those issues could be addressed by means of laws and regulations (Rosero et al, 2011: 92). Furthermore, the open and participatory nature of the process was itself a source of optimism. Historically excluded *campesino* and indigenous populations gained access to political allies (Peña, 2016: 226), participated directly in rethinking Ecuadorian society (Ibid; Giunta, 2014: 1213), and were

[418] AI: Luis Andrango.

recognised as key actors in the area of food sovereignty (Ortiz, 2008: 16). The hopes engendered by this period would prove largely unfounded, however. In the words of Luis Andrango: "the assembly was a democratic *fiesta*, but then came the hangover"[419].

Switching Foreshadowed? The Agrarian Mandate

In fact, for some the party ended while the assembly was in its final days. At a summit in May 2008 Latin American presidents declared a regional food "emergency" due to sharply rising prices of basic staples[420]. Subsequently, Correa prepared a range of measures aimed at boosting the agricultural sector. The measures – including subsidies for fertilisers, tax breaks for importers of agro-chemicals and agri-food companies, and a two-year exoneration from tariffs for imported agricultural inputs – were augmented by a presidential decree that promoted bio-fuels (Lucas, 2015: 156)[421]. The proposed measures were the subject of a five-hour consultation between Correa and agribusiness players at the presidential offices[422]. Among those present were Isabel Noboa[423], sister of Alvaro and head of the Nobis group that has significant agri-food interests, including dairy farms, the country's largest sugar mill, and a Coca-Cola bottling monopoly[424]; and Salomon Larrea, with interests in sugar and bio-fuels[425]. Both expressed their satisfaction with the proposals, with Larrea lauding the government's commitment to the private sector[426].

While Correa enacted the subsidies via decree[427], the tax breaks required the approval of the constituent assembly[428]. The text of Mandate 16 (the 'Agrarian Mandate') was put to the assembly without prior consultation with civil society (Rosero et al, 2011: 94), as an emergency measure[429]. Thus in spite of misgivings, it was passed on July 3rd (Ibid). Some noted that the cost of the measures to the state would amount to $415 million (Ibid), which it was feared would strengthen monopolies (Lucas, 2015: 157). Furthermore, Lucas notes that the mandate would incentivise agro-chemical use, and "totally contradict" the food sovereignty proposal (Ibid). Rural organisations came together to oppose this "attack" on food sovereignty, producing an 'Alternative Agrarian Mandate' that drew attention to the financial and environmental costs to the state of subsidising petroleum-based agro-

[419] Ibid.
[420] AFP, May 7th, 2008.
[421] Universo, June 14th, 2008.
[422] Ibid.
[423] Ibid.
[424] Wikileaks Cables, August 8th, 2008. Romero Carbo contributed to Correa's campaign, and is the ex-husband of Nobis Group CEO Isabel Noboa.
[425] Universo, June 15th, 2008.
[426] Universo, June 14th, 2008.
[427] Executive decree 1137, 2008.
[428] Ibid.
[429] AI: Roberto Gortaire.

chemicals[430]. The government declined to alter its course, however. Subsequent investigation revealed that the measures directly benefited agri-food companies and not small producers (Rosero et al, 2011: 94).

Nevertheless, the Agrarian Mandate reiterated the state's commitment to food sovereignty. The text noted the need to support small and medium-sised producers and promote agro-ecological production by way of sustainable and environmentally responsible activities[431]. Furthermore, the mandate expedited the design and execution a Food Sovereignty Programme, which was seen as positive (Hidalgo, 2013: 41). Via Executive Decree 1285 in August, 2008 Correa delegated the formulation of the programme to the Ministry for the Coordination of Production (García, 2014: 414). Separately, an inter-institutional commission was formed to begin writing the Organic Law of the Food Sovereignty Regime (LORSA) (Ibid; Rosero et al, 2011: 97).

The period following the constituent assembly and ratification of the Constitution saw further shifts in the correlation of forces toward the right wing of the governing coalition (Lucas, 2015: 203). The first stage came during the transition regime between the constituent assembly and general elections, a period Esperanza Martínez views as the fulcrum[432] of a wider 'switch'[433]. Most significant was the interim legislative commission known as the '*congresillo*' (little Congress), the members of which were "hand-picked" by Correa (Muñoz, 2014: 207). To the dubious legality and legitimacy of the *congresillo* (Becker, 2015: 190) was added a significant concentration of power in the Executive. During the constituent assembly, delegates had struggled with the design of the state, eventually creating a so-called 'fifth power' in the form of citizen participation. According to Martínez, however, under the transition regime, "five powers became one"[434]. In the view of opposition analyst Julio Clavijo, Correa "decapitated" civil society[435].

A "beheading" (Muñoz, 2014: 211) of another kind took place within PAIS, as Correa oversaw the departures of members connected to social movements, including Alberto Acosta and Gustavo Larrea[436], to be replaced by "political opportunists" (Ramírez Gallegos, 2010: 93). As Correa consolidated power, the main "enemy of the state" switched from opposition parties to social movements (Sánchez, 2103: 45). For sympathetic movements like FENOCIN and FEINE there were opportunities (Becker, 2015). For those not in agreement, however, the approach was distinct.

[430] Official and alternative Agrarian Mandates available at: https://www.servindi.org/actualidad/4317.
[431] Ibid.
[432] Martínez refers to the transition regime as a "rupture" and a "scandal" - AI: Esperanza Martínez.
[433] Alberto Acosta considers that the government 'switched' around this time - AI: Alberto Acosta.
[434] AI: Esperanza Martínez.
[435] AI: Julio Clavijo.
[436] Another prominent figure from the left, Monica Chuji, departed PAIS in the aftermath of the constituent assembly and became a sharp critic of the government (Becker, 2015).

While some believed that food sovereignty would prove a battleground between government and movements (Lucas, 2015: 202), it was the Mining Law that lit the spark. When CONAIE made clear its opposition[437], Correa resumed his criticism of movements, labelling indigenous and environmental organisations "infantile" and "dangerous"[438]. When CONAIE called for a mobilisation, FENOCIN rejected the move (Muñoz, 2014: 208-9). Confronted by a *congresillo* united behind Correa and ebbing energy levels, the indigenous movement was no longer able to articulate key social sectors in resistance (Ibid: 210).

Food Sovereignty: Enabled or Tamed?

As a result LORSA proved less controversial than anticipated, reflecting the new correlation of forces[439]. The management of the Inter-institutional Commission on Food Sovereignty was delegated to the Ministry of the Economy. Other government players were Social Development Minister Cely, and new Agriculture Minister Walter Poveda, who had links to agro-industry, specifically rice and maize production[440]. The debates on LORSA between October 2008 and February 2009 considered land distribution, GMOs, commercialisation, tax and duties, and productivity (Rosero et al, 2011: 97). The commission promoted a conservative vision based on the agri-business model (Carrión & Herrera, 2013: 14). As in the constituent assembly, representative bodies like agricultural chambers were absent; instead support came from individual corporations, including PRONACA and Supermaxi (Ibid; Rosero et al, 2011: 97). The vision of food sovereignty as radical change set out in the Constitution was promoted by indigenous and peasant organisations. An 'intermediate' position in line with food security was advocated by some state entities and international bodies (Ibid).

In light of the divergence between positions, the text approved by the *congresillo* in February 2009 was very much a compromise (Ibid: 98). In particular, Article 32 of the draft law effectively outsourced the taking of the most critical decisions to a citizens' body under the auspices of the Agriculture Ministry (Ibid; García, 2014: 414). The proposed Food Sovereignty Council made up of representatives from the executive, legislature, local government and civil society would write the enacting laws, a process estimated to take 18 months[441]. Nevertheless, the text submitted to the president contained progressive elements, such as a ban on using food for bio-fuels, and limitations

[437] According to indigenous leader Humberto Cholango, the mobilisation was not only in opposition to the Mining Law, but to the wider neoliberal agenda that included the Food Sovereignty Law that "favours agro-food monopolies" (Lucas, 2015: 213).
[438] Enlace Ciudadano 90, October 11th, 2008. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DBjSAzMTkFA.
[439] AI: Roberto Gortaire.
[440] Hora, January 21st, 2008.
[441] Universo, February 17th, 2009.

on the introduction of GMOs (Rosero et al, 2011: 98). However Correa exercised his veto over the draft law, making ten modifications including an exception to the bio-fuel ban, the extension of state subsidies to large-scale producers, and limitations on the law-making powers of the proposed Council (now Conference) (Ibid). No opportunity was afforded to debate the amended text, and LORSA became law in May 2009.

Strictly speaking, LORSA fulfilled much of its constitutional mandate to establish a legal framework for food sovereignty, including: sustainable production, incentives for the productive use of land, the promotion of small farmers' associations and healthy food (García, 2014: 414). Nevertheless, it was greeted with scepticism by social actors (Rosero et al, 2011: 99). Alberto Acosta condemned the lack of democratic debate, and noted that the president's veto left the door open to bio-fuels and GMOs (2009). With regard to the extension of state subsidies, Acosta concluded that it was a concession to "the pressures of the big agricultural producers" (Ibid). A further criticism was that LORSA failed to establish a clear process for proposing laws, leaving the Conference in 'limbo' (Rosero et al, 2011: 100). The situation was not addressed until late 2010 with the submission of a LORSA reform bill, which was again partially vetoed by Correa (Ibid). The outcome was that any proposal of the Food Sovereignty Conference (COPISA) had to be routed through the Executive (Ibid: 101).

By the time LORSA was enacted, Ecuador had held new elections. Unlike in 2006, no plan for government was presented, with the election acting as a plebiscite on Correa and the government project (Bowen, 2010: 187). Thus the electoral offering with regard to agrarian issues went unchanged. On this occasion Correa triumphed over Lucio Gutiérrez in the first round; but while PAIS emerged the largest party in the new legislature (Assembly), it failed to secure a majority (Ibid). Nevertheless, with the political opposition effectively disarmed (Ibid), the government had less need of social support than during its turbulent early years[442]. As Luis Andrango pointed out, when Correa took power in 2007 the biggest issue he faced was governability[443], following a period that saw three sitting presidents ousted (Philip & Panizza, 2011). By 2009, this was no longer the concern it had been.

Nonetheless, sources of hope for the food sovereignty programme persisted within the government framework. The NDP 2009-2013 represented a "call to action," proposing a framework for achieving '*sumak kawsay*', of which LORSA was a part (McKay et al, 2014: 1186). The plan critiqued the notion of an economy based on primary commodities, and purported to map a future

[442] AI: Daniel Ortega.
[443] AI: Luis Andrango.

path via knowledge and biodiversity (García, 2014: 381). The plan allowed for a period of transition, however. Thus in regard to agriculture, the plan provided for bio-fuel production in the short-term, though not at the cost of food sovereignty (SENPLADES, 2009: 115). Overall the plan placed food sovereignty at the heart of a "structural change" to a sustainable mode of development (Ibid: 329).

Another hopeful sign for was the belated convocation of COPISA. Made up of eight representatives from civil society, including the *Mesa Agraria*[444], COPISA was briefed with fostering citizen participation in the formulation of nine supplementary laws (Peña, 2014: 226)[445]. The body had some initial success. Between 2010 and 2012 COPISA organised 188 policy-making workshops, cultivating what Peña describes as a "synergistic relationship" between civil society and the state (2014: 230). One effect of this dynamic was to lend legitimacy to the state (Ibid). Peña also opines that the process strengthened the movements involved, but two COPISA delegates interviewed expressed misgivings. Richard Intriago pointed to the lack of adequate funding, and contrasts the failure of Correa to meet even once with delegates with the "regular" meetings with the *Mesa Agraria* in the months prior to the constituent assembly[446]. Roberto Gortaire saw COPISA as an example of the "bureaucratisation of participation," noting that it ended up as "just another public institution with no power"[447].

Undoubtedly the biggest disappointment of COPISA – and of the government's food sovereignty programme in general – was the failure to pass even one of the bills it prepared into law (Ibid; Clark, 2016). In the words of CONAIE leader Severino Sharupi, there was a "terrible gulf" between the Constitution and the realities that followed[448]. Only the Law of Agrobiodiversity entered the legislative process under Correa (Ibid: 193), and by the end his time in office in mid-2017 not even this had become law[449]. According to Giunta, this "slowdown" has to be understood in the context of "concrete relations in the Ecuadorian agri-food sector" (2014: 1221). In particular, it evidences a lack of political will in the face of the "power and pressure" of agribusiness (Clark, 2016: 198).

[444] FENOCIN had the largest representation with two delegates, with members of FEINE and other rural movements also present.
[445] The nine areas to be legislated upon were: land access and use; seeds and agro-biodiversity; food safety; credits, subsidies and insurance; commercialisation; agro-industry and the workforce; nutrition and health; artisanal fishing and mangroves; ancestral territory and communal property.
[446] AI: Richard Intriago.
[447] AI: Roberto Gortaire.
[448] AI: Severino Sharupi.
[449] AI: Richard Intriago.

In contrast to the bureaucratic quagmire facing food sovereignty, Cely was able to agree a new Production Law for agro-exporting within approximately six months (Rosero et al, 2011: 101)[450]. The law reduced the tax burden on companies[451], and was an example of "concessions to the private sector" then being discursively rejected by government (Ospina, 2015). The divergence of access and influence was also notable. When considering new tariffs in March 2009, the government consulted business representatives following which, according to Andy Wright of Supermaxi, it "softened its position"[452]. In the view of former Agriculture Minister Ramon Espinel, this asymmetry in terms of influence can also be observed in the processes of preparing three laws regulating areas central to food sovereignty – water, seeds, and agrarian development – none of which involved participation by peasant organisations[453]. This situation left peasant groups with no voice or vote (Hidalgo, 2013: 41).

The Unfulfilled Promise of Land Reform

It therefore came as a surprise when Correa appointed Espinel as Minister for Agriculture in 2009[454]. Unlike his predecessors with their ties to agro-industry[455], Espinel had a PhD from the University of Berkeley and had worked in academia, where Correa had been his student[456]. What is more, Correa personally approached Espinel to urge him to oversee a "radical change" in agriculture in Ecuador[457]. The programme proposed by Espinel – and approved by Correa and his cabinet – centred on two key reforms. The first was a root-and-branch restructuring of the Ministry for Agriculture which, according to Espinel, responded mainly to the agro-industrial sector[458]. The second was a programme of "radical agrarian reform" to redistribute a projected 2.5 million hectares of land (McKay et al, 2014: 1186). Land use and distribution was considered "central to the way the new Constitution addresses food sovereignty" (Ibid).

Under Espinel, the Agriculture Ministry began to prioritise family farming for the first time. Espinel created new institutions in an attempt to re-orient the Ministry. The '*Consejo Campesino*' (Peasant Council) made up of over 300 peasant organisations was invited to meet monthly at the ministry's offices to analyse rural policies[459]. This unprecedented access was formalised by the ministry's

[450] The agribusiness sector was given a draft to review in June, 2010 and the code was agreed by December that year - Universo, June 26th, 2010.
[451] From 25 per cent to 22 per cent (Ospina, 2015).
[452] Although, it bears adding, the sector was against any kind of tariff - Washington Post, March 26th, 2009.
[453] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[454] Universo, July 15th, 2009.
[455] AI: Francisco Rhon.
[456] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[457] Ibid.
[458] Ibid.
[459] Ibid.

2009 strategic plan that recognised small producers as subjects of public policy (Carrión & Herrera, 2013: 80). Espinel further created a vice-ministry of rural development to push the necessary structural changes in land ownership, although the process took more than one year[460].

Nevertheless, via Executive Decree 373, Espinel's proposal to create a sub-secretariat for land and agrarian development to administer the proposed measures was enacted (Rosero, 2011: 85). Espinel proceeded to scrap the Haciendas Plan that purported to redistribute 10,000 hectares of seized land[461], and replaced it with the more ambitious '*Plan Tierras*' (Land Plan) (FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 46)[462]. Under this plan, 69,000 hectares of state-controlled land would pass into peasant hands, while a national fund would be created for the purchase and expropriation of over 1.5 million hectares of 'unproductive' private land (Ospina, 2013: 176-177; FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 47). The terms of the plan also foresaw the provision of titles to over one million hectares (Ibid).

The proposal set out in *Plan Tierras* created significant expectations[463], due to Ecuador's historically high levels of land concentration, as noted in the plan for government (PAIS, 2006b: 41). According to research by Espinel's team, there were almost one million peasants with little or no land (Rosero, 2011: 83). While the plan did not offer to give land away, Espinel promised both access to credit and "social prices" (FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 50), along with ancillary supports for commercialisation, organisational association, training and technology transfer[464]. While Espinel's team initially worked on establishing the quantum of unproductive land, by late 2009 they were ready to begin transferring lands into the hands of the AGD[465]. As Rosero notes, rural movements foresaw that 2010 would be the year of food sovereignty and agrarian revolution (2011: 85).

These expectations would ultimately be dashed, however. The process advanced very slowly, resulting in rising levels of frustration in rural areas. By mid-2011, less than 5,000 hectares had been distributed (Carrión, 2013: 92). Two years later this figure had risen to 22,000 hectares (FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 52), with the final amount of land redistributed under the plan by its completion reaching just 80,000 hectares[466].

One problem encountered was the confusion regarding the quantity of land available for distribution (McKay et al, 2014: 1186; FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 50). Another issue resulted from the lack of a legal

[460] Ibid.
[461] Universo, May 25th, 2009.
[462] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[463] AI: Mario Macias.
[464] Tiempo, October 24th, 2009.
[465] Universo, October 19th, 2009. With the closure of the AGD in late 2009, control of these assets passed to the Central Bank and Ministry of Finance (FIAN Ecuador, 2013: 50).
[466] AI: Mario Macias.

framework for transferring state-held lands into peasant hands (Ibid: 51). This ambiguity led to the marginalisation of peasant movements (Giunta, 2014: 1220), and permitted the AGD and Central Bank to erect "bureaucratic obstacles" that saw just ten per cent distributed within the first two years[467]. A further problem was that the lands that were distributed happened via a "buy and sell process" that failed to provide protections to peasants, such as guarantees against predatory re-purchasing[468]. Thus, despite the stated aim of *Plan Tierra*s to reduce inequality[469], Ecuador experienced a re-concentration of land ownership in subsequent years[470].

Along with these issues, *Plan Tierras* was hindered by the correlation of forces in the agrarian sector. One element was the lack of unity among social movements during this time. FENOCIN had remained a staunch, though not entirely uncritical, ally of the government (Becker, 2015). Nevertheless, the organisation was "fixed on land reform" (McKay et al, 2014: 1188), and when its approach of dealing directly with government failed to yield returns, internal splits began to appear. While Pedro de la Cruz remained within government, FENOCIN under the leadership of Luis Andrango announced an official "distancing" from the administration[471]. These divisions within and between movements resulted in declining levels of mobilisation after 2009 (Giunta, 2014: 1210)[472]. Rosero opines that the absence of a national mobilisation to press for land distribution was a key factor in the failure of *Plan Tierras* (2011: 88).

A Switch Consolidated: Agroindustry Over Food Sovereignty

This shift in power away civil society organisations was to the benefit of agro-industry (Giunta, 2014: 1202). In Espinel's opinion, control over key agricultural inputs like fertilisers, along with the economic and political stability the sector could offer, were crucial to its increased influence[473]. However, while Espinel – who departed his post in early 2011[474] – maintained that the government was still capable in 2009 of "radical thinking" on agrarian issues[475], others have questioned Correa's motives for appointing the minister. Agrarian scholar Francisco Rhon believes that Espinel was "abandoned" by the government, and that his appointment was a political move to create fresh expectations in rural areas[476].

[467] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[468] AI: Mario Macias.
[469] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[470] AI: Pablo Ospina.
[471] Comercio, March 5th, 2010.
[472] AI: Esteban Daza.
[473] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[474] Universo, January 26th, 2011.
[475] AI: Ramon Espinel.
[476] AI: Francisco Rhon.

This logic is echoed by scholars and social actors who believe PAIS involved organisations like FENOCIN in agrarian reform in order to legitimate its proposals (Silva, 2017: 107)[477]. This conclusion was also reached by a number of peasant and indigenous organisations when they refused to participate in the pre-legislative consultation for the new land law, believing from previous experience that their presence merely served to legitimate the process[478]. McKay et al (2014: 1178) go further, noting that food sovereignty itself has been "used to galvanise consent and popular support" for the government's goal of consolidating state power, reducing the concept to a "legitimating discourse".

Support for this view is provided by Correa effectively abandoning the idea of large-scale redistribution of land less than a year after Espinel's departure (Ospina, 2013: 177). During his television show Correa equated small-scale farming with low productivity, and expressed concern that land reform would lead to increased poverty[479]. Furthermore, Correa's characterisation of productivity in the peasant sector as "disastrous"[480] appeared to condemn entirely the notion of an agricultural system based on food sovereignty. This criticism was particularly damaging in the context of a government ever-more preoccupied with productivity[481]. The NDP 2013-2017 (SENPLADES, 2013), with its focus on transforming the 'productive matrix', appeared to herald the end to government commitment to food sovereignty. According to Richard Intriago, from that point there was "no more talk about small producers"[482].

While acknowledging the slow pace and difficulty of implementing the legal framework in practice, state functionaries at the Ministry of Agriculture nonetheless insisted that LORSA continued to guide Ecuador's agrarian policies[483]. But the government's self-styled 'agrarian revolution' – based on incentivising farmer organisation and investment in education (McKay et al, 2011: 1187) – was not intended to transform the agrarian system, but to ameliorate the vulnerability of small farmers (Carrión, 2013: 88).

There were also threats to the constitutional provisions, with Correa openly considering the amendment of Article 401 to relax the ban on GMOs (Giunta, 2014: 1218), which he described as an "error"[484]. Furthermore, for many advocates of food sovereignty the ratification of a trade

[477] AI: Richard Intriago.
[478] AI: Mario Macias.
[479] Enlace Ciudadano 240, October 1st, 2011. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T6kKlEFyTJ0.
[480] Ibid.
[481] AI: Esteban Daza.
[482] AI: Richard Intriago.
[483] AI: Jamill Ramon; and Cecilia Ponce.
[484] Universo, September 26th, 2012.

agreement with the European Union in November 2016[485] opened the door to GMOs, threatening peasants' rights to save seeds and accelerating mono-cropping (Ecuador Decide, 2015: 6). Meanwhile, the Ministry for the Environment began conducting workshops on the use of GMOs[486].

Pressure to relax the GM ban came from national and international sources. Companies like PRONACA, which is tied to Monsanto (Dávalos, 2016: 133), exercised its influence on behalf of transnational partners (Ibid; Muñoz, 2014: 290). Meanwhile US diplomats attempted to influence the debate on laws regulating this sector through the media[487]. Perhaps predictably, opposition to GMOs failed to garner widespread or sustained support[488]. In a similar fashion the government incentivised the production of bio-fuels over food (Giunta, 2014: 1218)[489], with measures such as the setting aside of 400,000 hectares for palm oil and sugar cane[490].

Within the agrarian sector, Cecilia Ponce noted "tensions" between large and small producers[491].Vice-Minister Ramon contended that government's role was to balance the interests of the peasant and agro-industrial sectors[492]. Maintaining such a balance was unlikely, however. According to Ponce, the organisational capacity of movements was key to their ability to press for policy change[493]. Yet as Ospina notes, that capacity was depleted and the organisations behind food sovereignty became divided and distant from government[494]. Many point to the government's role in fostering divisions. Measures included co-opting leaders, causing splits by creating parallel organisations, and legal measures to control civil society. These included Decree 016, that obliged social organisations to register and to refrain from political action (de la Torre & Ortiz, 2016: 9-10)[495], and the prosecution of movement leaders with charges like terrorism (Ospina et al, 2015)[496].

By contrast, the major economic power groups had no need to mobilise in order to influence policy[497]. Nevertheless, as interviews with business leaders revealed, the approach of PAIS to these actors during Correa's tenure was highly selective. In particular, the government for much of its time in power held business organisations at arm's length[498]. While business leaders interviewed

[485] Prensa Latina, November 11th, 2016.
[486] Available at: http://www.ambiente.gob.ec/.
[487] Wikileaks Cables, January 15th, 2010.
[488] AI: Monica Chuji.
[489] AI: Esteban Daza.
[490] Hoy, September 18th, 2011.
[491] AI: Cecilia Ponce.
[492] AI: Jamill Ramon.
[493] AI: Cecilia Ponce.
[494] AI: Pablo Ospina.
[495] AI: Ramiro Galarza; Richard Intriago; and Franklin Ramírez Gallegos.
[496] Estimates suggest between three and four hundred such arrests were made between 2009 and 2013 (Ospina et al, 2015).
[497] AI: Ramiro Galarza.
[498] AI: Juan Carlos Díaz Granados; Eduardo Cadena; and Roberto Aspiazu.

noted some thawing of relations following the downturn in oil prices in 2014 – the agreement with the EU can be seen as a manifestation of that change – most observed that government was more open to dealing with individual companies[499]. As commentators have noted, the food sector in Ecuador is particularly well articulated, due in part to the relatively small number of players (Clark, 2016: 197)[500]; and also to the high levels of personal inter-connection[501]. As a result it achieved a high level of influence.

The effects of this influence can be seen in the outcomes of agrarian policy. Research by Carrión and Herrera reveals that state interventions in the economy led to increased production of traditional cash crops, to the detriment of those for human consumption (2013: 26-30, 42). This in turn led to an increase in food imports (up by 60 per cent in 2008) (Ibid: 46), in breach of a stated aim from the campaign trail. While overall investment in agriculture rose under Correa, the majority of it (80 per cent in 2009, the year of highest spending) went to the coastal region to benefit agro-industry and exporters (Carrión, 2013: 89). Overall, a framework was established which on multiple levels – credits, prices, technology and subsidies – benefited agri-business (Carrión & Herrera, 2013). Nor was it the case that *campesinos* benefited proportionally; in fact their situation worsened, as many were pushed into orienting production toward exportation rather than food production, or to selling up to agro-industry (Ibid).

Certain companies benefited more than others, with those that refrained from political activism doing particularly well[502]. Furthermore, government promotion of the internal market through subsidies, incentives and limited tariff walls benefited the major players in that market (Román, 2013). In the food sector, Supermaxi and PRONACA are repeatedly cited as profiting from government policy (Carrión, 2013; Dávalos, 2016; Peña, 2016)[503]. As Ospina points out, government focus on domestic production helped these companies obtain significant influence over PAIS[504]. Furthermore, the Wright family were early donors to Correa's political movement (Lucas, 2007: 112), while the Bakker family behind PRONACA kept a low political profile (Gachet & Carrión, 2014: 124-125)[505].

[499] AI: Eduardo Cadena; and Roberto Aspiazu.
[500] AI: Pablo Ospina.
[501] For example, PRONACA (Bakker Group) has established a commercialisation alliance with Supermaxi (La Favorita Group) (Leon & Yumbla, 2010: 73); has strategic alliances with a Monsanto subsidiary and fertiliser company Agripac on the production side (Ibid: 78); and on the agro-industrial side, Luis Bakker is a board member of Isabel Noboa's Nobis Consortium (See: http://www.consorcionobis.com.ec/home/junta-directiva/).
[502] AI: Roberto Aspiazu.
[503] AI: Richard Intriago; Esperanza Martínez; Pablo Ospina; and Roberto Gortaire.
[504] AI: Pablo Ospina.
[505] Wikileaks Cables, August 8th, 2008.

Supermaxi enjoyed "exponential" growth (Dávalos 2016: 132) thanks to a structure that placed supply chains under the control of supermarkets, presenting a barrier to peasant commercialisation (Hidalgo, 2013: 41). PRONACA profited in particular from government failure to provide sufficient credit to peasants (Rosero et al, 2011: 74)[506], obliging many to sign contracts with companies (León & Yumbla, 2010). PRONACA also availed of subsidies for 'technological packets' containing agro-chemicals and seeds, formalising an agreement to that effect with the Agriculture Ministry in December 2012[507]. In the opinion of Esteban Daza, the purpose of the agreement was to shore up support in the coastal region before elections in 2013[508], which PAIS won handsomely.

In conclusion, Ecuador under Correa joined a small group of countries that not only enshrined food sovereignty in its Constitution, but also in law. Nevertheless, there is widespread consensus that aside from some targeted programmes, the government failed to transform the agricultural system as it promised (Giunta, 2014; McKay et al, 2014; Clark, 2016). Instead most commentators agree that the policies relating to agriculture continued the pre-existing model, which Augusto Barrera describes as a "quasi-colonial" structure[509]. This "debt" was acknowledged by government, including Correa himself, but was presented as one that it was in the process of being resolved. This analysis suggests this was never the case.

With regard to the various aspects of food sovereignty offered – peasant production, land reform, environmental sustainability, and the prioritising of human consumption – it completed "absolutely nothing" of what it offered[510]. In fact the situation of the rural actors that drove the food sovereignty programme worsened. While the Correa government intervened repeatedly in the agrarian sector, the result of these interventions benefited agri-business interests, frequently at the expense of peasants (Carrión & Herrera, 2013: 46). The net effect of the government's agrarian policies poses grave risks to food sovereignty in Ecuador in the medium to long-term (Ibid). As a result, government policy in this area must be classified as a switch.

5.5 Discussion

[506] This failure was admitted by government and ex-government actors. AI: Betty Tola; and Augusto Barrera.
[507] A copy of the signed agreement was obtained via an interviewee. The other companies that were party to the agreement were: Agripac, Equaquimica, Del Monte, Interoc, and Febres Cordero. Available at: http://www.andes.info.ec/fr/node/15268.
[508] AI: Esteban Daza.
[509] AI: Augusto Barrera.
[510] AI: Pablo Ospina.

Two main points arise from this analysis. Firstly, the literature typically treats Rafael Correa as a straightforward case of a non-switching left populist. However, as with the Gutiérrez chapter, the analysis here chapter reveals a more complex picture. This thesis reveals that the identification of Correa as a non-switching left populist should be limited to the earlier period of his presidency. When the analysis is extended over a longer time frame, and to separate policy areas, a different picture is revealed. Following his victory over the constituent assembly, when he was less vulnerable to being ousted, Correa could begin to 'switch' in some policy areas. Food sovereignty was one such area. As this chapter reveals, the Agrarian Mandate began the undermining of food sovereignty and the privileging of large agribusinesses. The trend continued and deepened in the period following the constituent assembly, when the policy direction increasingly favoured agro-industrial interests over small producers. Nevertheless, it took time for this switch to become visible. As such therefore the analysis of food sovereignty demonstrates variation in terms of switching between policy areas, and also within a policy area over time.

This analysis reveals that switches do not always occur early in a president's period in office, and further that they can vary from one policy area to another.

Secondly, this analysis demonstrates that the timing and partial nature of the switch in this area relate to the causal mechanism proposed by this thesis. This chapter reveals that Correa began his term as a vulnerable president, devoid of institutional support, and threatened by social mobilisation. Thus in response to pressure from civil society, the Correa government made good on its key pledge to convoke a constituent assembly, even in the face of trenchant opposition from political parties and domestic elites. Furthermore, social movements maintained these levels of articulation and mobilisation within the assembly to enshrine key demands in the text of a new constitution, despite resistance from pro-business forces and, at times, Correa himself. In short, during this early period Correa's liberty to take a path of switching was severely curtailed by the threat from articulated social movements that used mobilisation as a means not only of pressurising opposition parties, but also the president.

However, the case of food sovereignty reveals a more complex picture. For a period government policy ran on twin tracks, discursively committed to food sovereignty while favouring agribusiness in policy terms. Meanwhile rural social actors became divided, both internally and between movements, with these fissures deepened by government actions. The end result presents a contradiction – that of Ecuador becoming one of the few countries in the world to institutionalise food sovereignty while decisively undermining it – that can only be explained by reference to changes in the influence of civil society.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter analysed the government of Rafael Correa, viewed broadly as a non-switcher. An overview of Correa's electoral campaign notes that it was identifiably left populist and openly influenced by civil society demands. The chapter focussed on two electoral offerings: the constituent assembly, and food sovereignty. This analysis reveals that amid high social mobilisation, and despite fierce opposition, Correa honoured his promise to convoke a constituent assembly. The section on food sovereignty highlights the more complex dynamics at play following Correa's re-election. While the influence of movements saw Ecuador institutionalise food sovereignty, Correa oversaw steady shift away from small producers towards agro-industry, leaving the 'agrarian debt' unpaid. Correa as much as admitted this in 2012, asserting with regard to the policies of his government: "We have done very well by doing the same as always … we are doing better, much better, but the same as always"[511]. As this chapter discusses, these findings reveal that switching can vary, and that these variations relate to changes in social pressure.

[511] Interview with Rafael Correa on ATV television station in Peru in October, 2012 (Muñoz, 2014: 295).

Chapter 6: Peru - Ollanta Humala and the Conga Mines Conflict

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will consider the case of President Ollanta Humala in Peru who was elected in 2011 as a "left populist outsider" (Roberts, 2013: 1440), but who is generally considered to have 'switched' on his election promises (Murakami, 2014). The chapter will analyse the Humala government's policies relating to mining, with a particular focus on the "emblematic" socio-environmental conflict around the Conga Mines project (Gómez, 2013: 130). This conflict is viewed by many as a defining moment in the Humala presidency, the point at which his 'switch' became apparent (Durand, 2016a: 54). The Conga conflict also had important political consequences that brought about a re-alignment in Humala's support base from which he would not recover (Durand, 2012).

This chapter reveals that while Humala is correctly classified as a switcher, the switch did not occur until well into his first year in office. Prior to that, Humala had appeared to honour key election promises while avoiding confrontation with Peru's powerful business and mining sectors. These moves were popular, and represented for many the fulfilment of Humala's election promises (Quiñón et al, 2016: 110). However, the president's path to moderate reform was soon blocked by the issue of the Conga Mines project. The president was forced to choose between the opposing demands of the mining lobby and a well-articulated anti-mining sector in Cajamarca. Humala came under concerted pressure from business elites, and in particular the powerful mining lobby. Furthermore, the absence of a real threat to his survival in the form sustained national mobilisation – with one brief exception – enabled Humala to enact a switch that led to repression and bloodshed. This analysis demonstrates the value of the theoretical framework utilised by this thesis, and the approach taken of unpacking switching by focussing on a specific policy sector and related conflict.

The first part of the chapter will review the Humala candidacy, paying particular attention to campaign promises about mining. The next section will analyse Humala's performance in power, with a particular examination of key promises that related to extractive industries and social conflict. The chapter witll then analyse the Conga Mines conflict in the Cajamarca region that erupted around the plan for the largest gold mining project in Latin America, and discuss the implications as they relate to switching and civil society.

6.2 Overview: The Humala Candidacy

Peru's polity is characterised by a collapsed party system (Levitsky & Cameron, 2003), fractured political left (Tanaka, 2008), disarticulated civil society (Silva, 2009), and the lowest public faith in democratic institutions in the region (Levitsky, 2011: 87). Under these conditions the emergence of a political outsider with an anti-system message would be expected (Avilés & Rey, 2017). Nevertheless, Peru differed from other countries in the region that experienced some kind of prolonged economic malaise. As Arce notes, Alan García' presidency was characterised by simultaneously high levels of both economic growth and social exclusion (2015: 80).

The period prior to the 2011 election witnessed sharp increases in levels of social conflict, with most relating to extractive projects (Ibid; Grompone & Tanaka, 2009; Murakami, 2013). The majority of these conflicts were geographically confined to the peripheral regions of Peru, far from the political and economic centre of Lima (Ibid; Grompone & Tanaka, 2009). he absence of a broadly articulated national movement with a significant mobilisational capacity was noted as an important difference between Peru and neighbouring countries[512].

Ollanta Humala came to prominence as the leader of the short-lived Locumba uprising in 2000 (Díaz, 2012). The rebellion made Humala a household name, creating his image as a "radical" (Murakami, 2012: 268-9). This image, along with a lack of political credentials and "virulent" nationalism (McClintock, 2006: 100), meant Humala fit the bill as a left populist when first running for president in 2006. During that campaign Humala advocated a "radical change" to neoliberalism (Murakami, 2012: 267), including the nationalisation of strategic industries and natural resources (Levitsky, 2011: 85). This "extreme" programme saw him forge close ties to Peru's social and indigenous movements[513], capturing enough votes from southern and central regions to enter the run-off. Humala moderated in the second round, retracting calls for nationalisations (McClintock, 2006: 106), and naming a Central Bank director as his running-mate to show that he was "not necessarily radical on the economy" (Murakami, 2012: 277). The prevailing view was that Humala's attempted moderation failed to counteract his perceived radicalism (Ibid).

Some evidence that Humala might not be quite so radical emerged later, however. Renowned peasant leader Hugo Blanco asserted that Humala's 'uprising' had been a coordinated distraction to facilitate Fujimori's flight into exile, and saw his leftist candidacy as a "farce"[514]. Moderate leftist Manuel Benza Pflucker was part of a team that drafted the plan for government in 2006[515]. Summarily fired by Humala as a "radical," Benza Pflucker publicly queried Humala's leftist

[512] Ibid.
[513] AI: Luis Vittor.
[514] AI: Hugo Blanco.
[515] AI: Manuel Benza Pflucker.

credentials[516]. US Embassy cables also note Humala's "growing connections to monied contributors" and tendency to "flirt" with leftist parties in order to win over their voters[517]. The Wikileaks Cables reveal a pattern of near-annual meetings with US diplomats between 2006 and 2009, during which Humala emphasised his ability to contain socio-environmental conflict relating to mining, and control the 'radical' left-wing (Avilés & Rey, 2017: 169).

These elements were largely unknown or overlooked during the 2011 presidential contest. Notable differences existed between his two campaigns, encapsulated for some by Humala swapping his trademark red t-shirt for a white one[518]. Nonetheless, among the public at large Humala's public image remained that of the "radical left" (Murakami, 2013: 204). For many, he was the candidate who represented change (McClintock, 2013: 236). Nor had the PNP institutionalised in the interim: effectively abandoned by Humala after his defeat, the party split, losing seats in Congress (Tanaka, 2011: 80). While re-organised ahead of the 2011 election, the party remained weak and dependent on Humala's candidacy (Quiñón et al, 2016: 109). It again fell to non-members to draft Humala's plan for government. 'Citizens for Change' was a grouping of left-wing leaders and intellectuals brought together by businessman and Humala's political 'creator', Salomon Lerner, to support his candidacy (Chehade, 2016: 97). Over a nine-month period in 2010 the group formulated the text of what would become 'The Great Transformation' (Ibid: 98).

The vision set out in the programme was "radically opposed to neoliberalism" (Murakami, 2014: 109). Even some within Citizens for Change were critical[519], believing the final text "too revolutionary" for 'conservative' Peru (Chehade, 2016: 126). Others viewed the proposals as "moderate" (Poole & Renique, 2011), amounting to the modification rather than overhaul of the existing system (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 114). The focus of the plan was reducing inequality and poverty through the vindication of economic, social and cultural rights (Quiñón et al, 2016: 109). The document contained no references to nationalising industries, instead seeking to promote the internal market, and to bring the state back as an economic and regulatory actor (Burron, 2012: 135). The plan acknowledged the importance of macroeconomic stability (Ibid), perhaps understandably given the record levels of economic growth fuelled by mining exports under García (de Echave, 2011).

[516] Benza Pflucker declared Humala "not of the left" on television. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mkqH3o6hXWE.
[517] Wikileaks Cables, January 23rd, 2006.
[518] AI: Luis Vittor.
[519] Chehade unfavourably compares the final text to "an interminable university thesis" (2016: 126).

The programme nevertheless referenced historic demands of the left, including universal public services rather than targeted social programmes[520]; the redistribution of wealth[521]; and the restitution of labour rights (Gana Peru, 2010). Furthermore, the programme incorporated demands of indigenous and social movements. These included proposals to: enhance environmental and water protections (Ibid); renegotiate the terms of Peru's FTAs (Ibid: 158); regenerate the agrarian sector, prioritising food sovereignty (Ibid: 126); audit the country's external debt (Ibid: 67); promote effective decentralisation and create a pluri-cultural state (Ibid: 32); combat corruption (Ibid: 18); and reform the tax system (Ibid: 69). A key proposal for increasing the role of the state was the writing of a new Constitution (Ibid: 19). On the basis of the foregoing, Humala's initial plan for government meets the criteria of a left populist campaign offering under the framework outlined previously.

The plan was viewed by those within Humala's team as a move away from an export-driven to a "transformative" model[522]. Sinesio López, an advisor to Humala, described it as a "counterpoint to neoliberalism"[523]. Furthermore, the contents were congruent with trends in the Latin American left, opening possibilities for long-term connections with other leftist governments[524]. Significantly, the programme brought the bulk[525] of the Peruvian left together behind Humala[526], forming a broad coalition called 'Peru Wins' (GP) (Burron, 2012: 136). As Ávila notes, it was the platform of the 'Great Transformation' that united Peru's fragmented left, despite doubts about Humala (2012: 24). Some media sources claimed that Humala admitted to "presenting himself" as leftist to ensure that no other candidate occupied that space (Murakami, 2014: 109). Chehade notes that Humala was uncomfortable with 'hard left' elements like Javier Diez Canseco in his coalition (2016: 107). Certainly no other leftist candidate emerged (Schmidt, 2012: 627), leaving that side of the political spectrum open to Humala (Levitsky, 2011: 87).

But if the left was united behind Humala's candidacy, right-wing actors were equally united against it. According to several commentators, Humala faced the 'implacable opposition' of the powerful business community (Sánchez Sibony, 2012: 113; Levitsky, 2011: 91; Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 256). Dating back to the rise of Alberto Fujimori, business interests have exerted important

[520] AI: Sinesio López.
[521] In an interview Humala described the 'Great Transformation' as "the great redistribution" – Republica, February 13th, 2011.
[522] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[523] AI: Sinesio López.
[524] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[525] Some within the left such as the influential Hugo Blanco kept their distance from Humala, however, and viewed those that supported Humala as "opportunistic" – AI: Hugo Blanco.
[526] Ibid.

influence over Peru's politics (Durand, 1998)[527]. The business lobby grew in strength by means of a co-ordinated approach spearheaded by the Confederation of Private Business Institutions (CONFIEP) (Ibid). As one business leader noted, advice from CONFIEP is "listened to by government"[528]. CONFIEP was increasingly dominated by the mining industry, which had enjoyed unparalleled political access and influence under previous presidents (Crabtree & Crabtree-Condor, 2012: 50)[529]. Humala was subjected to a "well-orchestrated" media campaign by the '*Comercio*' media group (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 115). While CONFIEP ran ads warning against Humala[530], *Comercio* likened the plan for government to Soviet policy[531] and fired journalists that refused to follow this editorial line[532].

Humala's proposed policies relating to natural resources were at the heart of business concerns (Poole & Renique, 2011). Mining accounted for over 20 per cent of foreign direct investment and six per cent of GDP (de Echave, 2011: 66), but employed only one per cent of the economically active population, and its contribution via taxes and royalties was low (Ibid: 68). Furthermore, as mining activity expanded from 2005, the number of social conflicts rose proportionally (Ibid: 73; Arce, 2015). The first round of voting in 2011 occurred against a backdrop of mining protests in the parts of the country considered Humala's 'base' (Burron, 2013: 136).

The proposals for this sector included a review of existing investment contracts; enhanced environmental oversight by the state, including a new, autonomous body; the prioritisation of human consumption and agricultural use of water; and a more equitable distribution of mining rents (Gana Peru, 2010: 135-6). Regarding the issue of redistribution, of particular note was the proposal for a new tax on windfall profits at a rate of 40 to 45 per cent in order to fund social policy (Ibid: 71). Addressing the issue of socio-environmental conflicts, the plan committed to respecting ILO Convention 169, affording indigenous peoples the right to be consulted on "any activity" on their lands (Ibid: 83, 184).

On the campaign trail, Humala talked of "eliminating" social conflict through dialogue and stronger state presence[533]. In a speech to business leaders in January 2011, Humala stated that he would re-write the Constitution to restore sovereignty over natural resources[534]. The candidate reiterated his

[527] According to Francisco Durand, pressure from business interests was central to Fujimori's 'switch' – AI: Francisco Durand.
[528] AI.
[529] By way of illustration, CEO of the Buenaventura mining company, Roque Benavides, was known to eat breakfast with President Alan García every Tuesday morning – AI: Carlos Alza.
[530] The ad urged voters not to "throw away" what had been gained - Pais, June 2nd, 2011.
[531] AI: Enrique Patriau; and Sinesio López.
[532] AP, June 3rd, 2011.
[533] Republica, December 24th, 2010.
[534] AP, April 1st, 2011.

commitment to protecting water as a human right, and ensuring that mining companies respected the environment, paid taxes, and created jobs[535]. As Durand notes, Humala was particularly explicit in his offerings in zones of mining conflict (2016a: 43). Dressed in ponchos or other local garb[536], Humala addressed rallies where he offered to favour communities over mining companies[537], and to involve social actors in decisions on extractive projects (Lupu, 2012: 622). A key element of his discourse was a vow to protect water over gold ('*Agua o Oro*') if forced to choose[538]. On foot of these promises, anti-mining activists not only voted for Humala (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 249), but campaigned on his behalf[539].

Thus following a sluggish start, beginning in March 2011 Humala began to rise in the polls[540]. From that moment, Humala began to moderate his discourse, even if the content of his proposals remained initially unchanged[541]. Chehade notes that left-wing elements within GP viewed the new style as an electoral strategy (2016: 116). From accounts by close aides, the impression is formed of a highly pragmatic campaign. For example, Chehade notes that when 'Wikileaks' cables revealed spying on Humala ordered by then-president Alejandro Toledo (Humala's chief rival), spokespersons were instructed to "play the victim" and denounce foreign interventions (2016: 111). While Humala's advisors during the first round were associated with the Spanish Communist Party[542], Chehade reveals that their replacement for the run-off in April[543] – Luis Favre, advisor to former Brazilian president Lula – had already been contracted (2016: 99). The plan, it appears, was to begin the campaign as 'radical' and moderate as it progressed.

According to Blanca Rosales, Favre's advice to Humala's team was to move to the political centre, as "the left will vote for you anyway"[544]. Thus even prior to the second round Humala began to alter elements of his programme, vowing to respect all international agreements[545], and issuing the first of four public statements modifying his initial offering[546]. Favre was proved right, however: Humala garnered the most votes in the first round on April 10, replicating his vote share from 2006 in both size and geographic spread (Tanaka, 2011: 79).

[535] Republica, December 25th, 2010.
[536] See for example this rally in Cusco: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACFlZYoUr2I.
[537] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[538] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[539] AI: Lynda Sullivan.
[540] AP, March 28th, 2011.
[541] AI: Sinesio López.
[542] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[543] Republica, April 5th, 2011.
[544] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[545] Republica, March 24th, 2011.
[546] AI: Enrique Patriau; BBC Latin America, May 20th, 2011.

No sooner had Humala reached the run-off – where he faced another 'populist,' Keiko Fujimori – than his campaign hit problems. According to Chehade, the press began to "scrutinise" the plan for government, unearthing 'radical' elements like references to inheritance tax, state regulation of the media, and constitutional reform (2016: 126). Remarkably, Chehade alleges that Humala had not read the 'Great Transformation,' but merely "leafed through it" and was thus unable to respond to media questions (Ibid). Chehade states that Humala was "furious" at this humiliation and blamed "the dinosaurs of the left" (Ibid), stripping some of their authority[547]. The episode saw Humala's support drop in the polls, and was the first 'break' with the left flank of GP (Ibid: 128).

According to Chehade (Ibid), in response Lerner and Favre formulated a plan that saw Humala going to "extraordinary lengths" to moderate (Schmidt, 2012: 627). Humala stated that he was open to changing "chapters" of the 'Great Transformation' to secure political support[548]. He committed to maintaining the existing economic model, and indicated a willingness to drop plans for constitutional reform[549]. Subsequently Humala made it clear that he would impose no new taxes apart from that on the windfall gains from mining[550].

Most significant was the "peculiar strategy"[551] of changing the plan for government in the midst of the election. The so-called 'Route Map' outlined "guiding principles" for Humala's prospective government (Chehade, 2016: 125), which his team were at pains to paint as complementary to the original plan (Lerner, 2016: 56)[552]. Nevertheless, by expressly committing to "gradual and persistent" change (Gana Peru, 2011: 2), the text effectively "whitewashed" the 'Great Transformation' (Chehade, 2016: 125), relegating it to a long-term plan and creating "fissures" within GP[553].

Humala cited a need to open his coalition to other social and political actors[554], with a view to forming a government of national unity (Díaz, 2012: 6). Lerner echoes this, describing it as a "collective switch" to legitimate a centre-left proposal (2016: 56). However, by the time the 'Route Map' was issued, an alliance with Toledo's 'Possible Peru' (PP) party was in place (Chehade, 2016: 120) – members of Toledo's team helped craft the new offer (Levitsky, 2011: 89; Schmidt, 2012: 627) – while many social movements were aligned with Humala. Furthermore, the new text made

[547] Republica, April 14th, 2011.
[548] Ibid.
[549] Ibid.
[550] Republica, May 6th, 2011.
[551] AI: Carlos Alza.
[552] Republica, May 16th, 2011.
[553] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[554] Republica, May 13th, 2011.

substantive changes to the existing platform, removing plans for constitutional reform, and promising to "facilitate private investment" (Gana Peru, 2011).

Some scholars point to the influence of Peru's powerful business lobby on the candidate (Millones, 2016; Dargent & Muñoz, 2012). But as that sector sought to get closer to Humala, the candidate moved to meet them halfway (Durand, 2016a: 45). For example, Humala announced his willingness to meet with the Association of Pension Fund Administrators (AAFP), stating that his 'Pension 65' welfare plan would be publicly funded and would not seek contributions from private pension funds[555] as envisaged by the plan for government (Gana Peru, 2010: 108).

Humala then called for talks with CONFIEP[556], which occurred days later[557]. For Durand, Humala's attitude and utterances[558] during the joint press conference with CONFIEP President Humberto Speziani indicated a 'switch' (2016b: 260)[559], though this wisdom perhaps comes in hindsight. Nevertheless, it was a significant moment, as some believe the business sector was "scared" by Humala and the forces he represented[560]. Ultimately Humala heeded Speziani's 'advice' by signing the National Accord, and proposing a government advisory of "economic and social powers"[561] (Gana Peru, 2011: 6). Indeed, the campaign ended with Speziani lauding Humala's "comprehensive" social policies[562]. This shift was notable, CONFIEP having hitherto supported Fujimori with ads warning against a "leap into the unknown"[563]. This may be an example of CONFIEP simply hedging its bets by supporting politicians across the spectrum, as some noted[564]. While it is not clear whether Humala received financial support[565], it is said to be difficult to run for president without business funding (Durand, 2016b).

However, the compromises made by Humala during this period did not exclusively favour business. The candidate also attempted to widen his base by meeting with social actors[566]. Humala received endorsements from the Central General Workers' Union (CGTP)[567], and the National Federation of

[555] Andina, April 26th, 2011.
[556] Ibid.
[557] Republica, April 29th, 2011.
[558] In an unguarded moment at the beginning of the press conference, without realising that the microphones are switched on, Humala leans in to Speziani and says, "The important thing is that you have confidence in me." Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rWW0BYOvXXo.
[559] According to Durand, Humala "gave 100 per cent" at that first meeting – AI: Francisco Durand.
[560] AI: José de Echave.
[561] Ibid.
[562] Republica, May 29th, 2011.
[563] Author with Blanca Rosales.
[564] AI: Salomon Lerner; and Carlos Alza.
[565] Peru's political system does not provide verifiable information on campaign finances (Durand, 2016b: 259).
[566] Ibid.
[567] Republica, April 30th, 2011.

Miners and Steelworkers of Peru (FNTMMSP)[568], in return for pledges to improve labour conditions. More significant was the agreement signed with the National Agrarian Confederation (CNA)[569], a front of indigenous and agrarian organisations at the forefront of opposing extractive projects. Member organisations included the National Confederation of Communities Affected by Mining (CONACAMI) and the Interethnic Development Association of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP) (Millones, 2016). The agreement committed Humala to passing a law on prior consultation, protecting the environment, and repealing a decree criminalising social protest[570]. Finally, the 'Land and Freedom' party tied to anti-mining movements declared tepid support for Humala on the basis that he would be more susceptible to social pressure[571].

The importance to Humala's campaign of support from social actors and communities resisting mining can be observed in several ways. During the first round of voting, a conflict over the Tia Maria mining project in Arequipa resulted in a strike and a threat by communities to boycott the election[572]. Days later Humala travelled to Arequipa to deliver his final campaign speech[573]. A similar situation arose during the run-off in Puno, where a voting boycott again threatened to cost Humala votes[574]. Humala convened a 'crisis cabinet' to review the situation, opting against overtly supporting the strike but vowing to address the community's issues (Chehade, 2016: 133), leading to the strike's suspension[575]. Finally, a broad front of social and human rights organisations, including anti-mining movements, mobilised thousands across Peru to march against Fujimori[576]. The next day Humala thanked the marchers for their efforts[577].

Thus while scholars are correct to note the importance of Humala's moderation (Tanaka, 2011: 81), support from communities affected by mining cannot be overlooked in an election that was decided in its final days[578], and by a narrow margin[579]. The bulk of Humala's votes came from these regions, with Lima's preference for once failing to prevail nationally (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 112). While some social actors were motivated by opposition to Fujimori, it is significant that Humala's offering on mining and conflicts remained consistent (Silva Santisteban, 2013: 437). For example, although Humala discussed reducing the rate[580], the promise to tax windfall profits was retained.

[568] Business News Americas, May 4th, 2011.
[569] Republica, May 13th, 2016.
[570] Ibid.
[571] Interview with Marco Arana – Republica, May 26th, 2011.
[572] IHS, April 6th, 2011.
[573] BBC Latin America, April 8th, 2011.
[574] AFP, May 27th, 2011.
[575] AFP, May 31st, 2011.
[576] Republica, May 27th, 2011.
[577] Republica, May 28th, 2011.
[578] Republica, June 6th, 2011.
[579] Humala triumphed by a margin of just less than three per cent (Murakami, 2013: 205).
[580] Canwest News Services, May 9th, 2011.

Furthermore, Humala swore a public 'oath for democracy,' which included a commitment to resolving conflicts via dialogue (Ibid)[581]. Finally, Humala continued to visit regions of anti-mining conflict[582], reiterating promises to defend water and control extractive projects[583], closing his campaign with visits to some of the main sites of conflict[584]. While Humala's mandate may not have been for "radical change," it was still a 'left turn' (Levitsky, 2011). In other words, Humala was empowered to alter the prevailing development model (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 123) and, in particular, to seriously question the conduct of mining in Peru. Nevertheless, it must also be emphasised that even the most high-profile anti-mining conflicts, while garnering national media exposure, did not lead to significant mobilisations outside the regions directly affected by those projects. For some, this relative absence of social pressure at national level lessened the political influence of social movements during the 2011 election[585].

6.3 Humala in Power: Mining Policies

Although Humala's moderated agenda helped him to victory in the second round, the real test came in the "third round" (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 123), the period between the run-off and inauguration, when the pressure began in earnest[586]. The president-elect took up residence in the Hotel Los Delfines in Lima, where he met with political, social and business actors. That this period involved a contest for influence over Humala is evidenced by public calls to end the "pressure" on the president-elect from diverse actors like CONFIEP[587], the National Society of Industry[588], and Lima's left-wing mayor Susana Villaran[589]. The key spoils pertained to cabinet and state posts, but of particular importance were the positions with control of the economic model: the head of the Central Bank, and the "super-ministry" that is Economy and Finance (Durand, 2016b: 260).

During this period the lack of an organised movement or party behind Humala came into sharp relief (Durand, 2012)[590]. According to Chehade, Humala began to admit people to his 'inner circle' that damaged relations with his party and supporters (2016: 148). This phase also saw continued

[581] Republica, May 20th, 2011.
[582] Republica, May 1st, 2011.
[583] For example, see this video of Humala's visit to Cajamarca on May 30th, 2011: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FZy918Numlo&t=18s
[584] The areas visited in the final days of the campaign included Cajarmarca, Cusco, Arequipa and Tacna – Republica, May 30th, 2011.
[585] AI: Luis Vittor.
[586] AI: Sinesio López.
[587] Comercio, June 8th, 2011.
[588] Ibid.
[589] Republica, June 9th, 2011.
[590] AI: José de Echave.

distancing from the left wing of his coalition (Durand, 2012). When Humala met again with CONFIEP in June, he appeared to cede to pressure. After the meeting, Speziani declared that the next Economy Minister would come from the private sector, and promised to assist Humala "from this moment onwards"[591]. Humala honoured this commitment by appointing Miguel Castilla, who was Deputy Minister during the García government[592]. Humala also retained the sitting head of the Central Bank, and other "neoliberal technocrats" (Murakami, 2013: 207) in what many regarded as "a guarantee of continuity" (Crabtree & Durand, 2017: 125).

For some, this was the moment at which Humala 'switched' (Ibid: 126)[593]; when he "threw in the towel before the fight" (López, 2012). Chehade was "surprised" by the appointment of Castilla, but saw the retention of Velarde at the Central Bank as a "spectacular switch" (2016: 163). Similarly, Salomon Lerner notes that the 'Route Map' did not demand the retention of a "completely orthodox functionary" as Central Bank head, claiming this was Humala's decision in an attempt get closer to economic elites (2016: 57). But while senior members of Humala's coalition were apparently not consulted on this decision, nor did they abandon the president-elect in its aftermath.

Instead early impressions of Humala's time in government were of a president intent on "responding directly" to his promises (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 265). In his inauguration speech, Humala promised redistribution, a strengthened state, and a "rational and balanced" approach to resource exploitation that respected the environment and communities[594]. Humala reiterated his promise of a tax on mining profits, which he pledged to fighting poverty. While the speech contained no mention of constitutional changes, Humala caused controversy by refusing to swear on the 1993 Constitution – a sign of disquiet with a text closely linked to the neoliberal model[595]. During the early months of his presidency, Humala established a Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion, and instituted social programmes related to education, nutrition and old age (Quiñón et al, 2016: 110), which some viewed as a highly significant advance in addressing Peru's long-standing "social deficit" (Arce, 2015: 207). These programmes strengthened the perception of a president concerned with inequality (Quiñón et al, 2016: 110), and ensured Humala the support of the poorest sectors of his electoral base (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 265).

Another signal was the "plural composition" (Ibid: 260) of what Humala characterised as a "unity cabinet"[596]. Headed by Lerner, the cabinet contained several 'leftists' (Murakami, 2013: 209),

[591] Republica, July 9th, 2011.
[592] Republica, July 20th, 2011.
[593] AI: Sinesio López; and José de Echave.
[594] Inauguration speech, July 28th, 2011.
[595] Latin America Herald Times, July 28th, 2011.
[596] Republica, July 25th, 2011.

mainly in 'social' ministries (Díaz, 2012: 7). These included Ricardo Giesecke as Environment Minister[597], and prominent anti-mining activist José de Echave as his Deputy Minister. According to de Echave, Humala personally recruited him with a promise to implement changes to the ministry long sought by environmentalists[598]. However, the cabinet also contained members with military backgrounds in violation of an electoral promise[599]. Finally, the departments with oversight of the economy went to neoliberal technocrats, prompting some to view it as a cabinet designed to "calm the financial waters" (Sánchez-Sibony, 2012: 123).

Some of Humala's most important early "victories" (Murakami, 2013: 207) related to resource extraction. In particular, the approval of the Prior Consultation Law that purported to give legal weight to the terms of ILO Convention 169 – a key demand of the indigenous movements – and the introduction of a tax on windfall profits from mining were apparent examples of key electoral pledges fulfilled (Ibid; Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 247). An evaluation of the early months of Humala's tenure would classify it as a non-switch, particularly in regard to mining. In time both achievements would be questioned, even considered failures. Yet neither can be viewed as a straightforward switch and not all the issues can be attributed to Humala.

The Prior Consultation Law

The project to introduce a 'prior consultation law' commenced under García as a response to a sharp rise in social conflicts (Grompone & Tanaka, 2009), culminating with the Bagua massacre (Arce, 2015)[600]. In its aftermath, AIDESEP brought 10,000 protesters onto the streets of Lima as part of a powerful campaign that called for a consultation law (Schilling-Vacaflor & Flemmer, 2015: 820). Nevertheless, the passage of the law had stalled, and AIDESEP was already weakened by the time Humala took power (Ibid) and appointed de Echave to oversee its enactment[601]. Yet by September 2011, Law 29785 had been unanimously approved by Congress (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 253). The fulfilment of this promise was celebrated at a ceremony in Bagua, symbolising the change represented by the new government (Schilling-Vacaflor & Flemmer, 2015: 816). According to Humala, the law would give voice to indigenous communities, and help to reduce social conflict (Ibid: 812). Some noted, however, the lack of debate about the law and its specifics[602].

[597] Ibid.
[598] AI: José de Echave.
[599] Ibid.
[600] 33 police and indigenous protesters died in this incident in 2009 – Comercio, June 5th, 2017.
[601] AI: José de Echave.
[602] AI: Luis Vittor.

Indeed issues would surface about the law's enacting regulation which was issued in April 2012. It soon became obvious that this would be the focus of opposition from the business sector (Meléndez & Sosa, 2013: 341)[603]. In particular, the Society for Mining and Petroleum (SNMPE) opposed what they saw as the illegitimate widening of the definition of "indigenous" to include highland communities[604]. Countering this was a 'Unity Pact' of social and indigenous movements – including AIDESEP and CONACAMI – which presented 'minimal principles' to government (Schilling-Vacaflor & Flemmer, 2015: 824). Unity did not last, however, with fissures within and between organisations arising during the law's meta-consultation (Ibid). This process highlighted a power asymmetry: while "powerful extractive corporations" lobbied the state (Ibid: 823), the lack of a unitary national body or political party to articulate demands left movements weak[605]. Indeed internal contradictions would lead to the collapse of CONACAMI within a few years (Millones, 2016: 644). While the enforcement of the prior consultation law was hindered by the mining lobby[606], the Humala government also imposed the regulation over objections from civil society (Schilling-Vacaflor & Flemmer, 2015: 825), resulting in the law being "disowned" by indigenous movements (Ávila, 2012: 23).

At a later stage (following Conga) Humala's government created new institutions designed to prevent further conflict. Chief among these were dialogue and development committees, which had limited positive effect (Mendoza, 2016). Another initiative was the 2012 creation of the National Environmental Certification Service for Sustainable Investment (SENACE). This reform took the power over Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for extractive projects out of the hands of the Ministry for Energy and Mines (MINEM) – which many saw as a conflict of interest (Arce, 2015: 101). The change was therefore viewed as a measure to reduce conflict[607].

The Windfall Tax

The introduction of a 'windfall tax' on mining was a key offering of Humala's campaign. When the measure was announced within Humala's first month in office, it appeared a clear sign that he planned to honour elections pledges. According to Lerner, the tax would bring in around three billion Peruvian soles (one billion US dollars) per annum[608]. By this calculation, the new regime stood to reap over five times the income from the purely voluntary contribution established by

[603] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[604] The phrase used by SNMPE President Carlos Galvez was that "not everyone who puts on a feather is indigenous" - AI: Carlos Galvez.
[605] AI: Ismael Muñoz.
[606] AI: Rocio Verastegui.
[607] AI: Mariano Castro.
[608] Comercio, August 25th, 2011.

García[609] – a figure Lerner reiterated at interview[610]. The sum was to be dedicated to combating poverty, and would represent a significant campaign pledge honoured. However, according to SNMPE President Carlos Galvez – himself involved in the negotiation – Lerner was "fixated" on the headline figure[611], and disregarded warnings that it would only be realised if mineral prices remained high[612]. A subsequent study of the new regime revealed that a combination of falling prices and tax offsets meant income averaged only 800 million soles per annum, much less than predicted (Crabtree & Durand, 2017: 145)[613].

Not all of the issues with the tax were due to external factors. Firstly, it questionable as to whether the measure could be described as a 'tax' at all (Chávez, 2012: 9). Most of the major multinational mining companies had tax stability contracts protecting them from changes to the tax regime (Ibid; Crabtree & Durand, 2017: 90). Humala had committed to respecting contracts in the 'Route Map,' and opted to honour this promise by negotiating for a greater contribution with the mining sector. This required the companies to voluntarily enter into an agreement with the state (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 51). Thus while the characterisation of the measure as a "voluntary contribution"[614] by the mining sector is not accurate – the added contribution was a legal obligation (Arce, 2015: 207) – it was not a tax in the sense of being imposed, but rather was the product of consensus. Furthermore, these negotiations took place in "closed chambers" (Poole & Renique, 2012: 4) with the "very influential" SNMPE[615]. According to some, the SNMPE were sufficiently disturbed by Humala's election that they were prepared to increase the amount contributed by its members, but had distinct ideas as to methodology[616]. In particular, they wanted the 'tax' levied on profits and not sales[617], giving companies control over their liabilities (Chávez, 2012). Not only did the government concede that issue, it allowed payments to be offset against income tax, leading to reduced yields (Ibid; de Echave & Diez, 2013: 52).

In time both the cases of the prior consultation law and the windfall tax came to be seen as examples of Humala's failure to honour promises. The windfall tax issue, in particular, was viewed as a "huge concession" to business[618], with a leading anti-mining activist naming it the moment Humala's

[609] García's entirely voluntary '*obolo minero*' (small mining contribution) took in approximately 2.5 billion Peruvian soles over his five-year term.
[610] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[611] AI: Carlos Galvez.
[612] Comercio, August 25th, 2011.
[613] The study was carried out by *Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana* (Citizen Proposal Group), a consortium of NGO's – Republica, March 18th, 2016.
[614] AI: Javier Jahncke.
[615] AI: Luis Vittor.
[616] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban; and Alejandro Diez.
[617] La Mula, August 15th, 2011.
[618] AI: Francisco Durand.

'switch' was visible[619]. Once again, however, this is a judgement made with the benefit of hindsight. While the sums taken in by the 'tax' were disappointing, few at that time foresaw the sharp fall in mineral prices that partially explains that failure. Some believe that the deal with the mining sector on the 'tax' was contingent on approval for major mining projects, starting with Conga[620]. Regardless of this, the tax would only have yielded increased revenue if mining activity had remained not only profitable but productive. While the negotiation of the terms of the 'tax' was weak, it is perhaps an overstatement to classify it as a 'switch'.

Thus the picture is more complex than typically portrayed. Indeed Blanca Rosales argued forcefully that the first two years of Humala's presidency were dominated by technocrats, and that a truer indication is provided by the final three years, during which the government attempted to "correct the errors of the first two years"[621]. Certainly it is the case that until the eruption of the Conga conflict Humala's approval ratings were high, and he was viewed as keeping his election promises (Dargent & Muñoz, 2012: 247). The president instituted a series of social programmes aimed at the poor, enacted the Consultation Law, and appeared to increase the state take from the mining sector to finance social programmes (Arce, 2015: 207). On this basis, some scholars note that Humala's early months in power were characterised by a sincere push to improve social inclusion (Ibid).

Nevertheless, Humala's attempts to satisfy everyone were unlikely to prove sustainable in the long run. In particular, his concessions to the business sector regarding the management of the economy appeared difficult to reconcile with explicit commitments to strengthening human rights and environmental protections. Put simply, while it was easy for Humala to make a discursive leap from '*Agua o Oro*' (Water or Gold) to '*Agua y Oro*' (Water and Gold), reconciling these opposing visions in reality would prove far more difficult. While Arce notes that neither Toledo nor García had any discernible strategy for dealing with socio-environmental conflicts (2015: 83), Humala had long asserted that he could better control anti-mining forces. Whatever his plan was, the Conga Mines conflict rapidly put paid to it. Instead when squeezed between pressure from the mining sector and staunch anti-mining resistance, Humala fell back onto the same heavy-handed methods of his predecessors and sealed his reputation as a 'switcher'.

6.4 The Conga Mines Conflict

In many ways it would be a specific set of promises relating to mining projects that would prove the litmus test of Humala's 'switching'. If Humala was explicit in his campaign promises in zones

[619] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[620] Ibid; AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban; and Alejandro Diez.
[621] AI: Blanca Rosales.

of mining conflict (Durand, 2016a: 43), this was particularly true in Cajamarca. At the time of the election, this northern region had almost 20 years' experience of the effects of large-scale mining, with the result that it ranked second for poverty in the country[622]. In particular the region had been exposed to the practices of Yanacocha, a mining consortium made up of US-based Newmont Mining – the world's second-largest gold miner (Triscritti, 2013: 441) – Buenaventura of Peru, and the International Finance Corporation, the investment arm of the World Bank (Crabtree & Durand, 2017: 156). By 2010, the year before Humala's election, Yanacocha had extracted over 19 million ounces of gold from the Cajamarca region (Arce, 2015: 145).

The activities of Yanacocha were characterised by high-handedness and a failure to engage with local authorities (Triscritti, 2013), leading to a succession of environmental conflicts (de Echave & Diez, 2013). As Arce details, the case of a serious mercury spill at Choropampa in 2000 was the "catalyst" in terms of community awareness about both the dangers of mining and Yanacocha's practices, as it attempted to shift the blame for the spill onto a sub-contractor (Ibid: 151). As a result, the population in the region was highly sensitive to environmental issues[623], and suspicious of Yanacocha (Triscritti, 2013: 446). This was confirmed by a 'listening study' commissioned by Yanacocha itself, which found that a majority in the Cajamarca region believed the company suffered from "an inability to listen effectively to the community" (Kemp et al, 2013: 10). While it may be an overstatement to talk of a "generalised rejection" of mining (Millones, 2016: 640), significant social sectors had built organisational capacity (Arce, 2015), and were questioning the extractivist development model[624].

Local organisation was spurred by Yanacocha's announcement in 2004 of the opening of the Conga Mines. The project promised to be the largest investment in Peru's history[625], and would affect a number of neighbouring provinces[626]. There were particular concerns about damage to water sources, with the company's own figures outlining an estimated production of 90,000 tons of toxic waste per day for the 17-year life of the project (Sullivan, 2013). Protests against the plan led to a municipal order in the province of Celendin declaring the area, including lakes and wetlands, an ecological reserve[627].

Water or Gold

[622] Republica, May 29th, 2012.
[623] AI: Rolando Luque.
[624] Ibid.
[625] Reuters, July 29th, 2011.
[626] Chief among those affected were the provinces of Cajamarca, Hualgayoc, Celendin and San Marcos.
[627] Municipal Order 020-2004-MPC/A, October 13th, 2004. Available at: http://siar.regioncajamarca.gob.pe/normas/ordenanza-municipal-no-020-2004-mpc-declarar-area-conservacion-ambiental.

It was in this context that Humala gave eight campaign speeches in Cajamarca during his 2011 campaign (Poole & Renique, 2012: 5). The speeches explicitly cited the "problems" mining posed for communities, and committed to respecting their will[628]. In a well-known speech in Bambamarca, Humala asked the crowd what was more important for them, water or gold; and the crowd forcefully replied "water!"[629] According to community leaders present at these events, Humala's commitment to prioritising water over gold was unambiguous. Milton Sánchez, General Secretary of the Celendin Inter-institutional Platform (PIC) – the first group to mobilise against Conga[630] – states that Humala offered to support the campaign against the exploitation of water by Yanacocha[631]. Manuel Ramos, a *rondero* and President of the Defence Front in Hualgayoc, noted that Humala's commitment to defend water and life convinced communities to vote for him[632], and that this support was key to his victory[633]. The belief in Humala was strengthened by his "radical" and leftist credentials[634]. As a result, there was a clear expectation in these communities that Humala would cancel the Conga project[635].

Cancelling Conga would have presented problems for the incoming president, however. The project was approved by the García administration in October 2010, and rescinding it could have exposed Peru to liabilities[636]. Nevertheless, there were valid reasons for questioning the process, and in particular the approval of the EIA. Some pointed to a conflict of interest between the dual roles of MINEM in promoting mining and approving EIAs (Gómez, 2013: 127; Arce, 2015: 101). The preparation of the EIA for the Conga project was a clear example of this dynamic. The assessment was overseen by Felipe Ramírez in his role as Director of Mining Environmental at MINEM. However, Ramírez was a former Yanacocha executive, a point that was not lost on the anti-Conga movement[637]. According to Durand, this was just one of many examples of the "revolving door" between MINEM and mining companies (2016b: 47). Furthermore, the Conga EIA was first presented in February 2010 and approved within eight months, even though the process usually takes two years[638]. Ricardo Giesecke called it a "Guinness world record"[639]. Finally, the EIA's

[628] This video compiles the key statements from Humala's speeches across the region of Cajamarca: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LqRlp1jJuP8.
[629] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EVgGQCl79do.
[630] AI: Rolando Luque.
[631] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[632] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[633] While a plurality in the Cajamarca region did not vote for Humala in the first round, he obtained a majority there in the run-off vote.
[634] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[635] AI: Alejandro Diez.
[636] Ibid.
[637] Republica, November 20th, 2011.
[638] Notisur, December 16th, 2011.
[639] Interview with Ricardo Giesecke – Republica, March 4th, 2012.

hydrological study, relating to the core concern of opponents, was not due until 2013[640]. Little wonder some viewed the approval of Conga as a "Greek gift" from García (Mendoza, 2016: 48).

According to Humala's communications director, Blanca Rosales, Humala considered rescinding the Conga concession during the campaign. Once in power, however, he decided it would be a "very bad signal" to the business sector[641]. This was to be the key turning point in Humala's presidency. As Durand notes, Humala had a mandate to do "something radical", particularly in relation to mining[642]. It is arguable that the potential existed for Humala to build on his support from social movements and the legitimacy he had won during his early months in office to implement substantive reforms. Instead Espinoza asserts that he chose not to mobilise anyone[643]. Nevertheless, it is also the case that civil society failed to exert much pressure on Humala via sustained mobilisation. Furthermore, Durand believes that the business sector "played their cards well"[644].

SMNPE President and Chief Financial Officer of Buenaventura Mining, Carlos Galvez, stated that Yanacocha's directors wrote to Humala giving him notice of its intention to proceed with Conga two days before his July 28th inauguration[645]. Galvez further confirmed that Yanacocha had arranged finance of two billion dollars, and was ready to start work on the first day of August[646]. The notice to Humala was minimal, however, as Newmont announced the launch of Conga the next day[647]. Buenaventura CEO Roque Benavides revealed the "important support" from government for Conga, while Newmont CEO Richard O'Brien expressed doubt that Conga would be "picked on", stating that the decision to proceed was based on certain "assumptions"[648]. Perhaps Humala was aware of the announcement, but for Lerner it was a "surprise"[649]. Whether the announcement was made on the basis of a deal or an attempt to pressurise the new president, it is clear that the mining sector was allowing Humala no grace period.

The announcement prompted a reaction from movements opposing the project. In August PIC and the Defence Front of Hualgayoc-Bambamarca jointly petitioned MINAM to review the EIA[650]. These movements had been building capacity and levels of articulation around the issue of Conga for some time. According to Sánchez, preparations began in 2009 and continued during the next

[640] Republica, March 9th, 2012.
[641] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[642] AI: Francisco Durand.
[643] AI: Roberto Espinoza.
[644] AI: Francisco Durand.
[645] AI: Carlos Galvez.
[646] Ibid.
[647] Reuters, July 27th, 2011.
[648] FD Wire, July 29th, 2011.
[649] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[650] AI: Marco Arana.

two years[651]. PIC and the Environmental Defence Front of Cajamarca came together in 2010 at a public meeting held by Yanacocha, even though they were prohibited from entering (Red Muqui, 2016: 43). At an assembly in Hualgayoc in July 2011 the Defence Fronts of Bambamarca, Cajamarca and Celendin united to successfully pressure Regional President Gregorio Santos to publicly oppose Conga (Ibid: 44)[652]. This political support would prove a distinguishing feature of the Conga conflict (Meléndez & Sosa, 2013: 331). The increasingly united movements took a similar approach to Humala. As Sánchez averred, in the absence of an institutionalised party, movements believed that the only way to reach the president was via social pressure[653].

This pressure increased as protests escalated throughout October (Red Muqui, 2016: 44). Talks between PIC and Lerner that month ended with the premier declaring that the project would proceed[654]. Nevertheless, Lerner agreed to visit the zone on November 1st with Giesecke, the Agriculture Minister, and Minister for Energy and Mines Carlos Herrera (Ibid: 45). The delegation was pressurised by both movements and the mining company[655], with the revelation that Herrera flew on the private jet of Roque Benavides attracting negative attention (Ibid). An outcome of the visit was that MINAM began an internal review of the Conga EIA (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 76). This review by 25 staff members led by de Echave[656] was subject to high-level pressure by Yanacocha. When MINAM refused to allow the company to participate in the process, de Echave was summoned to a meeting at the presidential palace. Upon arriving, he found Humala seated with the "top brass" from Yanacocha. De Echave – who would resign weeks later – took this as a "clear message"[657].

Meanwhile Yanacocha was proceeding with its works. At the same time the communities were articulating opposition by building on established structures (Politai, 2013: 105). Particularly significant were the '*rondas campesinas*' (rural patrols) that were granted legal status by Article 149 of Peru's Constitution[658], and which were well-organised in Cajamarca[659]. Many of the leaders of the anti-Conga movement were '*ronderos*,' including Gregorio Santos – the "most visible" of them all[660] – and the protest methods used to resist Conga mirrored those of the *rondas*[661]. Another

[651] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[652] Ibid.
[653] Ibid.
[654] Republica, October 29th, 2011.
[655] Interview with Ricardo Giesecke – Republica, March 4th, 2012.
[656] Republica, January 18th 2012.
[657] AI: José de Echave.
[658] AI: Zulma Villa Vilchez.
[659] AI: Roberto Espinoza.
[660] AI: Rolando Luque.
[661] Republica, June 25th, 2012.

important factor was the presence of many left-wing political groups in the area[662]. Santos was of the '*Patria Roja*' party, and as such had a non-traditional view of development[663]. Also in the region was Marco Arana's Land and Freedom party, which grew out of anti-mining struggles[664], and was linked to both CONACAMI and PIC[665]. These political networks helped the anti-Conga movement to articulate its demands (Ibid).

Nevertheless, many of these actors would have been "political enemies" under other circumstances[666]. Instead a "broad array" of organisations was united by resistance to Conga[667]. This shared opposition also overcame the rural/urban divide, uniting movements such as the *rondas* and local defence fronts, with associations and unions in the city of Cajamarca, mainly under Wilfredo Saavedra's Environmental Defence Front (FDA)[668]. There is evidence that other socio-environmental conflicts in Cajamarca were suspended during the confrontation over Conga, as communities prioritised this issue (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 8). The threat from Conga also superceded the historic rivalry between the provinces of Celendin and Bambamarca[669], while the environmental and indigenous agendas were "never so united" as over Conga (Millones, 2016: 643). For example, Manuel Ramos states that the main demands of the movement were "prior consultation and clean water"[670].

The reasons for this level of unity related to the scale and scope of the Conga project, which was viewed as a threat on various levels. Along with Yanacocha's poor track record in the area (Triscritti, 2013; Arce, 2015) and failure to provide suitable employment (Politai, 2013), the project was to be located at the headwaters of a number of rivers[671]. The EIA referenced four affected lakes – two that lay above the gold deposits, and another two for dumping toxic waste material[672]. In the view of many locals, however, Conga would impact numerous other lakes and wetlands, threatening all water sources in the area[673]. This outcome would affect both drinking water for urban areas and water used for agriculture. Another consideration was the scale of the project. Conga had a footprint

[662] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[663] AI: Rolando Luque.
[664] AI: Roberto Espinoza.
[665] AI: Lynda Sullivan.
[666] AI: Rolando Luque.
[667] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[668] Republica, June 25th, 2012.
[669] Ibid.
[670] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[671] Newspaper supplement sponsored by the Regional Government of Cajamarca: "Por que Conga no va", March 4th, 2012.
[672] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[673] AI: Manuel Ramos; and Lynda Sullivan.

of almost 6,000 hectares (Red Muqui, 2016: 40), making it the largest gold mine in Latin America (Triscritti, 2013: 442). Marco Arana described Conga as "Titanic in a bathtub"[674].

Water and Gold?

Despite these simmering tensions around Conga, the issue remained confined to the local stage, only garnering national attention with Humala's announcement on November 16th that the project would proceed ('*Conga va*')[675]. During the speech Humala deemed Conga "important for Peru". Furthermore, he rejected "extreme positions" that created a dichotomy between 'water or gold,' opting for a "sensible" view that allowed for both. This narrative conveniently overlooked Humala's use of the of 'water versus gold' discourse during the campaign, and that he was now doing "exactly the opposite" to what he promised (Chehade, 2016: 197). This point was not lost on those in Cajamarca: according to Santos, this was the point at which he lost hope of support from central government and opted to openly oppose the project (Lucio, 2013). On the other hand, the speech generated a "wave of solidarity" for the movement (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 96).

The anti-Conga movement was further strengthened by the content of the review carried out by MINAM[676] which expressed serious misgivings with the EIA (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 77). In particular, the review concluded that the project would alter the headwaters in a significant and irreversible manner, and proposed stronger environmental mitigation measures, including 'saving' two of the main lakes (Ibid: 79). Perhaps due to these findings, the review was dismissed by MINEM (Ibid: 96) and disowned, only to be leaked days later[677]. The episode demonstrates divisions within Humala's cabinet[678], which would be brought into the open by Conga.

On November 24th a general strike began in Cajamarca led by Saavedra's FDA which, while peaceful, closed schools, blocked roads and disrupted commerce[679]. The response by Humala was to call for dialogue[680], which Lerner soon began informally (Ibid: 97). According to Lerner, the protest leaders were seeking an audit of the EIA and genuine dialogue regarding the project[681]. Lerner established parallel meetings with Yanacocha in Lima and movements in Cajamarca, at which he proposed a series of measures including: an international audit of the EIA; 'saving' two of the lakes by forcing Yanacocha to construct reservoirs for waste; state investment in

[674] AI: Marco Arana.
[675] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=amKPPay68IM.
[676] Republica, November 24th, 2011.
[677] Ibid.
[678] AI: José de Echave.
[679] Republica, November 23rd, 2011.
[680] Republica, November 24th, 2011.
[681] AI: Salomon Lerner.

infrastructure and services; and an insurance scheme funded by mining companies to rectify environmental damage[682].

The negotiations were bearing fruit with Santos, who in Lerner's view was chiefly interested in maintaining leadership of the movement[683]. Nevertheless, Lerner believed that powerful interests were seeking the failure of the talks. Certainly Humala was coming under pressure from political opponents, members of his own cabinet[684], the media and the SNMPE to take control of the situation[685]. A high-placed government source stated at interview that the suspension of the Conga project on November 29th – widely reported as taking place at the request of government – was a "unilateral" decision by Yanacocha in order to scupper the dialogue[686]. It was later reported that the suspension was negotiated directly by Humala[687]. The president then obliged Lerner to attend a joint press conference with Yanacocha head Carlos Santa Cruz, thereby sending a message to protesters regarding the government's priorities[688].

Credence is also given to this view by the events of December 4th. That day Lerner travelled to Cajamarca to meet with protest leaders following intense police repression at the lakes that left several injured and one protester, Elmer Campos, paralysed (Red Muqui, 2016: 48). Nevertheless, according to accounts by Lerner and others who attended the meeting, the dialogue was "frank and sincere"[689] and offered the possibility of a negotiated settlement. According to Lerner, an agreement was reached in principle along the lines set out above (state investment, preserving two of the lakes, and an audit of the EIA)[690]. Ombudsman officer Rolando Luque, present at the dialogue, recalled an agreement to convene committees to review both environmental and social issues relating to the mines[691]. Santos articulated this proposal as meetings between relevant parties to review the EIA and jointly establish terms of reference for the project[692].

Those present agreed that social leaders requested time to put the proposals to an assembly in their communities before formalising the deal. According to Luque, Lerner was prepared to agree to a

[682] Ibid.
[683] Ibid.
[684] Specifically Interior Minister Oscar Valdes who – according to several sources – favoured a more aggressive police response – AI: Blanca Rosales; and Rolando Luque.
[685] AI: Salomon Lerner; and Rocio Silva Santistevan.
[686] AI.
[687] Republica, February 26th, 2012.
[688] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v3diCe2xcLM&t=219s.
[689] Interview with Gregorio Santos - newspaper supplement sponsored by the Regional Government of Cajamarca: "Por que Conga no va", March 4th, 2012.
[690] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[691] AI: Rolando Luque.
[692] Interview with Gregorio Santos - newspaper supplement sponsored by the Regional Government of Cajamarca: "Por que Conga no va", March 4th, 2012.

24-hour extension, but "others who were not present" decided otherwise[693]. Lerner makes it clear that it was Humala who made this decision. Protest leaders had agreed to 'suspend' the strike pending a final decision, but Lerner asserts that Humala insisted by telephone that they 'lift' the strike immediately[694]. This was confirmed by Idelso Hernández, leader of the Cajamarca Defence Front, who claimed that the parties were on the verge of agreement when Interior Minister Oscar Valdes told Lerner that he had to do as Humala had ordered by telephone[695]. Requests for a shorter extension to allow for consultation – Sánchez recalls offers of 12 hours or less[696] – were denied, and the deal collapsed[697]. In the view of Lerner, Humala was convinced to take a hard line by the SNMPE[698].

The response by Humala was to declare a state of emergency in four of the region's provinces: Cajamarca, Celendin, Hualgayoc and Contumaza[699]. It was at this stage, Lerner claims, that he became aware of a 'Plan B' to prepare for the state of emergency by bringing 1,200 soldiers into Cajamarca from bases in Chiclayo and Iquitos[700]. Similarly Manuel Ramos claims that protesters were informed of the state of emergency at a meeting on December 5th at Cajamaraca town hall, which was surrounded by "all of the armed forces of the state" in a manner designed to intimidate[701]. Ramos further alleges that the leaders were not permitted to leave for their communities, and felt their lives were at risk[702]. This "taking" of Cajamarca was seen as a prelude to any further talks[703]. The following day the government commenced a campaign of criminalisation by arresting leaders, including Saavedra and Sánchez (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 97).

If Humala's intention was to sabotage the dialogue, he was successful. Having been undermined and kept out of the loop by Humala, Lerner resigned within days, citing events in Cajamarca[704]. Although some believe that Lerner had already been "stripped of his power" before the state of emergency[705], a negotiated settlement had appeared imminent. Instead the dialogue process was taken over by new premier, Oscar Valdes, who employed an authoritarian approach[706]. Valdes convened a meeting of community leaders on December 19th, allegedly to resume the dialogue

[693] AI: Rolando Luque.
[694] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[695] Republica, February 10th, 2012.
[696] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[697] Notisur, December 16th, 2011.
[698] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[699] Comercio, December 5th, 2011.
[700] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[701] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[702] Ibid.
[703] AI: Marco Arana.
[704] Republica, December 10th, 2011.
[705] AI: Marco Arana.
[706] Ibid.

(Ibid: 98). However the encounter began with attempts to exclude certain leaders, including Saavedra[707]. During the meeting Valdes presented an agreement for Santos to sign, which the regional president rejected on the basis that he had not participated in its preparation[708]. Saavedra then abandoned the chamber when Valdes refused to let him speak, giving Santos no choice but to follow[709]. There would be no further meaningful attempt at dialogue regarding Conga[710].

On the other hand, if Humala's actions were designed to ensure "order above all"– as he told Lerner[711] – and end the protest, they failed. In the short term, Valdes' tactics served to unite the leaders in condemning him[712]. Along with his approach, Valdes also lacked legitimacy among the protest leaders due to his personal ties to the mining industry[713]. As a result, attempts by Valdes to co-opt the anti-Conga movement by convening a 'regional development committee' of local authorities in Lima were rebuffed by Santos and others[714]. As Ramos notes, many felt Valdes gave them no choice but to protest[715]. The regional government intensified its opposition by issuing Regional Order 036, declaring Conga 'unviable'[716]. Indeed it was Humala's government that was damaged, with the fall of the 'Lerner Cabinet' heralding the resignation of numerous functionaries, among them Giesecke and Herrera (Ibid). As de Echave notes, this was the first instance in Latin America of a cabinet being brought down by a mining conflict[717].

Gold Over Water

The installation of the Valdes cabinet was seen as a move to the right (Durand, 2012), thereby completing Humala's 'switch'[718]. A speech given by Valdes on January 5th, 2012 – wherein he outlined the government's commitment to continuing García's policies of encouraging investment and mining – appeared to represent a "180-degree turn" (Poole & Renique, 2012: 4). According to Durand, this change can be explained by a shift in the correlation of forces within the government: not only were military elements emboldened, but the loss of leftist members unbalanced the executive, stripping it of the power to bargain with mining companies (2012).The approach to Conga also changed, as the conflict moved into a more confrontational phase.

[707] Republica, December 20th, 2011.
[708] Ibid.
[709] AI: Rolando Luque.
[710] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[711] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[712] Republica, December 20th, 2011.
[713] Valdes' family operate a mine in Tacna – Republica, December 12th, 2011.
[714] Republica, December 26th, 2016.
[715] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[716] The order was actually passed on December 5th following the state of emergency, but not published until late December – Republica, December 29th, 2011.
[717] AI: José de Echave.
[718] AI: Sinesio López.

According to Arana, resistance to Conga took three different approaches: the political/social, the legal, and the technical/scientific[719]. In the technical/scientific arena, Valdes began by announcing a review of the EIA by international experts[720] – not an audit, as urged by Lerner[721]. Similarly, the government rejected a proposal by Santos for a fresh EIA[722]. Initially it was reported that the expert review would assess the viability of the project (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 98), but doubt was immediately thrown on this by Valdes' announcement that Conga would proceed[723]. The expert review was welcomed by Yanacocha, but rejected by leaders of the protest[724]. While the government talked the review up as a means of resolving the conflict, it is likely that its true purpose was to separate the leaders of the movement from their base, and to wrest back legitimacy. At the meeting in Lima on December 27th boycotted by Santos and others, Valdes met with mayors from the Cajamarca region[725] with whom he purported to approve the expert review[726]. In turn the mayors joined a 'development committee' that yielded promises of five billion soles in infrastructure spending[727].

Santos issued a legal challenge to the decisions taken at that meeting, alleging they were invalid due to the absence of many regional and community leaders[728]. Marco Arana publicly labelled the expert review a "smokescreen" to cover up an agreement between the government and Yanacocha[729]. The doubts of protesters were borne out when the terms of reference for the review were made public: the remit was to improve mitigation measures for environmental damage, in particular pertaining to the availability of water, but did not extend to assessing the viability of the project[730].

Nevertheless, any technical legitimacy the government hoped to obtain from the expert review was largely undermined by the adoption of a similar approach by civil society. In the months that followed Valdes' announcement, a number of international experts contracted by local and international organisations reviewed the EIA. Javier Lamban, contracted by Engineers without Borders, questioned the lack of detail on water sources[731]; while waterways expert Guido Peralta

[719] AI: Marco Arana.
[720] Republica, December 20th, 2011.
[721] AI: Salomon Lerner.
[722] Republica, December 28th, 2011.
[723] Republica, December 20th, 2011.
[724] Republica, December 28th, 2011.
[725] Including the Mayor of the city of Cajamarca – Republica, December 27th, 2011.
[726] La Repulica, December 29th, 2011.
[727] Republica, January 14th, 2012.
[728] Republica, January 21st, 2012.
[729] Republica, February 9th, 2012.
[730] Republica, February 15th, 2012.
[731] Republica, March 1st, 2012.

noted "serious errors" in the original study[732]. Perhaps the most high-profile review was by hydrology consultant Robert Moran[733], which found evidence of subterranean connections between the lakes and other water sources[734]. Moran questioned the objectivity of the EIA, and noted that it would not be acceptable in 'developed' countries. Finally, he noted that replacing lakes with reservoirs would transfer the community's water from public to private hands[735]. Others pointed out that reservoirs are non-renewable sources, and saw the idea to use them to replace the lakes as "ridiculous"[736].

Thus the review was undermined even before its report issued, forcing the experts to announce that they were not asked to assess the viability of the project[737]. Their report in April 2012 found the EIA acceptable, but made suggestions for improvement. Furthermore, the loss of the four lakes and 100 hectares of wetland was deemed insignificant for water production, and improved mitigation measures were recommended[738]. But while Humala used the findings to justify resuming Conga, he seemed to sense that he was losing the public relations battle. Perhaps, as one insider suggested, he was trying to assert authority over an "uncontrollable company"[739]. In any event, Humala exceeded the experts' recommendations by calling on Yanacocha to preserve two lakes, create 10,000 new jobs, and replace all water resources affected by the project[740]. Humala's additional conditions were not well-received by Yanacocha. Having initially announced a 'technical review'[741], the company took nearly two months to agree to the terms[742], and even then took exception to preserving the lakes and the number of jobs to be provided[743].

In the legal field, far from rolling back practices and policies criminalising social protest, Humala added to them (Vásquez, 2013). The government began to exert pressure on the protesters via an unprecedented use of criminal prosecutions. Over 300 political and social leaders were charged in relation to Conga (Ibid: 425)[744], with prominent leaders receiving up to 60 charges each[745]. Added to the quantity of charges was their seriousness – including allegations of "terrorism"[746] – which

[732] Republica, April 9th, 2012.
[733] Moran was contracted by the Cajamarca-based NGO Grufides.
[734] Republica, March 5th, 2012.
[735] Available at: http://denjustpeace.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Peru-Conga-REM-Rept-English-March-84.pdf.
[736] AI: Javier Jahncke.
[737] Republica, April 17th, 2012.
[738] Republica, April 19th, 2012.
[739] AI: Blanca Rosales.
[740] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u1jVWfxXK7I&t=34s..
[741] Republica, April 23rd, 2012.
[742] Republica, June 15th, 2012.
[743] Republica, June 20th, 2012.
[744] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[745] AI: Zulma Villa Vilchez.
[746] Milton Sánchez was one that was charged with terrorism.

denoted a clear objective to "associate social protest with criminality" (Ibid: 424). The government also passed legislation relaxing regulations on the use of force by police (Ibid), and moving cases related to Conga to another department[747], contravening basic legal norms (Ibid: 430). Many of the charges levelled were 'preventative' in nature, frequently arising from denunciations by Yanacocha (Ibid: 429). Perhaps the most high-profile case was the preventative detention of Santos on corruption charges[748], which nevertheless failed to derail his re-election as regional president[749]. The state also challenged the status of Regional Order 036, which was declared unconstitutional[750].

The breadth and unity of the anti-Conga coalition again proved significant in response. Following the violent events in November 2011, the Unity Pact supported a claim by the '*rondas*' for human rights violations[751]. Legal counsel was provided by Grufides and the Lima-based International Institute for Law and Society (IIDS). In turn, both were exposed to persecution[752]. The organisations brought proceedings to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) on several grounds, with the substantive petition centring of the failure to consult the affected communities per ILO Convention 169[753], (the Consultation Law was deemed inapplicable)[754]. The IACHR granted precautionary measures on behalf of 46 protest leaders[755], but another claim alleging that environmental pollution constituted a threat to life was folded into the substantive petition[756]. Nevertheless, it was falsely reported as an approval of the Conga project in some media[757].

If the government won that public relations battle, it suffered setbacks in other cases. The violent arrest of Marco Arana in Cajamarca, which left the ex-priest with a fractured eye socket, was filmed and proved a "symbolic defeat" for the government[758]. The case of Maxima Acuña, a small landholder who resisted Yanacocha's attempts to oust her family, became an international *cause celebre*[759]. In a further act of international solidarity, Columbia Law School assessed Conga using World Bank standards and deemed the project unviable (Conga No Va, 2015).

[747] Administrative Resolution No. 096-2012-CE-PJ.
[748] Republica, May 17th, 2014.
[749] SNL Metals & Mining Daily, October 23rd, 2014.
[750] Republica, April 17th, 2012.
[751] AI: Maria D'jalma Torres.
[752] One IIDS lawyer, Zulma Villa Vilchez, herself has received seven charges – AI: Zulma Villa Vilchez.
[753] Republica, April 20th, 2012.
[754] AI: Mariano Castro.
[755] Republica, May 9th, 2014.
[756] At the time of writing, the substantive petition based on the failure to obtain free and prior informed consent has yet to be heard by the IACHR – AI: Maria D'jalma Torres.
[757] Comercio, May 8th, 2014.
[758] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[759] In 2016, Maxima was the winner of the Goldman Environmental Prise – Guardian, April 19th, 2016.

Thus the anti-Conga movement was successful at matching – at times even out-matching – the government in the technical and legal arenas. Nevertheless, it is clear from interviews that the leaders of the movement considered the social/political field the most important arena of contention. Furthermore, this arena involved a wide range of actors, domestic and international, and showcased significant variation in the methods employed. However, as the conflict progressed the limited nature of the articulation between social movements became clear, particularly at the national level.

One aspect highlighted by social leaders at interview was the advent of the "guardians of the lagoons"[760]. This approach involved *ronderos,* chiefly from Celendin and Bambamarca, taking shifts to camp by the threatened lakes, helping to ensure that Yanacocha could not commence work (Millones, 2016: 643). The police had used violence against protesters at Lake Azul in November 2011, leaving many injured and one paralysed (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 97). Despite this, community leader Manuel Ramos vowed that protesters would resume their vigil if the expert review favoured Conga[761]. The protesters therefore returned to the lakes in April 2012, but this time in significant numbers (approximately 500)[762]. This figure swiftly rose to over 2,000 as the conflict intensified[763], and in the view of Ramos this consistent presence was effective in stalling further works[764].

Another notable event was the National March for the Right to Water, which succeeded in bringing together a broad front of political and social actors. The march that began in Cajamarca on February 1st, 2012 (Ibid: 99) was an attempt by the Conga resistance to widen solidarity networks at national and international levels. By this measure the march was a huge success, coming as a "big surprise" even to those involved in its organisation[765]. About 2,000 protesters made the long march to Lima, forging alliances en route via shared experiences with extractivism[766]. This articulation with other regions was key to Conga's conversion into a national issue[767]. According to Sánchez, the march also helped to bring visibility to the protest abroad, leading also to international alliances with human rights organisations like Amnesty International[768].

[760] AI: Milton Sánchez; and Manuel Ramos.
[761] Republica, April 12th, 2012.
[762] Republica, April 16th, 2012.
[763] Republica, April 18th, 2012.
[764] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[765] AI: Milton Sánchez.
[766] In the words of peasant leader Hugo Blanco, each town visited had "its own Conga" – Republica, February 10th, 2012.
[767] AI: Marco Arana; and Milton Sánchez.
[768] Ibid.

In spite of a near-total media blackout (Arrojo, 2012), the march grew in size as it neared Lima, involving 120 social organisations[769]. As one participant described it, the marchers entered the capital city "like a river"[770]. While estimates of the size of the crowds on the streets to welcome the marchers vary considerably[771], it was a significant event in Peru, where regional issues rarely impact the capital[772]. The march also succeeded in uniting Peru's progressive forces, bringing together leftist actors like the unions, the Communist Party, and Javier Diez-Canseco[773]; indigenous movements and *campesino* leaders like Hugo Blanco[774]; and other anti-mining movements and leaders like Walter Aduviri[775], along with all involved in the Conga resistance. AIDESEP advisor Roberto Espinoza believes that the march was important in terms of articulation between social actors in Peru[776]. It was also around this time that Conga became a source of international solidarity. Humala faced protests during a state visit to Spain in January[777]; and again in June on a wider European trip, during which MEP Catherine Greze accused him of violently repressing protest[778].

A Switch Confirmed: Violent Repression

The heightened profile of Conga and its leaders also brought tensions, and highlighted the limits of the movement's articulation. In particular, attempts to translate the success of the regional movement to the national level exposed personal rivalries, differing visions, and the challenge of moving from social to political action. Newspaper reports date these divisions to the march, during which Santos and Arana allegedly grew closer while isolating Saavedra[779]. These divisions became public when Saavedra convened an assembly of social actors – including AIDESEP and Alberto Pizango – to establish a national water movement and to seek a constituent assembly to re-write the Constitution.[780] The move was condemned by both Sánchez and Hernández, who characterised Saavedra's followers as "extremists"[781]. Santos refused to attend the event on the basis that it promoted disunity. Critics of Santos and Arana claimed that both were motivated by political

[769] Republica, February 9th, 2012.
[770] AI: Gladiz Marilú Chillón Gutiérrez.
[771] Millones refers to 20,000 (2016: 643), while Milton Sánchez put the figure at over 35,000 (AI). Video available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oHdI9z3jK30.
[772] AI: José de Echave.
[773] Republica, February 10th, 2012.
[774] Ibid.
[775] Republica, February 9th, 2012.
[776] AI: Roberto Espinoza.
[777] Republica, January 29th, 2012.
[778] Republica, June 25th, 2012.
[779] Republica, April 15th, 2012.
[780] Republica, March 31st, 2012.
[781] Republica, April 1st, 2012.

ambitions[782], charges which in time would be somewhat borne out[783]. The assembly, which adopted demands including a ban on mining at headwaters and the repeal of the Consultation Law, was seen as an attempt by Saavedra to regain a leadership role[784]. Despite his criticism of the assembly, Santos took up its call for a new Constitution[785].

These divisions were seized on by Humala to delegitimise the movement[786], with opinion polls showing that over half the population viewed Arana, Santos and Saavedra as motivated by political ambition[787]. While the level of disharmony would prove overstated, these divisions had repercussions. In the view of some, this breakdown "reduced the organisational capacity" of the movement to the local stage (Murillo Ramírez, 2012: 8). It supports the view that unity of the movement derived from a shared opposition to mining, but that this was not sufficient to sustain a political movement (Politai, 2013: 106). As de Echave noted, the anti-Conga movement had a specific agenda, and lacked the power to question the overarching economic model[788]. Some pointed to the absence in Peru of a social movement operating at a national level[789], with the collapse of CONACAMI a debilitating blow[790]. Attempts to fill this void, such as the 'Summit of the Peoples' organised by the PIC in late 2014[791], have to date yielded little. Thus in spite of Santos invoking the presidential ousters of Ecuador[792], the reality in Peru is that presidents have little fear of losing office due to protests (Vergara & Watanabe, 2016: 154).

As tensions rose, a variety of interests supporting Conga moved to increase pressure on the protesters. Newmont CEO Richard O'Brien let it be known that if social conditions were not favourable for Conga, the company would seek investment opportunities elsewhere[793]. In turn, Humala characterised the protesters' concerns as political not environmental, while CONFIEP President Speziani called the protests a "reaction against Peru"[794]. Buoyed by an opinion poll showing a national majority favouring Conga[795], Valdes announced a counter-protest in

[782] For example, in May 2012 fake presidential campaign posters featuring Marco Arana appeared in Celendin – Republica, May 22nd, 2012.
[783] Santos ran for president in the 2016 election while Arana, having been considered for the candidacy of the '*Frente Amplio*', eventually was elected to Congress in that election.
[784] Republica, April 15th, 2012.
[785] Republica, June 6th, 2012.
[786] Republica, June 1st, 2012.
[787] Republica, April 22nd, 2012.
[788] AI: José de Echave.
[789] AI: Luis Vittor.
[790] AI: Marco Arana.
[791] AI: Lynda Sullivan.
[792] Republica, June 6th, 2012.
[793] Republica, April 27th, 2012.
[794] Republica, June 1st, 2012.
[795] Republica, May 2nd, 2012.

Cajamarca[796]. According to media, the Collective for Cajamarca, led by members of the Chamber of Commerce, brought 20,000 marchers onto the streets of the city to support mining activity[797]. The group made common cause with those mayors working with the government[798], who met with Humala in early July to discuss infrastructure investment (de Echave & Diez, 2013: 101). Meanwhile Environment Minister Manuel Pulgar-Vidal claimed Santos was interested only in elections[799]; and Minister for Women and Vulnerable Populations, Ana Jara, accused the protesters of using children as "human shields"[800].

In the face of these internal and external threats, the resistance to Conga closed ranks under the banner of the Unitary Struggle Command (CUL), built on the foundations of the '*rondas*'[801]. Under the leadership of Hernández – himself a '*rondero*' – the CUL brought together 200 leaders from 13 provinces to declare an "indefinite strike" at the end of May[802]. The action began with a show of unity, a march of 15,000 headed by the most prominent leaders including Santos, Arana, Saavedra and Hernández[803]. As with the vigils at the lakes, the strike was organised in shifts, as different groups rotated between the city and outlying provinces[804]. The strike attracted solidarity within Peru, with marches held in mining regions like Puno, Ancash and Ayacucho[805]. Elements of the Catholic Church provided support[806], with protesters meeting and sleeping at San Francisco Church[807]. Labour unions also supported the movement, with the Union of Education Workers of Peru (SUTEP) cancelling classes[808], while the CGTP called a national strike[809].

With battle lines drawn, the strike dragged on with no call for dialogue on either side. Instead Santos wrote a letter seeking an "audience" with Humala, alleging there was no basis for real dialogue[810]. Strikers sought to maintain interest and energy with creative approaches like a 'women's protest' and even a 'pet protest'[811]. Nevertheless, the strike continued to intensify and levels of violence gradually increased. A dozen protesters began a hunger strike at the door of San Francisco

[796] Republica, May 21st, 2012.
[797] Republica, May 29th, 2012.
[798] Republica, May 27th, 2012.
[799] Republica, June 25th, 2012.
[800] Republica, June 2nd, 2012.
[801] Republica, June 25th, 2012.
[802] Republica, April 24th, 2012.
[803] Republica, June 1st, 2012.
[804] Republica, June 10th, 2012.
[805] Republica, June 1st, 2012.
[806] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[807] Republica, June 1st, 2012.
[808] Republica, June 5th, 2012.
[809] Republica, June 19th, 2012.
[810] Ibid.
[811] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.

Church[812], while attempts by police to dislodge strikers led to violent clashes[813]. The tense atmosphere was not aided by Yanacocha's announcement that it had begun work on the construction of water reservoirs, a clear indication that the project would proceed[814]. The leadership of CUL headed off an attempt by Saavedra to directly impede the construction works[815], but it was clear that a confrontation was imminent.

The spark came in Celendin the next day, when a march by local teachers was joined by civil workers, in town from the coast to carry out construction works[816]. These workers have been described as the "shock troops" of the public unions[817]. Armed with iron bars and sticks, the workers attacked government offices, setting fires and destroying documents[818]. Later reports would reveal what happened next. These reports note that the civil workers fled, and those present in the offices when the police arrived were locals that had played no part in preceding events. Nevertheless, around 50 police officers proceeded to surround the offices, taking up positions on rooftops, with more armed police in helicopters[819]. Once in position, the police opened fire with live ammunition, killing three protesters immediately, including 16-year-old Cesar Medina, who died from a shot fired from above[820].

Initial media reports blamed the protesters, however, with police alleging that officers were injured by bullets, and the Interior Minister insisting that police used "non-lethal weapons"[821]. Later reports revealed that protesters had fired flares in response to live rounds[822]. Humala condemned the anti-mining movement, and declared a state of emergency in three provinces[823]. Along with another protester who died from injuries sustained in Celendin, a separate clash with police led to a further death in Bambamarca[824]. The public arrest of Arana, during which he was surrounded and assaulted, rounded off a week of violence[825].

Humala's Watershed

[812] Republica, June 24th, 2012.
[813] Republica, June 22nd, 2012.
[814] Republica, June 30th, 2012.
[815] Republica, July 2nd, 2012.
[816] Republica, July 8th, 2012.
[817] AI: Rocio Silva Santisteban.
[818] Republica, July 8th, 2012.
[819] Ibid.
[820] La Mula, July 7th, 2012.
[821] Republica, July 3rd, 2012.
[822] Republica, July 4th, 2012.
[823] Republica, July 3rd, 2012.
[824] Republica, July 5th, 2012.
[825] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Bw8FCelp8w.

The events of those days in July 2012 represent a watershed for the Conga project, the resistance movement, and, tellingly, for Humala's government. Within weeks of the incidents Humala's approval rating – measured at over 50 per cent in late April[826] – had plunged to 36 points[827]. It would not recover during the course of his presidency. The president faced condemnation both at home and abroad. Solidarity protests erupted during July in Lima and Puno, but also in cities across Europe and the United States (Ibid). Humala tried to rescue the situation by appointing Catholic Monsignor Cabrejos to mediate[828], but Santos gazumped him by inviting his own mediator, Father Gaston Garatea. The visit by the clergymen to the region did not yield the sought-after results, however, with local leaders of the view that the mediators gradually came to sympathise with their cause[829].

Humala reshuffled his cabinet, sacking Valdes and replacing five ministers, but failed to reap any reward[830]. When an opinion poll of citizens in Cajamarca revealed that almost 80 per cent now opposed the Conga project[831], the writing was on the wall. Humala reiterated that Conga would proceed, but now insisted that Yanacocha had to "guarantee" a sufficiency of water before that could happen[832]. By giving Yanacocha two years to fulfil this condition, Humala effectively put this issue into political cold storage. In the view of Carlos Galvez, Humala wilted in the face of sustained social pressure[833]. Yanacocha's attempt to revive the project in 2014 was met with fierce resistance[834]. This prompted Humala to declare that the fate of Conga was a "private sector decision"[835], to the frustration of the mining company. As Galvez pointed out, Conga was both approved and promoted by the state, which stood to benefit in income and employment[836]. Others in the mining industry no longer see Conga as viable due to falling mineral prices and the lack of a social licence[837].

While the Conga mining project has not advanced, the conflict clearly revealed a switch by Humala. The president's capitulation to pressure from the mining sector and abandonment of his specific promises was compounded by his sabotaging of attempts at a negotiated outcome and use of violent repression. In these ways he reneged on his promises to both civil society and business. As a result,

[826] Republica, April 29th, 2012.
[827] Republica, July 23rd, 2012.
[828] Cabrejos was also the choice of CONFIEP – Republica, July 7th, 2012.
[829] AI: Manuel Ramos.
[830] Republica, July 23rd, 2012.
[831] Republica, August 23rd, 2012.
[832] Ibid.
[833] AI: Carlos Galvez.
[834] SNL Metals and Mining Daily, January 20th, 2014.
[835] Ibid.
[836] AI: Carlos Galvez.
[837] AI: Luis Vittor.

Humala did not reap any clear dividends with the mining sector or wider business community. At interview those associated with business associations were highly critical of what they viewed as Humala's weak leadership[838]. Perhaps in an attempt to win back their favour, Humala deepened his switch during the remainder of his presidency, introducing laws to further deregulate the mining sector. As Lynda Sullivan notes, not even Alan García introduced as many pro-business laws as Humala[839]. According to Crabtree and Durand, these measures were done "on the suggestion of CONFIEP" (2017: 127). Perhaps most notorious was Law 30230 which rolled back environmental protections and weakened oversight of the mining sector (Ibid). The reforms included the relaxation of the rules around EIAs, and the domestication of the autonomous environmental watchdog, the Agency for Environmental Assessment and Enforcement (OEFA)[840]. In the view of Javier Jahncke, these laws were designed to remove stumbling blocks to future mining projects[841].

These measures ultimately failed to win Humala any favour in business circles. According to de Echave, elites had been frightened by Humala's electoral success, and were determined to prevent the future emergence of leftists[842]. Accordingly, despite having switched and given them "whatever they asked for", elites would not refrain from "pursuing" Humala until he had been neutralised[843]. Some support for this view is provided by subsequent events. Humala ended his presidency with low approval ratings, and deeply unpopular with both the social and business sectors. As details emerged implicating both Humala and his wife, Nadine Heredia, in the corruption scandal related to the Brazilian construction company Odebrecht, the former first couple were placed in preventative detention in July 2017[844]. The couple were not released until almost nine months later, and continue to face corruption charges[845].

6.5 Discussion

This analysis in this chapter raises two points with regard to switching. Firstly, Humala is typically considered to be an early 'switcher'. However, by adopting an in-depth qualitative approach, this thesis shows that simplistic assessments of switching and non-switching need to be complexified. Here, Humala made early moves to honour promises not only in regard to social programming, but also to mining. The introduction of a 'tax' on windfall profits was a signature campaign promise from which Humala never deviated. Furthermore, it was an offer upon which the president appeared

[838] AI: Carlos Galvez; and Pablo Secada.
[839] AI: Lynda Sullivan.
[840] Ibid.
[841] AI: Javier Jahncke.
[842] AI: José de Echave.
[843] Ibid.
[844] Reuters, July 14th, 2017.
[845] Reuters, April 26th, 2018.

to have delivered within months of taking power. The fact that the 'tax' was in fact negotiated with mining interests and allowed liabilities to be written off led some to dismiss the measure as a 'switch'. This is not accurate, however. The measure was legally enforceable, and would have substantially increased the state 'take' from mining had global mineral prices not fallen dramatically. The promise to introduce a 'prior consultation' law was another example of a promise honoured by Humala, even if a less substantive one given the watered-down nature of the law's enacting regulation. Overall, in contrast to the prevailing image in the literature, the qualitative approach adopted here demonstrates that Humala was initially a president who kept his promises.

Secondly, this chapter also shows that in the end Humala did switch. The decision to support the Conga Mines project (and to abandon dialogue in favour of repression) was the hinge upon which his presidency turned. As with the Gutiérrez and Correa chapters, the analysis shows that it is important to examine the whole period of a presidency when considering whether or not a president is a switcher. The analysis in this chapter reveals that switches do not necessarily occur at the outset of a president's term in office, and that they can vary not only over time but across policy areas.

This chapter also raises two points with regard to the causal mechanism. The first relates to the influence of business elites. Humala took power with little by way of institutionalised support, and was therefore vulnerable. In power he came under pressure from highly articulated and powerful business and mining interests. Having vehemently attacked him during the campaign, business sought accommodation with Humala as president-elect. Meanwhile the Yanacocha mining company effectively forced Humala to make a decision regarding the Conga project by announcing its commencement on the day of his inauguration. This chapter finds evidence that Yanacocha exerted an increasing influence over Humala, leading ultimately to the undermining of negotiations that might have borne fruit. In other words, the increasing pressure from business interests was instrumental in Humala's eventual switch.

The second point relating to the causal mechanism concerns the influence of civil society more generally. Humala campaigned on a promise to prioritise water over gold. Furthermore, at the time of his election a large number of social protests had erupted over mining projects in Peru. However, these movements were localised and often issue-specific. This lack of articulation and mobilisation at a national level meant that they posed little threat to his political survival, again facilitating an eventual switch in combination with pressure from business interests. Accordingly the correlation of forces in Peru made switching more likely. While strongly unified local resistance to the Conga Mines project succeeded in forcing Humala to abandon the project, it failed to impact his overall policy switch.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter examined the presidency of Ollanta Humala, who is generally considered an example of a left populist switcher. An overview of his campaign reveals that explicit promises by Humala raised expections of a new government approach to mining projects. Furthermore, this analysis notes that Humala began his term by honouring promises relating to mining, including a 'tax' on windfall profits, and the passage of a Consultation Law. However, an in-depth case study of the Conga Mines Project reveals that Humala came under pressure from business elites to abandon his campaign promises. Humala attempted to push the project through, rather than rely on social power to honour his mandate[846]. Although the anti-mining movement was not articulated at national level, its unity of purpose in Cajamarca led Humala to repress the protests. As this chapter discusses, these findings have implications both for the policy switching generally and for the causal mechanism of this thesis.

[846] AI: Roberto Espinoza.

Chapter 7: Bolivia – Evo Morales and the TIPNIS Conflict

7.1 Introduction

This chapter will consider the case of President Evo Morales of Bolivia, who was first elected in 2005. Morales is generally classified as both 'leftist' (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; Burbach et al, 2013) and a 'populist' (Philips & Panizza, 2011), although some qualify this description by labelling him "movement left" (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011: 15), or "movement populist" (Levitsky & Loxton, 2013: 110). Overall, the presidency of Evo Morales is presented as an example of left populism 'in power' (de la Torre & Arnson, 2013), and Morales is classified as a 'non-switcher' (Johnson & Ryu, 2010; Campello, 2014).

The Morales presidency and its relationship with social movements will be analysed, with a particular focus on the 'emblematic' TIPNIS social conflict (Silva, 2017: 101)[847] that had both short-term impacts and a "lasting resonance" in Bolivian politics (Crabtree & Chaplin 2013: 18). The conflict precipitated the fracture and re-alignment in the government's support base (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 55; Mayorga, 2014), and was for many the moment a 'switch' in government policy became visible (Ibid; Achtenberg, 2011)[848].

This analysis will critically examine the classification of Morales as a 'non-switcher' and the concept of switching more broadly. Morales' election in 2005 took place against the backdrop of prolonged social mobilisation (Kennemore & Weeks, 2011; Collins, 2014). Movements largely set Morales' electoral agenda and brought him to power, but less attention is paid to their influence on policy outcomes. This analysis reveals that pressure from mobilised and articulated movements helped to ensure that Morales honoured key election promises. However, as Morales gained political power and movements lost unity of purpose during his second term, a switch began which finally crystallised with TIPNIS. The violent police repression and subsequent "defenestration" of the indigenous movement[849] exposed the gulf between government discourse and policy.

The first part of the chapter will review the Morales candidacy, paying attention to the influence of social movements. The next section will briefly analyse the performance of Morales in power, focussing on key promises around the constitution, nationalisation of hydrocarbons, and land reform. The chapter will centre on a detailed analysis of the conflict that erupted around the

[847] AI: Georgina Jiménez; and Carlos Crespo.
[848] AI: Fredy VillaGómez.
[849] AI: Silvia Molina.

government's plan to construct a highway through the TIPNIS indigenous territories, and conclude with a discussion of the findings as they related to switching and civil society.

7.2 Overview: The Morales Candidacy

Morales' 2005 victory occurred in a context of "sustained mobilisations" (Tockman, 2017: 124-5) that led to the ousters of two presidents (Silva, 2009). These events spawned the 'October Agenda', a set of broad anti-neoliberal demands which unified Bolivia's social and protest movements. The agenda included the nationalisation of the country's natural gas, land reform, and the convoking of an constituent assembly (Silva, 2012). These demands not only formed the basis of Morales' electoral campaign (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 8), but set the agenda for all major candidates[850].

Evo Morales emerged from the union of coca-growers (*cocaleros*) in the Chapare region, gaining prominence as president of the *Federacion Tropico*. Though Aymara by ethnicity, Morales was never involved in the indigenous movement (Laserna, 2007: 102), instead identifying as a "union leader"[851]. Threatened by coca eradication programmes, the *cocalero* unions evolved an authoritarian style[852]. Having assumed the role of local authority in Chapare (Silva, 2009: 113), and unable to negotiate demands, in 1988 the unions created a "political instrument" with the goal of taking national power (Archondo, 2007: 91). This 'instrument' became known as the Movement Toward Socialism (MAS) but began life as the 'Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the People' (IPSP) (do Alto, 2011: 100). Indeed, the 'MAS' name was taken from a moribund "falangist" [853] movement to create MAS-IPSP (Crabtree, 2013: 279)[854]. The purpose was to represent the "corporatist" interests of unionised peasant movements (Archondo, 2007: 88). Thus, as Sarela Paz emphasises, MAS was created as the 'instrument' of "one particular social sector"[855].

From this base, the MAS acted as an "umbrella" for a range of organisations (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 15), albeit with a distinct hierarchy (do Alto, 2011). The central axis was *campesino*/*cocalero*, forged by the unions know as the 'triplets': the Unitary Syndical Confederation of Peasant Workers of Bolivia (CSUTCB); Bartolina Sisa National Confederation of Peasant, Indigenous, and Native Women of Bolivia (CNMCIOB); and Syndicalist Confederation of Intercultural Communities of

[850] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[851] Interview with Evo Morales, Punto Final, May 22nd, 2003. Available online at: http://www.puntofinal.cl/543/evomorales.htm#.
[852] AI: Sarela Paz.
[853] AI: Sarela Paz.
[854] As Morales related, having failed on five occasions to register the 'IPSP' moniker, an agreement was reached to acquire the name to contest the 1999 municipal elections. – Interview with Evo Morales, Punto Final, May 22nd, 2003.
[855] Ibid.

Bolivia (CSCIB) (Ibid: 102). CSUTCB emerged in the early 2000s as a point of articulation for popular resistance (Silva, 2012: 5). While the main ethos of MAS was said to be "national-populist", it framed its offerings in "indigenist terms" (Silva, 2009: 132) and adopted indigenous symbols (Spronk, 2008: 40). This "strategic ethnicity" (Rivera, 2015: 47) led to the incorporation of the indigenous movements the Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia (CIDOB) and National Council of Ayllus and Markas of Qullasuyu (CONAMAQ) at a lower level (do Alto, 2011)[856]. MAS also began expanding into the cities from 2001 (do Alto, 2011: 101), but Morales' impressive showing in the 2002 presidential election – coming "within an ace of winning" (Ibid: 5) – owed little to urban support. Running on a left populist platform, Morales finished less than two points behind Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada ('Goni') (Singer & Morrison, 2004: 176), drawing his vote mainly from peasant and indigenous strongholds (Ibid: 178). Furthermore, during the post-election jockeying, Morales made it clear MAS would not negotiate with other parties to form a government (Ibid). This refusal to compromise burnished his legitimacy.

Cochabamba's 'Water War' in 2000 was a key stage in forging Morales' profile. Oscar Olivera, the protest leader, helped to link issues of water to the struggles of the *cocaleros* by using the coca leaf as a "unifying symbol" for social movements (Olivera & Lewis, 2004: 165). While this association enhanced the standing of MAS, it altered internal structures, making the movement more dependent on Morales' charismatic leadership to unite its disparate elements (Philip & Panizza, 2011:82). For some, this is the point when the "direct relationship" with peasant movements began to dilute[857], and the authoritarian tendencies of the *cocaleros* "conquered" MAS[858]. After 2002 MAS became the point of articulation for "latent hostility" toward neoliberalism (Crabtree, 2013: 281). This discontent erupted in September 2003 when two million people mobilised to demand control of hydrocarbons, a constituent assembly, and the end of coca eradication (Silva, 2009: 139). Violent state repression in October 2003 heralded the 'Gas War' that ousted Goni and forged the 'October Agenda' (Ibid). Morales' role in these events was not active (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2005: 188), as some claimed (Fara, 2005: 130) [859]. But what is clear is that he was successful at "articulating social movement demands in the electoral sphere" (Kohl & Farthing, 2012: 232).

Some have highlighted Morales' ambiguous attitude toward social mobilisation during the government of Carlos Mesa, Goni's successor. According to Petras and Veltmeyer, Morales beat a "strategic retreat" and "abandoned the mass struggle in favour of electoral politics" (2005: 200). Morales adopted a more instrumental approach to Mesa (Singer, 2007: 201), using MAS' legislative

[856] An example of this hierarchy came in 2002, when moves to form a cross-party 'indigenous bloc' were "unequivocally rejected" by Morales (Do Alto, 2011: 104).
[857] AI: Miguel Lamas.
[858] AI: Sarela Paz.
[859] AFP, June 3rd, 2005.

influence to negotiate the suspension of coca eradication (OSAL, 2004d: 162-3). Rather than abandoning street politics, it appears that MAS were "playing two hands" during the Mesa era: drawing close to the social sectors while providing an "ambiguous counterweight" to the government (Salazar, 2015: 115).

The correlation of forces shifted significantly with the formation in September 2004 of a 'Unity Pact' (UP) between the major indigenous and peasant movements (Garcés, 2011: 48). The pact articulated the demands of organisations with "various historical trajectories" (Ibid) and "long-standing divisions" (Tockman, 2017: 124). Nonetheless, these "uneasy bedfellows" (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 20) were united by broad demands for change. The UP included: indigenous movements CIDOB and CONAMAQ; peasant organisations CSUTCB, CNMCIOB and CSCIB; and *cocalero* unions, of which Evo Morales remains president (Ibid: 16) [860]. MAS responded by formalising an alliance with the UP in May 2005 (OSAL, 2005b: 159). With this newfound level of articulation, movements ramped up pressure on Mesa, staging an average of 49 protests per month (Lehoucq, 2008: 116).

However, the president also faced a vociferous right-wing coalition of business organisations and "paramilitary" groups dubbed the 'Committee for Santa Cruz' (CPSC) demanding regional autonomy (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 133). In June 2005 Mesa gambled by calling both the constituent assembly and autonomy referendum votes for the same day[861]. The move backfired as protesting miners, peasants and indigenous "paralysed"[862] La Paz (Fara, 2005: 122), forcing Mesa to flee the presidential palace[863]. MAS duly pivoted from supporting to opposing Mesa (Mayorga, 2007: 106)[864], leading him to resign (OSAL, 2005c: 175).

Individual campaigns mattered little during the 2005 elections, as the electoral agenda had been defined by the events of previous years (Fara, 2005; Singer, 2007). According to MAS Senator Adolfo Mendoza, even conservative forces were influenced by the UP[865]. All eight candidates supported the call for a constituent assembly (Ibid: 202), while six proposed some kind of 'nationalisation' of hydrocarbons (Ibid)[866]. Accordingly, the election centred on the personality of the candidates, and on perceptions of their role in preceding events. Morales was well-placed to present as the "legitimate interlocutor" of those struggles (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 62).

[860] Bolivia Prensa reported on December 18th, 2017 that Morales was set to be re-elected as President of the *Federacion del Tropico* in July of 2018.
[861] AFP, June 3rd, 2005.
[862] AFP, June 2nd, 2005.
[863] AFP, June 3rd, 2005.
[864] AFP, June 2nd, 2005.
[865] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[866] Razon, October 6th, 2005.

Morales' campaign offerings were influenced by the demands of the UP, including the constituent assembly and nationalisation of gas (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 8). MAS also adopted proposals from a range of indigenous, peasant and urban movements (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 60). These included land reform, state control of resources, and redistributive measures (Ibid: 80); and enhanced political participation and social protections (Silva, 2009: 143). Allied with his strong criticisms of foreign interference, Morales' platform was viewed as a "radical break" with neoliberalism (Kennemore & Weeks, 2011: 269). During the campaign, Morales limited his public utterances, refusing to participate in debates or interviews, leaving media duties to his running-mate, Alvaro García Linera (Fara, 2005: 132), to appeal to the urban middle classes now targeted by MAS (Ibid: 131). Morales instead played on his ethnicity, frequentl participating in indigenous ceremonies (Singer, 2007: 203), including launching his campaign with a traditional '*Challa*' (blessing)[867].

When he did speak publicly, Morales' utterances were vague and lacked detail. One example relates to his "star policy", the nationalisation of hydrocarbons (Laserna, 2007: 105). Even before the campaign, Morales confused matters by talking of seizing private gas fields but also about attracting foreign investment[868]. Morales initially called for a continuation of Mesa's policies (Salazar, 2015: 116)[869], but later shifted position to echo social movements' call for state ownership[870]. In a television ad, Morales outlined an economic plan based on industrialisation and "responsible nationalisation"[871]. Morales forcefully criticised neoliberalism, railing against privatisation, free trade, and foreign interests[872]. Nonetheless, Morales' proposals were said to "lack specifics"[873], and reports noted his tendency to vary his tone and content[874], using "one message for one audience, and another for another"[875].

Morales moderated his discourse and offerings as the election approached, softening attacks on foreign companies (Fara, 2005: 132). As the campaign progressed, Morales revealed that his plans for gas included a role for private companies, but as "partners, not patrons"[876]. Most surprisingly, at a meeting in the offices of the IMF in Washington, Morales pledged to implement "neither

[867] AP, October 12th, 2005.
[868] AP, August 31st, 2005.
[869] Following a referendum in 2004, Mesa had introduced a Hydrocarbons Law that purported to increase the state share from 19 to 50 per cent, but the UP movements dismissed measure as insufficient (Salazar, 2015).
[870] Washington Post, October 31st, 2005.
[871] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=adMvqkWi_RM.
[872] International Herald Tribune, December 10th, 2005.
[873] Ibid.
[874] IHS, December 16th, 2005.
[875] IHS, November 22nd, 2005.
[876] ANSA, December 15th, 2005.

confiscation nor nationalisation"[877]. In contrast to his vague position on hydrocarbons, Morales was crystal clear on his intention to de-criminalise coca production[878].

The MAS Plan for Government issued in November 2005 reflected this moderation and incoherency. The document was drafted by leftist intellectuals and those from the NGO sector[879], many of whom would become ministers under Morales but were not MAS members (do Alto, 2011: 107). The plan promised to convoke a constituent assembly (MAS, 2005: 54) and combat corruption (Ibid: 36), but lacked coherence (do Alto, 2011: 107). In the agrarian sphere, the plan committed to production based on food sovereignty (MAS, 2005: 22), but overall had a clear export focus (CEDLA, 2005: 23). During the campaign Morales talked of land redistribution[880], but the plan safeguarded property rights, promising only the redistribution of unproductive land (MAS, 2005: 22). The plan for government outlined nonetheless meets the criteria for left populist offerings as outlined in Chapter Two.

The document heralded a "new era of the state" (Ibid: 2), and criticised the economic model based on primary commodity exporting, stating that it excluded the majority (Ibid: 5). Enhanced environmental protections were promised, including a commitment to conserve resources in protected areas (Ibid: 25), but the overarching priority was productivity. The plan proposed a new "productive matrix" involving modern companies, urban micro-enterprise, and peasant collectives, overseen by a strong state capable of industrialising natural resources (Ibid: 11-31)[881]. A stated objective was the "nationalisation of hydrocarbons" (Ibid: 14) conceived as the "practical execution" of the changes introduced by Mesa (Ibid: 15). CEDLA's analysis concluded that the plan reduced the radical demands of social movements to the "equal co-habitation" of state and transnational corporations, describing as "nonsense" attempts to present it as a 'nationalisation' (2005: 13-16).

In spite of the "unusually business-friendly" nature of the plan[882], Morales retained support from social movements due to his strong "anti-imperialist" image (Fara, 2005: 132). In this sense, Morales benefited both from the identity of his opponents and their tactics. 'Tuto' Quiroga had served as president when Banzer fell ill[883], and was associated with neoliberal economics. His attempts to portray his opponent as a 'Chávez puppet' backfired when Morales responded by

[877] Ibid.
[878] AP, October 28th, 2005.
[879] AI: Carlos Mamani.
[880] AP, August 31st, 2005.a
[881] Razon, October 6th, 2005.
[882] IHS, November 9th, 2005.
[883] AP, August 31st, 2005.

labelling him the (US) 'embassy candidate'[884]. Indeed, Morales' candidacy was "staunchly opposed" by the US, which accused him of receiving funds from Chávez[885], but the criticism enhanced Morales' status. Likewise, a "dirty war"[886] by media failed to stop Morales from commanding headlines (Fara, 2005: 136).

Beyond this, Morales benefited significantly from the uniting of the left behind his candidacy (Mayorga, 2007: 116). Nevertheless, this backing was not uncritical, and social movements were not under Morales' control. When a dispute in Congress saw the elections postponed "indefinitely"[887], the movements took to the streets despite a call from MAS for "citizen pressure, not mobilisations"[888]. Nevertheless, the elections were promptly re-scheduled for December 18th (OSAL, 2005c: 177). With this momentum behind him, Morales swept to power with 54 per cent of the vote (Singer, 2007: 203).

7.3 Morales in Power: Pressure and Promises

This section will briefly analyse Evo Morales' first term as president from 2006 to 2009, with a focus on his key electoral promises: nationalisation of hydrocarbons, land reform, and the writing of a new Constitution. According to some, within a year of taking power Morales had completed most of his election promises (Archondo, 2007: 82-3). This fidelity to his mandate – a "novelty" in Bolivian politics (Silva, 2009: 145) – garnered Morales a level of legitimacy that would sustain him for many years. However, this analysis reveals that the honouring of these promises typically came on foot of pressure by social movements, and implementation was not always faithful.

Morales' 2005 victory was historic as he was both the first candidate elected with an outright majority[889], and the first 'outsider'. Furthermore, Morales was Bolivia's first president of indigenous ethnicity. Despite his lack of an "indigenous project"[890], Morales was quick to frame his victory in ethnic terms, proclaiming to the major indigenous peoples, "we have the presidency!"[891] Morales also presented the new government as radical, declaring "the people have defeated the neoliberals"[892]. In this way Morales signalled his support for movements while saying nothing specific regarding policy. The real question was whether Morales would fulfil promises for

[884] Ibid.
[885] IPS, December 16th, 2005.
[886] Jornada, December 18th, 2005.
[887] AP, October 28th, 2005.
[888] AFP, October 18th, 2005.
[889] BBC Mundo, December 19th, 2005.
[890] AI: Fernando Mayorga.
[891] The full quotation is: "I want to say to all the Aymaras, Quechuas, Guaranis, and Chiquitanos: For the first time, we have the presidency!" – Christian Science Monitor, December 20th, 2005.
[892] Deutsche Presse Agentur, December 19th, 2005.

radical economic and political change or demonstrate 'pragmatism' to reassure business and investors.[893]

In the weeks following his election, Morales' choice was difficult to discern. The president-elect did not abandon his campaign rhetoric and appeals to movements. Along with pledges to nationalise hydrocarbons, Morales promised the indigenous movement he would end the "colonial state"[894]. Morales vowed to reject US aid[895] and its anti-drugs programmes[896], while also visiting Cuba and Venezuela to sign trade agreements[897]. Shortly after his victory, Morales fulfilled one particular promise, announcing the end of state coca eradication programme during a visit to Chapare (Singer, 2007: 204)[898].

But the media noted that Morales's discourse varied by location, shifting to a "reassuring voice" in Europe[899]. The president-elect promised to respect property, reiterating his 'nationalisation' would involve no expropriations[900] during state visits abroad[901]. Furthermore, he struck a conciliatory tone at a meeting with Santa Cruz business elites just days after the election, prompting the head of the Chamber of Commerce to note that Morales had offered "more than we asked for"[902]. Morales also moderated at a meeting with the CPSC, promising a referendum, and offering the opportunity to nominate members to his transition team[903]. These meetings continued in the run-up to inauguration, with agribusiness interests sufficiently impressed with Morales' infrastructure plans to give him a standing ovation[904].

This uneven approach was evident in Morales' inauguration speech and first cabinet. Morales' speech revisited the main offerings of his campaign, committing himself to a constituent assembly, to modifying land reform policies, to instituting anti-poverty programmes, and to state investment[905]. The "fiery speech"[906] emphasised natural resources, noting an "obligation" to nationalise and industrialise hydrocarbons[907]. Morales asserted that social struggles for coca, water

[893] Ibid.
[894] EFE, December 14th, 2005.
[895] Human Events Online, December 29th, 2005.
[896] International Herald Tribune, December 21st, 2005.
[897] Greenwire, January 4th, 2006.
[898] BBC Mundo, February 19th, 2006.
[899] NYT, January 20th, 2006.
[900] International Herald Tribune, December 21st, 2005.
[901] Spain, France, China and Brazil – BBC Mundo, January 15th, 2005.
[902] AP, December 28th, 2005.
[903] IHS, December 29th, 2005.
[904] AP, January 6th, 2006.
[905] Inauguration Speech, January 22nd, 2006.
[906] AFP, January 23rd, 2006.
[907] Ibid.

and gas had "brought us here", and created an "obligation" to abandon neoliberal policies[908]. Nevertheless, Morales also stated that his government would be open to all sectors including business[909], and called for movements to de-mobilise and channel energies into a constituent assembly to "unify all Bolivians"[910].

Morales also highlighted his indigenous ethnicity with a "carefully staged" (Laserna, 2007: 102) indigenous ceremony that saw him "crowned maximum authority of indigenous peoples"[911]. Indigenous leader Felipe Quispe dismissed the ceremony as a "mockery"[912]. Nevertheless, Morales' 'cabinet of change' contained "many representatives" from unions and social movements (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 10), including "fellow Indians"[913]. Among them were Casimira Rodriguez, head of a domestic workers' union; Andes Soliz Rada, a "Marxist" journalist[914]; and leader of the "radical" Federation of Neighbourhood Councils (FEJUVE), Abel Mamani[915]. These moves were interpreted as meaning that state policy would be strongly articulated with social movement demands (Salazar, 2015: 129). Yet Morales also included a prominent Santa Cruz businessman (Deheza, 2007), and within a year many movement leaders were replaced with middle-class ministers (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 58).

In office, Morales immediately moved to honour some promises. The president reduced his own salary by 57 per cent (Deheza, 2007), brought state watchdogs under direct executive control (Ibid), increased teachers' salaries (OSAL, 2006: 188), and rolled back 'neoliberal' reforms of education and labour (Ibid: 186). However, this combination of strong rhetoric, ethnic symbolism, and 'populist' gestures did not satisfy the social movements, which continued to pressure the government to substantively make good on key promises.

'Nationalising' Hydrocarbons

Before Morales took office, the Bolivian Workers' Centre (COB) announced that failure to nationalise gas "by confiscation and military occupation" would be a betrayal[916]. *Campesino* leader Eugenio Rojas reminded Morales that he was not "immune" from dissent[917]. Felipe Quispe noted

[908] Ibid.
[909] Ibid.
[910] Ibid.
[911] BBC Mundo, January 21st, 2006.
[912] BBC Latin America, January 27th, 2006.
[913] AFP, January 23rd, 2006.
[914] AP, January 23rd, 2006.
[915] AFP, January 23rd, 2006.
[916] IPS, January 11th, 2006.
[917] Washington Post, January 22nd, 2006.

that the president could fall "tomorrow" if he failed to keep his promises[918]. Days after the election, MAS Senator Román Loayza gave Morales a deadline for nationalisation, asserting "we don't have to wait for Evo"[919]. Finally, a group of *cocaleros* were the first to protest against the government over their desire to enter an ecological reserve[920]. Thus, as Salazar notes, for the movements the election of Morales was "an important victory, but not *the* victory" (2015: 128). Indeed, two weeks after inauguration the UP held a "tense meeting"[921] with García Linera, where the movements demanded – and received – a promise of government loyalty[922]. Despite his apparent "flip-flopping" (Spronk, 2008: 41-2), Morales had little option but to honour his promises.

Accordingly, Morales made a show of acting on his key electoral offering to nationalise hydrocarbons. On May 1st, 2006 he issued the 'Decree for the Nationalisation of Hydrocarbons in Bolivia' (Decree 28701). Furthermore, Morales sent troops to formally occupy and 'reclaim' the Margarita gas fields for the Bolivian state (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 143). The president appeared on national television, flanked by military personnel, to announce "the nationalisation of our natural resources"[923]. For some, the decree represented a "complete overhaul of the rules of the game" (Burbach et al, 2013: 84).

Nevertheless, the details of the 'nationalisation' raise questions. Decree 28701 was an enforcement of the Hydrocarbons Law[924] and therefore a continuation of the policies of his predecessor (Arze & Gómez, 2013: 61). The decree introduced two reforms. The first temporarily imposed a higher rate of tax on hydrocarbons, increasing the state take from 50 to 82 per cent for a limited period, and the other 're-nationalised' some small former state-owned oil companies which had been privatised (CEDLA, 2006: 6). Given that Decree 27801 was in line with existing legislation, it begs the question why the government sent troops to the gas fields, risking offending Brazil (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 143). The answer is that it was a "public relations gesture" (Ibid) which, in the view of Farthing and Kohl, was intended to placate Bolivia's social movements (2014: 38).

While criticised by some sectors, overall the gambit worked. FEJUVE viewed the decree and subsequent "softening" of the legal terms of the nationalisation in the 2009 Constitution (Philip & Panizza, 2011: 146) as the beginnings of a 'switch'[925]. Former ally Oscar Olivera dismissed the

[918] BBC Latin America, January 27th, 2006.
[919] Christian Science Monitor, December 20th, 2005.
[920] The reserve in question was Carrasco National Park, in the same region as TIPNIS - BBC Mundo, February 2nd, 2006.
[921] At least part of the tension arose from the failure of Morales to attend – Razon, February 8th, 2006.
[922] The prevailing attitude was captured by one *cocalero* militant: "There are plenty of 'Evo's' here, better ones even". Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ri7LVE9YhyA.
[923] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uZRTWRC8VjM&t=359s.
[924] Law 3058.
[925] AI: Miguel Lamas.

decree as propaganda (2012: 83). However, opinion polls conducted after the announcement revealed 80 per cent approval for the 'nationalisation' (Lehoucq, 2008: 117). Others in peasant movements accepted the government line. At interview in 2016, a peasant leader referenced the nationalisation as a key achievement of Morales, referencing the 82 per cent headline rate[926]. This is hardly surprising given that the government has "insisted" on continuing to mention that figure, even though it ceased to be applicable in 2007 (Fernández, 2012: 148). Even if the 'nationalisation' was not exactly "audacious" (Rosales, 2012: 1449), in the view of many Morales had kept a key promise. The manner in which it was carried out suggests that Morales was highly conscious of the need to satisfy social movements.

Land Reform

Land reform was a central plank of Morales' electoral platform due to his ties to "indigenous-peasant organisations" (Spronk, 2008: 41). Within a year of taking office, Morales introduced Agrarian Law 3545 which "substantially modified" the existing system of land redistribution under 1996's INRA Law (Salazar, 2015: 135). Not only did Morales create a new framework, he also appointed Alejandro Almaraz as Vice-Minister for Land to accelerate of the process of '*saneamiento*'[927] and titling (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 28)[928]. Under the National Institute for Agrarian Reform (INRA), nine million hectares were redistributed in ten years; under Morales, the figure reached 51.7 million hectares by 2011 (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 27). The government also reduced costs and created collective titles in the highlands for the first time (Ibid). Furthermore, Article 398 of the new constitution prohibited '*latifundios*' and limited landholdings to 5,000 hectares.

On this basis, some view Morales' land policies as a "sharp departure" (Araujo, 2010: 503-4). Nevertheless, these changes came on foot of pressure from social movements. The expectations of UP movements related not only to increased access to land but extended to confronting the power of landed elites (Salazar, 2015: 137). Furthermore, in spite of the differences that existed between indigenous and peasant organisations, there was complete unity regarding the concept of land reform by confiscation (Ibid; Garcés, 2011: 55). However, the government faced a similar level of articulation among landowners, who came together to declare a "war in defence of land"[929].

[926] AI: Pedro Quiroz.
[927] Cleaning-up of the title.
[928] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[929] Los Tiempos, May 20th, 2006.

The government sought to mediate between the factions, reassuring "legitimate owners" that they had nothing to fear provided their land had an economic or social function (FES)[930]. At the same time, Morales introduced agrarian reforms, including the grant of state lands to peasant, indigenous and landless workers[931]. But the use of this time-honoured "escape valve" (Salazar, 2015: 144) failed to satisfy rural movements determined to ensure Morales was not "diverted" from promises (Gutiérrez, 2011: 21). Thus, in late 2006 the UP movements began mobilising as a "means of pressure" (Salazar, 2015: 146). The movements occupied the central plaza of La Paz, surrounding the Senate. When opposition senators abandoned the session due to the protests, the government appointed '*suplentes*'[932] and voted in Law 3545 despite claims of bribery[933] (Laserna, 2007: 105). Another key promise had been delivered on foot of pressure by social movements.

The Constituent Assembly

Given that it formed part of the electoral platforms of all candidates (Singer, 2007), the promise to convoke a constituent assembly appeared straightforward. As members of peasant and indigenous movements held a two-day vigil in the main square in La Paz, a bill to start the process was passed in early February 2006 (OSAL, 2006: 188). Furthermore, the opening of the elections to social movements led to an "explosion" of participation, with many winning seats (Deheza, 2007). The assembly convened on August 6th, 2006 in Sucre, but soon became mired in disputes (Lehoucq, 2008: 118).

With MAS and opposition parties deadlocked, the UP movements worked on a draft constitutional text (Salazar, 2015: 187). This collaborative process saw the UP overcome its internal contradictions (Ibid: 192), utilising indigenous concepts like 'pluri-nationality' and '*Vivir Bien*'[934] as frames to articulate demands across movements (Garcés, 2011: 50). The UP text was the only "serious proposal" put forward, as MAS never produced its own draft (Salazar: 198). Although some called this text the 'MAS draft' (Lehoucq, 2008: 119), the party initially opposed it (Garcés, 2011: 58). However, the assembly process was accompanied by high levels of mobilisation (Deheza, 2007), with indigenous and peasant organisations in Sucre to put pressure on all delegates, including MAS (Mayorga, 2007: 160).

This polarised atmosphere soon manifested in violence. In January 2007, clashes erupted in Cochabamba, resulting in two deaths, including a "lynching" (Laserna, 2007: 116). The government

[930] Deber, May 19th, 2006.
[931] Supreme Decree 28733, June 2nd, 2006.
[932] Substitutes.
[933] ANF, November 28th, 2006.
[934] Living well.

failed to intervene (Ibid), but later "lambasted" movements for failing to respect political institutions (Spronk, 2008: 41). When three died in Sucre in November, the government moved the assembly to its stronghold in Oruro (Morales, 2012: 66). When the opposition boycotted the venue, MAS delegates used a "ruse" to suspend the two-thirds majority requirement (Lehoucq, 2008: 119). During a "midnight session" (Ibid), 411 draft articles were approved in 16 hours[935]. Despite earlier resistance, the text adopted was largely faithful to the UP (Tockman, 2017: 124-5)[936]. While some saw the government's "fragility" (Salazar, 2015: 192), and dependence on the "political strength" of movements (Spronk, 2008: 42), it appeared that the government had kept its promise.

That was not the end of the story, however. Right-wing opponents in the eastern states erupted in open defiance in 2008, including talk of secession (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 134). In response, the government abandoned its conciliatory approach and attitude to mobilisation, calling on movements to take to the streets (Spronk, 2008: 42). The polarised situation forced social movements closer to the government, but the movements were themselves "pushed together" by the ferocity of the opposition[937]. In spite of the tensions between them[938], they "closed ranks" behind Morales (Martínez, 2010: 123).

The indigenous movements played a particularly "decisive" role in the delivery of the Constitution (Mayorga, 2014: 26). During the "difficult" process of the assembly, indigenous influence was crucial to overcoming divisions[939]. Concepts from indigenous cosmovision helped articulate demands (Garcés, 2011). Furthermore, in the conflict with the right, the indigenous gave "militant" backing to Morales, suffering violence as a result[940]. CIDOB President Adolfo Chávez was assaulted by an opposition delegate[941], while the organisation's headquarters was burned down by paramilitary youth groups[942]. In the words of one activist, the indigenous "put their bodies on the line"[943].

The correlation of forces shifted in 2008, however. Hemmed in by social pressure from the right and left, Morales responded by asserting his electoral power. The surprising decision to call a recall referendum provided him with a strengthened mandate[944]. A subsequent explosion of racially motivated violence in the eastern provinces (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 135) left over 30 people

[935] Patria, December 10th, 2007.
[936] Jornada, December 15th, 2007.
[937] AI: Sarela Paz.
[938] Ibid.
[939] AI: Tomas Candia.
[940] AI: Ruben Martínez.
[941] Los Tiempos, July 12th, 2007.
[942] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[943] AI: Qhapaj Conde.
[944] MAS triumphed, with Morales receiving 67 per cent of the vote.

dead, culminating with the 'Pando Massacre' (Morales, 2012: 67). The government moved on both fronts, forming a subservient umbrella organization – the National Co-ordinator for Change (CONALCAM) – to usurp the UP and 'deactivate' the movements (Salazar, 2015: 202); and dividing right-wing opposition between its political and business arms (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 135). The Santa Cruz business elite gradually adopted the pragmatic stance already taken by those in La Paz (Durand, 2006: 155)[945].

In turn, the opposition accepted Morales' proposal to modify the constitutional text in Congress, usurping the function of the constituent assembly. The result was a new draft that "departed in significant ways" from the approved text (Garcés, 2011: 59), altering 146 articles (Salazar, 2015: 215). Unconcerned by this apparent capitulation, García Linera described the draft as an "improved version"[946], while Morales announced that he had fulfilled his commitments to the Bolivian people[947]. In spite of criticism from the UP (Tockman, 2017: 125), the new Constitution was approved in January 2009 (Ibid). Largely on the basis of having honoured his promises, in December Morales was re-elected on a platform of continuity, garnering 64 per cent of the vote (Alpert et al, 2010: 759).

In spite of the partial nature of the hydrocarbons 'nationalisation', and concessions regarding the constitutional text, an overall assessment of Morales' first term concludes that he was a 'non-switcher'. Even critics admitted that the president stayed predominantly true to his mandate during this term[948]. For example, former Vice-Minister for the Interior, Rafael Puente, described Morales' first administration as "the best government in the history of Bolivia"[949]. Nevertheless, as Alejando Almaraz notes, pressure from civil society was instrumental in leading the government to honour promises[950]. During this period, social actors were mobilised and united by two main factors: the realisation of broad demands, and opposition to right-wing opponents. The violent crisis engendered by those forces also threatened Morales, supporting the view that before 2009 he could not risk ostracising supportive movements[951].

As this threat receded and Morales grew less vulnerable due to enhanced electoral legitimacy and formal powers, it is claimed that the government disconnected from its base[952]. However, levels of unity between social movements also declined as the opposition fractured, and as demands were

[945] AI: Rodrigo Agreda.
[946] IPS, October 21st, 2008.
[947] AP, October 21st, 2016.
[948] AI: Alejandro Almaraz; Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[949] AI: Rafael Puente.
[950] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[951] AI: Carlos Mamani.
[952] AI: Rafael Puente.

enacted. According to MAS Senator Mendoza, movements began "putting their own needs first"[953]. Nevertheless, several interviewees concurred that government policy altered notably around 2009-2010, with some viewing it as a 'switch'[954].

For example, some assert a "radical switch" occurred in agrarian policy in 2010 (Colque et al, 2016: 217), with the dismantling of Almaraz's team and sharp drop-off in '*saneamiento*' (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 28). Law 3545 remains in force, meaning that land failing to satisfy FES may be redistributed. But as Eastern Agricultural Chamber (CAO) Director Edilberto Osinaga noted, "in reality this does not happen"[955]. A switch in policy was also evident with regard to indigenous rights. Despite their prior support for Morales, the 2010 Electoral Regime Law[956] limited the number of candidates 'selected' by customary indigenous means to seven of 130 (Tockman, 2017: 128)[957], a reversal that reduced Adolfo Chávez to tears[958]. These changes form part of a wider distancing from movements[959], with scholars noting the unravelling of the relationship with the UP from 2009 (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 29). Support for this view is provided by Morales' decision to stop attending UP summits that same year[960].

This section reviewed three core election promises: the nationalisation of hydrocarbons, land reform, and the convoking of a constituent assembly to re-write the Constitution. Overall it has established that Morales did not switch on these promises during his first term in office. These findings raise issues about the conceptualisation of switching. Nevertheless, as the next section will examine, it was only with the conflict over the road through TIPNIS that his switch became apparent.

7.4 The TIPNIS Road Conflict

The conflict that erupted in 2011 over the building of a road through the *Territorio Indigena y Parque Nacional Isiboro-Secure* (TIPNIS) is seen as 'emblematic' in that it revealed the contradictions inherent in many of Morales' policies (Silva, 2017: 101)[961]. In particular, the government's handling of the conflict not only precipitated a political crisis but fractured the UP

[953] Which included the opening of CONALCAM to unions and other social actors.
[954] AI: Fernando Vargas; Alejandro Almaraz; David Birbuet; Ruben Martínez; Sarela Paz; and Carlos Mamani.
[955] AI: Edilberto Osinaga.
[956] Law 026, June 30th, 2010.
[957] The indigenous movement had initially sought to have 17 representatives: https://www.servindi.org/actualidad/opinion/10380.
[958] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=M9_jz1QLIwA.
[959] AI: Fernando Vargas; and Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[960] Ibid.
[961] AI: Georgina Jiménez.

that had formed Morales' support base since his candidacy (Mayorga, 2014: 36). For many, it is the moment Morales' 'switch' becomes clear (Ibid: 25; Salazar, 2015: 289)[962].

Such a switch seemed unlikely based on government actions during Morales' 2009 re-election campaign. With opinion polls showing 60 per cent of the electorate undecided as the election neared[963], Morales remained dependent on social movement backing. At his campaign launch, Morales called on movements to manage voter registration[964], and sought to shore up this support by running social leaders as candidates (Quisbert, 2010: 83) and inviting COB and co-operative miners into CONALCAM[965] (Martínez, 2010: 122). This realignment of relations with movements[966] had a significance that surpassed voting blocs. Such was the legitimacy provided by movement support that the opposition considered running an indigenous candidate against Morales (Quisbert, 2010: 73).

Morales ramped up his indigenist, environmentalist and anti-capitalist rhetoric. In a speech to the UN General Assembly, he attributed climate change to "capitalist lifestyles," lauding indigenous peoples who live in harmony with nature[967]. Discourse aside, there were reasons to doubt Morales' commitment to the 'process of change'. In Spain the president was quick to reassure multinational companies of his openness to investment[968], while the outline of a new NDP prioritised infrastructure for agro-industry, mining and hydrocarbons[969]. Furthermore, in October 2009 Morales opened a copper plant with a South Korean state company without any environmental licence or consultation[970]. The move prompted protests and criticism from CONAMAQ, but Morales responded by advising indigenous groups to engage in less activism[971].

Perhaps hoping to quieten the indigenous movements, during the campaign Morales took concrete actions by granting the legal title for Original Community Lands (TCO) to the peoples of TIPNIS[972]. According to Almaraz, the territories were '*saneado*' very quickly[973], and in June 2009 Morales travelled to TIPNIS to present the title to the leaders of the TIPNIS Sub-Central, recognising it as

[962] Ibid; AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[963] Diario, September 2nd, 2009.
[964] ANSA, August 1st, 2009.
[965] The miners have been referred to as the 'shock troops' of Bolivia's social movements – AI: David Birbuet.
[966] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[967] US State News, September 23rd, 2009.
[968] IHS, September 16th, 2009.
[969] Business News Americas, October 15th, 2009.
[970] UPI, October 28th, 2009.
[971] IHS, October 29th, 2009.
[972] Supreme Resolution 230292, published on January 31st, 2009.
[973] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.

"sole and absolute owner"[974]. The title granted did not cover the entire surface of the national park, however. A southern section known as '*Poligono 7*' had been 'colonised' by *campesinos* migrating from the highlands and used for coca cultivation. The title presented was for just over one million hectares, omitting 130,000 hectares of colonised lands, despite the area being home to pre-existing indigenous groups (Guzmán, 2012: 2).

Nevertheless, it was a significant achievement for the indigenous peoples, and a strong statement by Morales, who was under pressure within MAS to prioritise individual titles over collective[975]. One MAS deputy complained that "most of the land is in the hands of seven per cent of the population," referring to the indigenous[976]. What is more, in September 2009 a group of *cocaleros* tested the government's resolve by establishing a settlement beyond the so-called 'red line', while claiming tacit government support[977]. This led to a violent clash with indigenous activists that left one coloniser dead[978]. Almaraz moved to evict the settlers and destroy crops, albeit without express authorisation[979]. Nevertheless, Morales backed him and sided with the indigenous[980]. In those circumstances, it is understandable that the indigenous groups in TIPNIS believed they had the right to self-govern their territories (Salazar, 2015: 286). This sensation was to prove temporary (Guzmán, 2012: 27).

The "Dream" of a Road

Indeed, it was between these events that Morales first publicly announced his government's plan to build a road through the heart of TIPNIS. The announcement was not clandestine: before a "massive" gathering of *cocaleros* and media in *Poligano 7*, Morales and Brazilian President Lula signed various agreements, chief among them the provision of $332 million in credit from the Brazilian National Development Bank (BNDES) to construct the 306-kilometre road[981]. On this basis, it is open to question whether the government's attempt to construct this road can be considered a 'switch' given that the plan – including its controversial route – was announced during the campaign. Furthermore, the programme for government in support of Morales' candidacy[982] mentions the plan to construct a road from Villa Tunari to San Ignacio de Moxos (MAS, 2009: 93).

[974] Executive Title TCO-NAL-000229.
[975] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[976] BBC Latin America, October 25th, 2009.
[977] The colonisers were reported to have claimed, "we are the government" – AFP, September 28th, 2009.
[978] AFP, September 28th, 2009.
[979] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[980] AFP, September 28th, 2009. These events followed days after Morales had lectured the international community at a UN Summit to follow the example of indigenous peoples in protecting the environment – US State News, September 23rd, 2009.
[981] AFP, August 23rd, 2009.
[982] ANSA, September 5th, 2009.

Although finance for the project was not secured "secretly"[983], this event was largely obscured by the grant of the title, leading some to believe that it was done to generate false expectations[984]. The government also worked hard to present an "inoffensive image" of the road (Guzmán, 2012: 2). For example, Almaraz – whose sector was impacted by the project – admitted that he failed to notice the signing of contracts with Brazil at the time[985]. Morales travelled to Cochabamba to present his plans to the leaders of the *cocalero* and *campesino* movements[986]. But indigenous leaders insist they were not informed of its contents at the time, despite being part of the UP[987].

Nevertheless, the legitimacy won by Morales through his discourse, image and identity, but his actions, led the lowland indigenous peoples to campaign for his re-election[988]. Indeed, in the 2009 election received the overwhelming backing of all indigenous groups as the candidate most likely to continue the process of change rather than on his personal merits (Quisbert, 2010: 89). For these groups, it was "unthinkable" that an indigenous president would impose an invasive project without their consent[989]. However, the Morales government had been working on just such a scheme, and its details support the contention that the road plan and its implementation amount to a policy 'switch'.

The plan for a road connecting Cochabamba and Beni across Bolivia's lowlands was formulated in 1985[990], and a 2003 decree[991] specified a section linking Villa Tunari and San Ignacio de Moxos (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2011: 9). The desire for the road was not confined to 'neoliberal' governments but was shared by some social movements. At interview a *campesino* movement leader referred to the road as their "dream"[992]. Similarly, occupying the 'unused' lands of TIPNIS was a longstanding "dream" of Chapare *cocaleros*, among them Evo Morales[993]. What became clear during the conflict was that MAS shared the vision of the *cocaleros* and *campesinos* regarding land use (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 20). Continuing the pre-existing policy, the government passed a law in 2006 declaring the road a "national priority" and authorising a study of its route (Salazar, 2015: 281)[994].

[983] AI: Roger Cortez.
[984] AI: Rolando Villena.
[985] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[986] UPI, September 10th, 2009.
[987] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[988] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[989] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[990] Law No. 717, February 15th, 1985.
[991] Supreme Decree 26996, April 17th, 2003.
[992] AI: Pedro Quiroz.
[993] AI: Sarela Paz.
[994] Law No. 3477, September 22nd, 2006.

By contrast, the dream of indigenous leaders was the implementation of 'autonomies' granting effective control over their territories[995]. Chief among their concerns was the construction of a road through the territory according to Paz, who cites personal testimonies collected in TIPNIS over a ten-year period[996]. By 2009 it appeared that progress toward that goal was being made, with the acquisition of title an important step. This may account for the delayed indigenous reaction to the government's August announcement (Guzmán, 2012: 1). Later that year leaders of the TIPNIS Sub-central contacted Almaraz requesting that the government consult them[997], and CIDOB wrote to Morales inviting him to TIPNIS[998]. Almaraz passed the request to Luis Sánchez-Gómez, Head of the Bolivian Roads Administrator (ABC)[999].

By that stage the ABC had made quiet progress on the road project. In line with procedures established in 2007[1000], the ABC sought tenders for the road through TIPNIS in March 2008 (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2011: 9). In August the contract for was awarded to Brazilian firm OAS (Ibid). According to internal rules, the contract would not become active until approved by executive and legislature, which necessitated securing finance[1001]. According to Almaraz, however, when Sánchez-Gómez brought the indigenous petition directly to Morales, the response was "no consultation"[1002]. Yet the government's guidelines mandated that coordination with the community take place during the "pre-investment phase"[1003]. The government also ignored two warnings from the National Protected Areas Service (SERNAP) in 2009, urging an EIA for the entire road (Ibid). Instead the project was artificially split into three phases to avoid an EIA within TIPNIS, resulting in the resignation of Vice-Minister Juan Pablo Ramos (Ibid)[1004]. In April 2010 a law approving the BNDES credit without any consultation was passed (Salazar, 2015: 282)[1005]. This omission not only breached international norms[1006], but also domestic legislation (Schilling-Vacaflor, 2013). As Rivera notes, the government violated the norms that it had put in place (2015: 43).

[995] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[996] AI: Sarela Paz.
[997] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[998] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[999] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1000] Supreme Decree 29190, June 11th, 2007.
[1001] AI: Sergio Colque.
[1002] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1003] AI: Sergio Colque.
[1004] Vice-Minister of the Environment - Los Tiempos, July 26th, 2010.
[1005] Law No. 005, April 7th, 2010.
[1006] By splitting the project into three and commencing work on the areas outside TIPNIS, the government claimed it was not obliged to carry out a consultation as those areas were not indigenous territories – AI: David Birbuet.

The response of the indigenous movement was conditioned by this drip-feed of information. One month after the finance was approved, an Extraordinary Meeting of TIPNIS Leaders on 18 May 2010 overwhelmingly resolved to reject the road via the proposed route (Contreras, 2012: 56). According to Paz, who was present, the leaders also wanted Morales to visit TIPNIS to talk with them[1007]. At that time, CIDOB's focus was on its March for the Autonomies in June 2010, which saw the movement start to question "its government" (Ibid: 18). Following the failure of that march amid the co-opting of leaders into MAS[1008], indigenous criticism of government grew. CIDOB became involved after the finance was ratified by presidential decree[1009]. At its National Commission in July 2011 it was decided to convoke the VIII March in Defence of TIPNIS (Guzmán, 2012: 28). This decision was ratified at the Annual Meeting of Leaders in TIPNIS on August 1st, 2011 (Ibid), where the indigenous asked: where was Evo Morales?[1010]

Pressurising 'Their' President: The VIII Indigenous March

The marchers continued asking this question as they departed Trinidad on August 15th. The importance of Morales as an 'indigenous president' was strongly felt among the movements. The image was promoted by government discourse, and echoed by Adolfo Chávez, who referred to the president as "brother"[1011]. Accordingly, when ratifying the petition to march, CIDOB's leadership resolved to only negotiate "directly with the president" (Salazar, 2015: 282). Rather than a formal consultation, it appears the indigenous leadership wanted the chance to put their case to Morales. As former Ombudsman Rolando Villena put it, "they did not want confrontation, they wanted Evo to listen to them"[1012].

This desire to resolve issues informally may explain why a formal consultation did not feature among the initial goals of the march[1013]. As a statement by CIDOB noted, its role was to stop the road, not to make proposals (Ibid). Furthermore, the expectation that the government would consult with them[1014] helps account for the delay in mobilising. CIDOB took the decision to do so reluctantly (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 52), and only after construction had begun without any attempt to meet them[1015]. Nevertheless, once taken the resolution made clear the movement's opposition to

[1007] AI: Sarela Paz.
[1008] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1009] Supreme Decree 0774, January 20th, 2011.
[1010] AI: Sarela Paz.
[1011] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1012] AI: Rolando Villena.
[1013] AI: Sarela Paz.
[1014] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1015] Ibid.

a road they had "never requested" because they believed it would destroy them (Salazar, 2015: 282).

The relationship with Morales would be a casualty of the conflict. Changes became clear even before the march when on June 2nd Morales resolved to construct the road through TIPNIS, "whether they want it or not" (Contreras, 2012: 59). This position becoming known as "*si o si*"[1016]. TIPNIS Sub-Central President Fernando Vargas asserted that alternate routes proposed by CIDOB were rejected by the government[1017]. Attempts at dialogue by other UP movements were undermined by ministers (Ibid: 61), while efforts from within MAS to broker a solution were overruled by Morales[1018]. Speaking directly to Morales, Rafael Puente highlighted the displacement the road would cause, and urged the president to enter dialogue, but his pleas were rejected[1019]. Senator Mendoza admitted that it "would have been better" to have consulted beforehand[1020].

For Puente, Morales' stance on TIPNIS reflected a wider change by a government "drunk on power"[1021]. According to Almaraz, the president wanted to put the indigenous movement in its place[1022]. Pablo Solon, Morales' former UN Ambassador, believed that the government wished to create a precedent for future projects[1023]. Two official explanations were given for building the road. The first was a desire for 'territorial integration'[1024]. According to Senator Mendoza, connecting the regions while avoiding the intervention of "lowland intermediaries" was in the common good[1025]. Although a justification for the road, this logic fails to explain the route. The second was the promotion of 'development' within the Amazon through the provision of public services (Achtenberg, 2011: 3; Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 25). According to Puente, Morales told him he needed to "end the misery" in TIPNIS[1026]. Yet this reason is also questionable, as the route would pass within a day's hike of only five of the park's communities[1027].

Interviewees privileged three alternate reasons. The first related to the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA). Originally a project of 'neoliberal' governments, IIRSA was taken up by Lula's Brazil (Contreras, 2012: 63). But the TIPNIS road was

[1016] 'Yes or yes.' Available at: https://youtu.be/vVkfT-ZETrI?t=32.
[1017] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1018] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1019] AI: Rafael Puente.
[1020] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[1021] Ibid.
[1022] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1023] Available at: https://fundacionsolon.org/2017/08/04/mas-alla-del-tipnis/.
[1024] Guardian, July 4th, 2011.
[1025] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[1026] AI: Rafael Puente.
[1027] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.

one of many potential east-west routes. The second reason relates to hydrocarbon potential in TIPNIS. Maps of the oil concessions reveal that the chosen route would pass close to existing blocs (Ibid; Achtenberg, 2011)[1028]. This has led some, including within CONAMAQ[1029], to conclude that oil explains the route (Farthing & Kohl, 2014: 52)[1030]. The view is supported by comments from Hydrocarbons Minister José Luis Gutiérrez that finding oil in TIPNIS would justify exploration in other national parks (Contreras, 2012: 61). Indeed in 2008 the government passed a law[1031] creating new oil concessions within protected areas, including TIPNIS (Andrade, 2015). Given Bolivia's depleted gas reserves, this potential was significant for a government heavily dependent on resource rents (Ibid).

Nonetheless, the reason most commonly given for Morales' insistence on routing the road through '*Poligono 7*' was the need to placate his primary base, the *campesinos* and *cocaleros*[1032]. This explanation was privileged by lowland indigenous leaders [1033], due perhaps to a long-standing fear of colonisation by highland peasants. There is evidence to support this point of view, however. At interview, Ferndando Vargas asserted that during his 2005 campaign, Morales promised to pay his "debt" to his base by providing more land in TIPNIS[1034]. While the timing diverges, the claim is supported by a 2001 video of Morales promising to gift the territories of "Isiboro Park" to landless peasants[1035].

It is clear that increased access to TIPNIS was a long-standing goal of *campesino* and *cocalero* movements. It is common for scholars to assert that social movements have the power to hold Morales to account (Roberts, 2007: 14; Phillip & Panizza, 2011: 99; Crabtree, 2013: 285; Levitsky & Loxton, 2013: 117). There is less analysis of which movements exert more influence, however. Distinctions were complicated by the composite term "indigenous-native-peasant" adopted during the constituent assembly (do Alto, 2011: 96), and the later "re-christening" of colonisers as "interculturals" (Rivera, 2015: 48). Do Alto contends that MAS is a *campesino* party that privileges "production at all costs" over an indigenous cosmovision (2011: 108). According to one peasant leader, "the government listens to us"[1036]. But there is evidence that the *cocalero* movement holds the most sway. An example is the *'Gasolinazo'*, when government plans to increase petrol prices were met by "serious protests" (Mayorga, 2014: 22). According to Puente, the *Federacion Tropico*

[1028] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1029] AI: Cristobal Huanca.
[1030] AI: Sarela Paz.
[1031] Law 3911, July 16th, 2008.
[1032] AI: Roger Cortez; Alejandro Almaraz; Rafael Puente; David Birbuet; and Silvia Molina.
[1033] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia; and Fernando Vargas.
[1034] Ibid.
[1035] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m5ICh09wAwU.
[1036] AI: Pedro Quiroz.

instructed Morales to drop the measure and he complied[1037]. Paz asserts that Morales has "debts" to this movement and is not free to make independent decisions[1038]. Journalist Roger Cortez believes the debt arises from the failure to industrialise coca[1039], and is to be by providing access to fresh land[1040]. The chosen route would provide access to suitable land[1041], allowing *cocalero* leaders to diversify into logging and agribusiness[1042].

Furthermore, the discourse and tactics employed by government during the VIII March closely resembled those used by the *campesinos* and *colaleros*. For example, both the the leaders of those movements and Morales himself used racist language[1043]. The most notorious example came from Roberto Coraite, Secretary of the CSUTCB, who insisted that the road would help lowland indigenous to stop living "like savages"[1044]. The statement prompted outrage from marchers, and condemnation from the Ombudsman (Contreras, 2012: 84). While some argued that the government did not approve of discrimination[1045], Morales made comments encouraging young male coca-growers to "go out and seduce" indigenous women to resolve the issue (Achtenberg, 2011: 3-4; Guzmán, 2012: 125)[1046]. These comments highlight an underlying hierarchy whereby *campesinos* viewed the indigenous as inferior[1047].

The government and its movement allies attempted to delegitimise the march. The *cocaleros* referred to the indigenous as '*latifundistas*'[1048] (Rivera, 2015: 47). Morales and these movements insinuated that the goal of the indigenous leadership was self-enrichment via logging (Contreras, 2012: 84, 87), and implied they had been duped by the opposition and the US[1049]. The march faced other obstacles placed both by *cocaleros* and the government, including "road blocks, tricks, repression and failed negotiations" (Rivera, 2015: 44). At times these tactics appeared coordinated, such as when a roadblock by colonisers in San Borja delayed the march to allow government ministers to arrive and attempt dialogue (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 44). These joint tactics reached a peak at Yucumo, where *cocaleros* blocked the road while police impeded access to the only water source (Ibid; Rivera, 2015: 44)[1050].

[1037] AI: Rafael Puente.
[1038] AI: Sarela Paz.
[1039] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1040] AI: David Birbuet.
[1041] AI: Alejandro Almaraz; and Fernando Vargas.
[1042] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1043] AI: Carlos Arze.
[1044] Available at: http://eju.tv/2011/09/dirigente-de-la-csutcb-los-indgenas-tienen-que-aceptar-la-carretera-para-que-no-vivan-ms-como-salvajes/.
[1045] AI: Qhapaj Conde.
[1046] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.
[1047] AI: David Birbuet.
[1048] Large land owners.
[1049] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HP9UvctqjA0.
[1050] EFE Newswire, September 24th, 2011.

Faced with these obstacles, the indigenous movements sought strength in unity. Joining CIDOB were other lowland indigenous movements, including TIPNIS Sub-Central, and National Confederation of Indigenous Women of Bolivia (CNAMIB), eventually totalling 16 organisations (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 58). Also participating was CONAMAQ, whose presence was viewed as "very important" (Rivera, 2015: 46) given the relative weakness of relations between the two organisations[1051]. While principally concerned about government plans to expand mining in the highlands[1052], some in CONAMAQ viewed TIPNIS as "the lungs of Bolivia"[1053]. Also important was the articulation the march achieved with environmental NGO's and citizen groups, including the Cochabamba Environmental Forum that supported the march with food and medicine – drawing the ire of the *cocaleros*[1054].

These organisations helped to formulate a more detailed platform (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 18), as CIDOB "never thought in terms of demands"[1055]. They also brought their own experiences and critiques. Celso Padilla, President of the Guarani Peoples Assembly, warned against the concentration of power in the hands of the "triplets"[1056]; while CONAMAQ leader Rafael Quispe described the government as having a neoliberal mentality but "an indigenous face" (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 55). Having swelled to 800, on August 19th the march arrived to face a "hostile" atmosphere and roadblock in San Ignacio de Moxos (Ibid: 62). Counter-protesters insisted the marchers meet with a government commission under led by Presidency Minister Carlos Romero. That night the movements jointly formulated a list of 16 demands (Ibid). Along with rejecting the route, the list addressed environmental issues, services, indigenous autonomies, and the need for a consultation via CIDOB (CIDOB, 2011).

Negotiations failed for a number of reasons, among them a loss of faith in Romero after he repeated accusations about illegal logging (Contreras, 2012: 74; Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 45). Another was the insistence that Morales meet the march (Contreras, 2012: 71). For all the talk of "brothers", a power struggle developed between Morales and the indigenous leaders. The president accused them of colluding with USAID, and indicated he was only prepared to meet the march leaders in La Paz (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 45). When the marchers responded with their own invitation, they were informed that Morales' presence "was not necessary" (Ibid). So the march resumed, with grassroots members urging leaders against talking to a government that insulted them (Ibid: 72). Delegations

[1051] Ibid.
[1052] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1053] AI: Cristobal Huanca.
[1054] Razon, August 19th, 2011.
[1055] AI: Carlos Mamani.
[1056] CSUTCB, the 'Bartolinas,' and the 'interculturals'.

of "low-ranking" functionaries continued seeking dialogue, but marchers came to view this as a "distraction"[1057]. When the marchers finally sat down with government on September 6th, they were frustrated to learn that decisions regarding the route depended on Morales[1058]. The same occurred in San Borja one week later, where *cocaleros* again blocked the road (Contreras, 2012: 80). The marchers agreed to an "indigenous to indigenous" meeting with Foreign Minister David Choquehuanca, who admitted he could not alter Morales' decision (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 45).

Blockades, Repression and a 'Victory'

As the march progressed without agreement, the tactics of the government and allied movement grew more desperate. It was after talks collapsed in San Borja that Coraite made his "savages" comments, suggesting that NGO's and businesspeople were taking advantage of the "ignorance" of the indigenous (Contreras, 2012: 84). A leader of a union of 'interculturals' threatened the marchers, stating "one way or another we will break them"[1059]. The government criticised the march for the presence of children and pregnant women, accusing the indigenous of wanting to be "victimised"[1060]. On September 6th Health Minister Nila Heredia called for them to be removed (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 78), highlighting the risks of dehydration and malnutrition[1061]. A fresh pretext was provided by the tragic death of eight-month-old José Uche on September 4th (Ibid). Yet these expressions of concern would ring hollow in the light of events in and around Yucumo.

There a blockade closed the road to both marchers and their supporters[1062]. Although Interior Minister Sacha Llorenti requested[1063] that the colonisers remove a road block some considered "illegal" (Contreras, 2012: 83), Romero excused it as a "vigil"[1064]. Contreras alleges that the roadblock was encouraged by government and financed by MAS legislators (2012: 83). Instead of removing the obstruction, 450 unarmed police were sent to Yucumo to prevent confrontation[1065]. Half the police blocked the passage of the march at a nearby village on September 20th. The marchers immediately sought to retrieve water for children and the elderly from a nearby stream, but police denied them access (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 100). While human rights activists

[1057] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1058] Ibid.
[1059] Comments attributed to Executive Secretary of the Intercultural Communities of Bolivia, Gustavo Aliaga – Deutsche Presse-Agentur, September 18th, 2011.
[1060] Comments made by Minister for Communications Ivan Canellas – El Dia Digital, August 19th, 2011.
[1061] Razon, August 27th, 2018.
[1062] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bNhElvREI1k.
[1063] Available at: http://eju.tv/2011/09/ministro-de-gobierno-pide-a-los-colonizadores-levantar-el-bloqueo-en-yucumo/.
[1064] Diario, September 10th, 2011.
[1065] Comments made by National Commandant of the Police, Jorge Santisteban, on September 9th, 2011, and available at: http://eju.tv/2011/09/polica-no-intervendr-el-bloque-en-yucumo/.

delivered bottles, rising temperatures saw the need for water become "desperate" (Ibid: 103)[1066]. With the way blocked and no dialogue in sight, some groups abandoned the march (Ibid: 45) and leaders feared the march would fail[1067].

But events at Yucumo led to a "wave of voices and mobilisations" in solidarity with the march (Contreras, 2012: 83). In Pando a protest by indigenous groups was violently repressed (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 104). This was not the case with vigils established in major cities (Ibid). In La Paz, protests were held daily, supplemented by posters, graffiti and social media campaigns (Contreras, 2012: 83). Others travelled to join the march, including former MAS supporters Almaraz, Olivera, ex-ambassador Gustavo Guzmán, and social leader Oscar Fernández[1068]. COB threatened to strike if the situation continued[1069], the first time a labour union supported an indigenous movement, according to Vargas [1070]. It was clear that the government needed to act.

September 24th was a pivotal day. Choquehuanca again travelled to meet the march[1071]. Curiously, Choquehuanca insisted that the marchers attempt dialogue with the colonisers[1072], despite having previously compared the tension between the groups to Rwanda[1073]. The indigenous refused, asserting that they had no conflict with the colonisers (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 45). Instead a group of women seized Choquehuanca's arms and marched him through the police blockade, continuing for five kilometres to the edge of Yucumo before releasing him (Ibid: 46). Undoubtedly frustration at the government's stalling and partiality toward the colonisers played a role in the incident that left two police wounded[1074]. In statements to the media, Fernando Vargas and indigenous deputy Wilson Changaray emphasised the deprivation of food and water[1075].

However, marchers alleged that the march was infiltrated by a female police officer (Contreras, 2012: 118). Activists later produced documents purporting to prove that it was a policewoman who first grabbed Choquehuanca, and that she received a service award for her role[1076]. Romero denied the allegation. What is undeniable was the speed and intensity of the government response. During the incident, marchers obliged Choquehuanca to call Llorenti to stand police down (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 110). The Interior Minister immediately called a press conference, claiming

[1066] EFE, September 24th, 2011.
[1067] AI: Ruben Martínez.
[1068] AFP, September 22nd, 2011.
[1069] EFE, September 24th, 2011.
[1070] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1071] UPI, September 23rd, 2011.
[1072] EFE, September 24th, 2011.
[1073] AFP, September 24th, 2011.
[1074] EFE, September 24th, 2011.
[1075] Ibid.
[1076] Deber, July 11th, 2013.

Choquehuanca had been "captured" (Ibid). Following his release, Choquehuanca stated that he had been "forced to walk" but hoped for a peaceful resolution[1077]. Llorenti instead ramped up his discourse, referring to the minister as a "hostage" who had been "kidnapped"[1078], stating that a commission would travel to the Interamerican Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) the next day to denounce the crime[1079]. Choquehuanca's wife stated publicly that she feared for her husband's life[1080].

The following day the government's stance appeared conciliatory, however. That Sunday Morales was in the town of San Antonio meeting with the Indigenous Committee of the South (CONISUR), an organisation of indigenous peoples living in '*Poligono 7*' that supported the road[1081]. The presence of colonisers in their territories saw these groups become involved in coca cultivation, abandoning traditional practices and collective ownership[1082]. There Morales announced his intention to hold a referendum in the departments of Beni and Cochabamba on the issue of the road. The president further offered to introduce a "drastic" law to limit settlements in TIPNIS[1083]. Morales also sent a letter to the leaders of the march, convoking a meeting at the presidential palace in La Paz that evening to reopen the dialogue they had "unilaterally interrupted"[1084]. It was while the march leaders were considering that letter – and realising that they could not get to the capital in time – that the repression began (Ibid:121).

The operation began with tear gas falling "like rain" on the marchers, including children, older people and pregnant women (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2011: 26). As the indigenous fled the gas, 500 police officers arrived to run them down indiscriminately, kicking or hitting them with truncheons (Ibid: 28). These physical assaults were accompanied by racist and misogynistic insults, accusing the "Indian shits" of failing to respect the government (Ibid: 29, 32). Even children were mistreated and insulted (Ibid: 33). Special attention was reserved for the leaders of the march – those on a "black list" (Ibid: 34). Fernando Vargas, who was beaten and threatened with death, described it as a "brutal attack"[1085]. Those captured were bound – and sometimes gagged – with masking tape and loaded onto trucks (Ibid: 29). Some escaped into the forest, among them children who found themselves alone as darkness fell[1086]. A detailed investigation by the Ombudsman found evidence of multiple violations of human and indigenous rights by police (Ibid).

[1077] EFE, September 24th, 2011.
[1078] Ibid.
[1079] Agencia Boliviana de Informacion, September 24th, 2011.
[1080] Ibid.
[1081] UPI, September 25th, 2011.
[1082] AI: Silvia Molina; and Sarela Paz.
[1083] UPI, September 25th, 2011.
[1084] AFP, September 25th, 2011.
[1085] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1086] AI: Alejandro Almaraz.

Those captured were forced onto buses, with parents often separated from children (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 123). The buses drove toward San Borja with the intention of returning marchers to Trinidad. The police attempted to control the use of mobile phones (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2011: 36) but were unsuccessful. As footage of the repression made it onto social networks[1087], the response was immediate. When the buses entered San Borja, they encountered a roadblock where a group of locals managed to release several marchers (Ibid: 37). Spooked, the police returned to Yucumo, and then set off for the airfield at Rurrenabaque. There they were again thwarted by solidarity. As the police tried to load the marchers onto military planes, locals flooded the runway, lighting fires and throwing stones (Ibid: 40). Attempts to disperse the protesters with tear gas failed, and the police opted to release the marchers (Ibid). In the opinion of the marchers, solidarity from these communities had "rescued" them[1088]

Initially the police claimed to have intervened to prevent a confrontation between marchers and colonisers[1089]. As footage of the incident emerged, however, public anger grew, stoked by erroneous reports that a child had died[1090]. Unions, opposition parties, environmental and human rights groups organised protests, vigils and hunger strikes in support of the march[1091]. Catholic bishops condemned the state, while COB called a national strike[1092]. Protests began in La Paz and spread to Cochabamba, Santa Cruz, Sucre and Potosi[1093], "paralysing" the country[1094]. This public rejection stemmed in part from the unprecedented nature of the repression that effectively ended the relationship the indigenous movement's relations with government[1095]. As leaders asserted, even 'neoliberal' governments had listened to them[1096], and never violently repressed a march in this way[1097]. The schism also "fractured" the UP[1098], with both CIDOB and CONAMAQ withdrawing.

Public attention turned to who had given the controversial order to repress the march, with Defence Minister Maria Cecilia Chacon making clear that it had not been her. In an open resignation letter, Chacon declared herself unable to defend the measure, asserting that the government had "agreed with the people" to do things differently[1099]. The implication of Chacon's comments was that these

[1087] Ibid.
[1088] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1089] AFP, September 25th, 2011.
[1090] EFE, September 26th, 2011.
[1091] Ibid.
[1092] Ibid.
[1093] Ibid.
[1094] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1095] IPS, September 26th, 2011.
[1096] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1097] AI: Fernando Vargas; and Tomas Candia.
[1098] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1099] Available at: http://boliviadecide.blogspot.com/2011/09/carta-de-renuncia-de-la-ministra-maria.html.

actions represented a 'switch' in government policy toward movements. Others resigned from state posts in solidarity, and as the inquest gathered pace it became a political crisis (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 128).

The government response quickly descended into confusion and contradiction. Llorenti initially claimed the operation was ordered by prosecutors, but this was denied by Attorney-General Mario Uribe[1100]. The Interior Minister then blamed his deputy, Marcos Farfán[1101], who was in Yucumo. Farfán resigned while denying that the "operative decision" was issued by him or the Executive[1102]. Llorenti also cast suspicion on Carlos Romero, who in turn implicated Farfán[1103]. Morales denied ordering the "unpardonable" repression[1104], and announced the suspension of the road project[1105]. In an interview with CNN, the president asserted that neither he, García Linera nor Llorenti had prior knowledge of the operation. Morales attributed the incident to a break in the chain of command following a "unilateral decision" by the police[1106]. It was not enough to save Llorenti, who resigned[1107] on foot of a campaign for his removal by social actors[1108]. García Linera told the media that the government knew who gave the order, but that an investigation ordered by Morales would establish this with "absolute clarity"[1109].

Over time evidence emerged to cast doubt on the official version. Days after the incident, police documents were found containing details of the operation[1110]. Receipts for bus hire and masking tape in the name of the Interior Minister were uncovered[1111]. A video emerged showing Farfán discussing the operation with police the night before it occurred[1112]. Farfán himself made official statements claiming to have received the order from Llorenti[1113]. Similar accounts were given by a ministry official and police sub-commandant Muñoz[1114], the only person sanctioned by the prosecutor[1115]. Air Force Chief Tito Gandarillas gave "contradictory" statements assuming responsibility for sending military planes (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2011: 113). Rafael Puente

[1100] IPS, September 26th, 2011.
[1101] AFP, September 27th, 2011.
[1102] Pagina Siete, September 25th, 2012.
[1103] Xinhua News Service, September 27th, 2011.
[1104] ANSA, September 27th, 2011.
[1105] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5cVlIG7TX8g.
[1106] Available at: https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2012/09/27/el-opositor-movimiento-sin-miedo-acusa-al-gobierno-boliviano-de-planificar-y-ordenar-represion-a-indigenas/comment-page-1/.
[1107] IPS, September 27th, 2011.
[1108] Pais, September 27th, 2011.
[1109] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CnFCZim3Km0.
[1110] Pagina Siete, September 25th, 2012.
[1111] Ibid.
[1112] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bJPAy139Yfw&t=40s.
[1113] Pagina Siete, September 25th, 2012.
[1114] Razon, June 26th, 2012.
[1115] Bolpress, January 31st, 2013.

doubted Gandarillas would do this without presidential authorisation, and suspected Morales' involvement[1116]. Both Chacon and Llorenti have since stated that the vice-president monitored the operation (Achtenberg, 2013)[1117]. Nevertheless, prosecutors hastily ruled Morales, García Linera and Llorenti out of their investigation (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 128). Llorenti went on to become Bolivia's UN Ambassador, and Gandarillas the Head of Armed Forces. Meanwhile, the victims were not even asked to give statements[1118]. According to former Ombudsman Rolando Villena, the operation was "totally planned"[1119].

Buoyed by the outpouring of solidarity, both national and international, the indigenous resumed the march on October 1st (Contreras, 2012: 124). The government sent a delegation of senators to try limit the damage, but the marchers refused to meet them (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 46). Morales inferred that the marchers wanted to damage the government's prospects in upcoming judicial elections (Contreras, 2012: 125). Such negatives were outweighed by positive signs for the marchers, who encountered increased support en route (Ibid: 126). The overwhelming reception they received in Caravani demonstrated that attempts to discredit marchers were failing (Ibid: 131). Sensing this, the leaders met with the government senators[1120], but rejected a law enacting Morales' proposal for a referendum (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 157). The marchers chose to arrive in La Paz after the judicial elections in an effort to remain neutral (Contreras, 2012: 139), but the damage had been done. Most of the votes were cast blank, in protest at the government[1121], resulting in Morales' first electoral setback.

As the march approached La Paz, it was enlarged to 2,500 by contingents from highland communities (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 165). The marchers were spurred on by an "uncontainable" solidarity from across the country (Contreras, 2012: 141), giving the government little choice but to let it proceed. The marchers entered La Paz as "heroes"[1122], with worker, student, feminist, environmental and religious groups joining to form a two-kilometre-long procession (Fundacion Tierra, 2012: 173). Tens of thousands of citizens lined the streets to welcome marchers with applause, songs, gifts and embraces[1123], bringing the entire city to a halt[1124]. But their ordeal was not over. When the march arrived at the presidential palace, hopes of a presidential welcome were

[1116] AI: Rafael Puente.
[1117] Pagina Siete, September 25th, 2012.
[1118] Bolpress, January 31st, 2013.
[1119] AI: Rolando Villena.
[1120] Among them Adolfo Mendoza.
[1121] Guardian, October 18th, 2011.
[1122] AI: David Birbuet; and Ruben Martínez.
[1123] Nacional, October 20th, 2011.
[1124] AI: Qhapaj Conde.

dashed[1125]. Morales had "abandoned" the palace[1126], heading to Cochabamba. The marchers were forced to camp in the cold for two nights[1127] surrounded by a police cordon to prevent supporters from passing blankets and food, even using tear gas against them[1128].

The government made half-hearted efforts to regain the ascendancy. Offers of dialogue with Communications Minister Canelas were rejected[1129], as was an attempt to avoid meeting in the presidential palace[1130]. But the government was on the run, shocked by the "historic articulation" of diverse groups backing the march (Rivera, 2015: 18). Nor was it prepared for the huge public support, or the arrival of marchers at the presidential palace (Contreras, 2012: 168). Many MAS members, steeped in social struggles, knew the power of indigenous marches, and feared them[1131]. The result of the judicial elections, along with a nine per cent drop in Morales' approval rating[1132], appeared to confirm their fears.

On October 21st the government announced the cancellation of the road project[1133]. The following day Morales finally sat down with the indigenous leaders. Following an exhaustive 48-hour session, the government acceded to most of the march's demands. In the presence of the indigenous leaders, the government "hastily approved" Law 180 on October 24th guaranteeing that no road would pass through TIPNIS[1134], as demonstrators maintained a vigil outside[1135]. The march appeared victorious, leading some to view the conflict as an example of Morales bowing to popular pressures (Crabtree, 2013: 287), and of civil society regaining its former influence (Guzmán, 2012: 144). But those like Rafael Quispe[1136] who sought to write the president's political epitaph had spoken too soon.

Morales' Response: Intangibility and the Counter-March

In fact, the source of future conflict lay in the very law the march had achieved. Article 1 declared TIPNIS an "intangible zone". The purpose of the clause, in the eyes of the indigenous, was per Article 5 that authorised the state to remove illegal settlements. In the hands of the government,

[1125] EFE, October 20th, 2011.
[1126] AI: Carlos Mamani.
[1127] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1128] AFP, October 21st, 2011.
[1129] AFP, October 20th, 2011.
[1130] EFE, October 20th, 2011.
[1131] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1132] Morales' approval fell to 35 per cent, its second-lowest level - Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, October 23rd, 2011.
[1133] One headline stated that the indigenous had "obliged" Morales to do so – Diario Vasco, October 22nd, 2011.
[1134] Law 180, October 24th, 2011.
[1135] IPS, October 25th, 2011.
[1136] Quispe declared "Evo Morales' cycle has ended" – BBC Latin America, October 24th, 2011.

however, 'intangibility' became a "double-edged sword" (Rivera, 2015: 47). Even though the law's regulation made exceptions for traditional indigenous practices, Morales began a "campaign of disinformation" claiming that all economic activities were prohibited (Contreras, 2012: 181). The government also argued that the status applied to all of TIPNIS, ignoring an agreement for differentiated zones[1137]. Others in MAS viewed 'intangibility' as contrary to the 'common good'[1138], despite its status as a national park[1139]. The campaign sowed confusion in indigenous communities, with even opponents of the road calling for the word to be removed[1140]. On this basis, some observers believe indigenous leaders were tricked in the negotiations[1141].

The other government focus was CONISUR, the ethnically 'indigenous' living in '*Poligono 7*' that had links to the *cocaleros*[1142]. According to the indigenous movement, this group was encouraged by the government to oppose the new law[1143]. In late November, CONISUR announced a counter-march calling for the road to be reinstated[1144]. Furthermore, construction on Phases I and III continued, despite Phase II having been cancelled[1145]. The counter-march departed Chapare on December 21st, attracting little public attention or solidarity, but receiving support from other sources. According to Rivera, the marchers' belongings were transported in buses provided by the government and *cocalero* unions (2015: 47). A legislative commission was formed to consider the marchers' demands, with member Adolfo Mendoza calling the march "more representative" than the VIII March[1146]. Upon arriving in La Paz, Morales received the marchers in the presidential palace that same day[1147].

CONISUR marchers also gained access to leaders of the Assembly and Senate, with whom they formulated a consultation law (Contreras, 2012: 184). After meeting Morales, CONISUR President Gumercindo Pradel announced a deadline of 48 hours for CIDOB and others indigenous movements to discuss the road project[1148]. García Linera supported Pradel's call, blaming NGO's for the issue of intangibility[1149]. The indigenous leadership refused to deal with CONISUR, who they accused of falsifying its organisational status and giving up their indigenous rights by acquiring individual

[1137] Razon, December 1st, 2011.
[1138] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[1139] AI: Tomas Candia.
[1140] Razon, November 28th, 2011.
[1141] AI: David Birbuet.
[1142] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1143] AI: Tomas Candia.
[1144] Razon, November 29th, 2011.
[1145] Ibid.
[1146] Razon, January 14th, 2011.
[1147] Razon, January 30th, 2012.
[1148] Razon, February 1st, 2012.
[1149] Ibid.

titles (Ibid: 182). Instead CIDOB resolved to call an "immediate mobilisation" if the law was passed[1150].

They did not have to wait long. By February 7th the draft law had passed to the Assembly. Indigenous deputy Pedro Nuni dismissed the law as "deceitful", noting it had not been consulted with the "true owners" of TIPNIS[1151]. Nevertheless, the Assembly approved the law, claiming it promoted "democratic participation"[1152]. Law 222[1153] was signed by Morales on February 10th, and established a timeline for a 'free, prior and informed consultation', citing ILO Convention 169[1154]. Some were quick to point out that Law 222 in fact contravenes the convention in not being 'prior'[1155], and by dividing the project into three parts (Guzmán, 2012: 148). The law also extended the right to consultation to *campesinos*, and to 'indigenous' groups living outside the legally titled territories (Ibid: 149). Most significantly, Article 4 established that the terms of the consultation would be to decide on the issue of 'intangibility'. In other words, acceptance of economic activity in TIPNIS would be considered equivalent to approval of the road (Ibid: 151; Salazar, 2015: 287).

Divided They Fell: The IX Indigenous March

The government wasted no time, sending functionaries to begin gathering information[1156]. In March CONISUR entered TIPNIS with the purpose of "socialising" the implications of Laws 180 and 222[1157], attracting accusations of "manipulation"[1158]. In response, TIPNIS community leaders met on March 19th and resolved to march again[1159]. The IX March convoked jointly by CIDOB and CONAMAQ articulated eight demands, including an independent investigation into the repression, and the annulment of Law 222[1160]. However, the confusion over 'intangibility' began to be felt, as the 22 leaders of Secure Sub-Central initially hesitated to participate[1161]. Furthermore, Morales cancelled the contract with OAS citing delays[1162], thereby lessening the need for a march[1163].

[1150] Razon, February 1st, 2012.
[1151] Razon, February 7th, 2012.
[1152] Razon, February 8th, 2012.
[1153] '*Ley Consulta*'– Law 222, February 10th, 2012.
[1154] Article 8, Law 222.
[1155] AI: Fernando Vargas; and Silvia Molina.
[1156] Razon, February 19th, 2012.
[1157] Razon, March 3rd, 2012.
[1158] Razon, March 23rd, 2012.
[1159] Razon, March 19th, 2012.
[1160] Razon, May 7th, 2012.
[1161] Ibid.
[1162] Available at: http://eju.tv/2012/04/evo-morales-anula-contrato-con-la-empresa-oas/.
[1163] Razon, April 10th, 2012.

When the march finally departed on April 27th, it did so under "the worst material and political circumstances" (Ibid). These included internal disunity, disgruntlement with leadership, and heightened politicisation. Furthermore, they faced a government that had learned lessons, and would throw the entire state apparatus at the march (Ibid). One difference between the marches was the interest paid by opposition political parties. Seizing on the government's difficulties, the right-wing National Unity party began proposing alternative routes[1164]. The indigenous movements drew close to the Green Party and the 'Movement Without Fear' (MSM), a former coalition partner turned government opponent. These alliances allowed MAS to accuse the march of "politicisation" and "destabilising democracy"[1165]. Particularly damaging was the admission that MSM was providing finance to the march[1166]. While MSM argued that the sums were small, it allowed opponents to claim that marchers were paid[1167].

Along with this diversification of allegiances came fresh tactics. After the VIII March, the indigenous considered legal action, including a complaint to the IACHR, and suing in Brazilian courts[1168]. Following Law 222, MSM brought a challenge to the Constitutional Tribunal (TC), only for MAS to respond by challenging Law 180[1169]. The court verdict was excessively delayed, and ultimately altered little. Law 180 was upheld, while the constitutionality of the consultation was conditioned on finding an "accord" between indigenous groups, and with government[1170]. The government saw the ruling as reason to proclaim the constitutionality of Law 222 and press ahead with the consultation.

The progress of the IX March proved more straightforward than its predecessor, encountering less resistance but also less solidarity. Indigenous leaders blamed the lack of impact on the government's "very clear strategy"[1171] to divide the movement (Ibid; Mayorga, 2014). Other factors also impacted the march, however. More than one scholar described the level of articulation and solidarity achieved by the VIII March as "ephemeral" (Rivera, 2015: 10)[1172]. Silvia Molina attributed much of it to public outrage at the police violence. The conditions for clashes with colonisers seemed to exist again, with CSUTCB resolved to resist the march (Salazar, 2015: 287), while locals in San Ignacio de Moxos blocked the road[1173]. But after passing that town, the march encountered little resistance thanks to Romero's interventions with local mayors and social leaders, convincing them

[1164] Razon, April 11th, 2012.
[1165] Razon, May 9th, 2012.
[1166] Ibid.
[1167] Razon, June 11th, 2012.
[1168] Razon, January 18th, 2012.
[1169] Razon, February 29th, 2012.
[1170] Razon, June 24th, 2012.
[1171] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1172] Ibid.
[1173] Razon, May 9th, 2012.

to let the march pass[1174]. While working to avoid conflict, the government was also determined to starve the march of publicity.

In a reversal of roles, during the march the government refused or ignored requests for dialogue[1175], even snubbing a meeting at the site of the repression[1176]. In a further change, the government decided not to negotiate with the leaders of the march or CIDOB (Mayorga, 2014: 38-9). Instead they focussed on representatives of the three Sub-Centrals – Secure, TIPNIS and CONISUR – in an attempt to disaggregate the movement (Ibid). The government targeted sub-national groups with agreements offering development projects and official posts, causing a split in the Secure Sub-Central[1177]. The creation of 'parallel' social organisations was another government tactic, attributed by some to a desire to "totally divide" the movements[1178]. Evidence for this view is provided by Morales' visit to TIPNIS before the march, where he signed agreements with two regional movements that immediately began to discuss a "parallel CIDOB"[1179].

Along with attempts to bypass established interlocutors (Ibid), the government targeted individual leaders for delegitimisation. Returning to the issue of timber trafficking, contracts naming Fernando Vargas were published, which he claimed were falsified[1180]. García Linera accused March Committee President Bertha Bejarano of involvement in drug trafficking in Brazil[1181]. Finally, Adolfo Chávez was suspended by CIDOB on charges of corruption, a move some attributed to the government 'buying' leaders[1182]. When the march reached La Paz, the Health Minister accused Chávez of denying marchers medical attention[1183].

The government alleged that march leaders were politically motivated. Morales declared the marchers "hostages" of MSM and the right[1184]. A MAS deputy accused the leaders of seeking to advance their political careers[1185]. Adolfo Mendoza claimed the leaders "positioned themselves politically" and thought only of themselves[1186]. That these accusations had some basis gave them added power. Ongoing interactions with opposition parties damaged the public perception of the

[1174] Razon, June 18th, 2012.
[1175] Razon, June 26th, 2012.
[1176] Razon, May 29th, 2012.
[1177] Razon, April 10th, 2012.
[1178] AI: Fernando Vargas.
[1179] Razon, April 20th, 2012.
[1180] Razon, May 9th, 2012.
[1181] Razon, June 12th, 2012.
[1182] Mundo, June 11th, 2012.
[1183] Razon, July 2nd, 2012.
[1184] Razon, July 2nd, 2012.
[1185] Razon, June 26th, 2012.
[1186] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.

march[1187]. According to Silvia Molina, the leaders saw a political opportunity and sought to take it[1188]. Rafael Quispe established links to the "far-right" party of businessman Samuel Doria Medina[1189], and was elected to the Assembly in 2014. Fernando Vargas ran as the Green Party presidential candidate in 2014, though his candidacy barely registered votes (Centellas, 2015: 96). Chávez considered a gubernatorial run for '*Frente para la Victoria*', but opted against it[1190]. He was later implicated in the 'Indigenous Fund' corruption scandal, eventually seeking asylum abroad on grounds of political persecution[1191].

Nevertheless, at the time of the march much of this had yet to pass. Instead the separation that occurred between the leaders and marchers had much to do with government tactics. The march was again visited by tragedy, with three deaths occurring[1192]. Unlike during the VIII March, however, adversity failed to unite the marchers. Some in CONAMAQ launched a blistering attack on Chávez, blaming the deaths on his 'refusal' to dialogue[1193]. Subsequently a group of Leco indigenous signed an agreement with the government, and immediately accused Chávez of "intimidation"[1194]. The unity of the VIII March was no more.

Weakened and divided, the march arrived in La Paz in June to be greeted by "dozens" of supporters[1195]. With the main square blocked by police, marchers established a vigil outside the vice-presidential offices[1196]. The government refused to meet with CIDOB, offering only to talk with community leaders and three sub-centrals, including CONISUR[1197]. The leaders of the march refused, and the vigil continued. The government moved ahead with its agenda, convoking talks with CONISUR, leaders of Secure Sub-Central, and some local leaders from TIPNIS Sub-Central[1198]. While Vargas rejected the move, with backing from COB, the government announced that 45 of 63 community leaders had consented to the consultation. Vargas disputed the status of these 'leaders', alleging they were "hand-picked" by Morales[1199]. Undeterred, the government signed a formal agreement with the 45[1200]. When a strike in Beni to support the march failed to

[1187] AI: Qhapaj Conde.
[1188] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1189] AI: Qhapaj Conde.
[1190] Pagina Siete, February 4th, 2015.
[1191] Erbol Digital, May 5th, 2017.
[1192] Two marchers died in a car accident, while a 6-month old baby died during the vigil in La Paz.
[1193] Razon, June 28th, 2012.
[1194] Razon, July 5th, 2012.
[1195] Razon, June 27th, 2012.
[1196] Razon, June 29th, 2012.
[1197] Ibid.
[1198] Razon, July 3rd, 2012.
[1199] Razon, July 4th, 2012.
[1200] Razon, July 9th, 2012.

materialise[1201], the writing was on the wall. The marchers left La Paz without meeting Morales. According to Romero, the consultation would be the "real dialogue"[1202].

A Switch Consolidated: The False Promise of Consultation

The marchers returned to TIPNIS with the intention of resisting the consultation from there but were soon dogged by divisions that were "worsened" by the government[1203]. Following the march, the government continued signing agreements with "indigenous organisations and peoples", alleging that two-thirds rejected intangibility[1204]. Attacks on the march leaders continued, with Presidency Minister Juan Quintana accusing them of causing a death by blocking rivers during the consultation[1205]. Internal divisions were also growing. The suspension of Adolfo Chávez caused a split within CIDOB[1206]. When Melva Hurtado was elected president, CIDOB's vice-president Nelly Romero accused the government of creating a "parallel organisation"[1207]. Following the march, Bertha Bejarano travelled to Santa Cruz to protect CIDOB's headquarters from MAS supporters "and the government"[1208]. Nonetheless, on July 27th the offices were forcibly taken by Hurtado supporters[1209], with some blaming the government[1210]. As a result, resistance to the consultation was fitful and ineffective, leading government to dismiss its organisers as a "small band of activists"[1211].

The state process of "free prior and informed consultation" was launched on July 29th but doubts quickly emerged as to whether it met any of those criteria. As noted, questions were raised about the issue being consulted (focussed on 'intangibility', and not on the road or the route); and about who was consulted, with the inclusion of CONISUR communities effectively ignoring indigenous autonomies (TIPNIS, 2012: 52). Furthermore, the government pitched the consultation as a plebiscite, emphasising that the minority would have to accept its outcome[1212]. Despite the ruling from the TC calling for an 'accord', Public Works Minister Vladimir Sánchez stated that the government was not obliged to achieve consensus[1213]. The process also failed to work through the recognised indigenous representative organisations, thereby contravening Convention 169 (Ibid:

[1201] Razon, July 10th, 2012.
[1202] Ibid.
[1203] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1204] Razon, July 11th, 2012.
[1205] Razon, October 18th, 2012.
[1206] AI: Qhapaj Conde.
[1207] Razon, July 16th, 2012.
[1208] Razon, July 9th, 2012.
[1209] Razon, July 27th, 2012.
[1210] AI: Carlos Mamani.
[1211] Razon, August 13th, 2012.
[1212] Razon, July 9th, 2012.
[1213] Razon, July 20th, 2012.

50). Instead García Linera promised to bring the consultation to "every family"[1214], and characterised those in resistance as "anti-democratic"[1215].

Doubts about the legitimacy of the process continued throughout its three-month duration. Convention 169 requires consultation to be carried out in good faith (Ibid). Yet as the process began the government made clear that state development projects in the region – including health and education services – were contingent on the outcome[1216]. On the first anniversary of the repression, the government announced the provision of a poverty bond, water purifiers and sanitation services to communities in TIPNIS, along with a promise to build houses[1217]. Stories emerged of official consultation brigades handing out food and petrol[1218], while newspaper journalists stumbled upon the handover of computers to a community[1219]. The expulsion of Quintana from a community revealed a practice of 'advance teams' arriving by helicopter to spread disinformation[1220]. Morales visited the region to establish an 'ecological brigade' to protect the environment[1221], ensuring a permanent military presence in TIPNIS. The base was viewed by indigenous communities as a "threat" (Ibid: 52).

These practices were detailed in a 'shadow' report jointly conducted by the Catholic Church and Bolivian Permanent Assembly on Human Rights (APDHB). It found that the 'information' provided by official brigades consisted of "gifts and promises of public works" (Caritas Boliviana, 2013: 117). The report, along with that of a 'self-consultation' by the TIPNIS Sub-Central, brought more serious transgressions to light. These included consulting with "non-existent" communities (Rivera, 2015: 48) – the government said it "discovered new communities"[1222] – and with small fractions of others (Caritas Boliviana, 2013: 117). According to indigenous leaders, the brigades consulted "*chacos*[1223], not communities"[1224]. On these grounds, Ombudsman Villena queried the consultation's legitimacy[1225], while in the view of the APDHB and a human rights mission, the consultation did not comply with international legal standards (Ibid; FIDH, 2013)[1226].

[1214] Razon, July 17th, 2012.
[1215] Razon, August 31st, 2012.
[1216] Razon, August 30th, 2012.
[1217] Razon, September 25th, 2012.
[1218] Razon, September 12th, 2012.
[1219] Razon, August 18th, 2012.
[1220] Razon, September 16th, 2012.
[1221] Razon, August 29th, 2012.
[1222] Razon, August 15th, 2012.
[1223] Indigenous word for a small allotment or plot for growing food.
[1224] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1225] FM Bolivia, December 8th, 2012.
[1226] Razon, May 10th, 2012.

Nevertheless, in September Sánchez announced that an "absolute majority" of the 69 communities favoured the road[1227]. Indigenous leaders rejected the figures, and its 'self-consultation' conducted that same month revealed that 28 of the 30 communities visited had not been consulted (TIPNIS, 2012: 67-9). The 'shadow report' found that 30 of the 36 communities consulted definitively opposed a road through TIPNIS (Caritas Boliviana, 2013: 118). The contrast with the official results could not have been starker. The report issued by the TSE stated that only four of the 58 communities consulted opposed the road[1228]. The government also sought to discredit dissenters. When a community leader in Gundonovia claimed that only five of 84 families had been consulted, Quintana dismissed him as a timber trafficker[1229]. The Presidency Minister also revealed Catholic Church landholdings in TIPNIS, calling its motivations into question[1230]. As for APDHB, the government sought to split the organisation by creating parallel leadership[1231], and seizing its offices[1232].

Even before the consultation ended, Morales used its findings to renew promises to his base. In early October, he visited Villa Tunari to announce that state funds would complete Phase I[1233], and in November sought tenders for the construction of Phase III[1234]. Some believe the consultation's true purpose was to "disarticulate and overthrow" community networks (Salazar, 2015: 289). Support for this view is provided by events in CONAMAQ. Divisions appeared during the IX March, and worsened during 2013, culminating in parallel elections that split the organisation[1235]. Following the schism, the pro-government side led by Hilarion Mamani attempted unsuccessfully to take its offices by force[1236]. In January 2014 some 300 returned and violently occupied the building, allegedly with police assistance (Saavedra, 2014). According to head of the anti-government faction, Cristobal Huanca, the timing of the assault was not arbitrary[1237]: within months the government passed a controversial Mining Law that CONAMAQ had previously opposed[1238]. Hilarion Mamani had no such qualms: as a co-operative miner, he stood to personally benefit (Almaraz, 2014).

[1227] Razon, September 12th, 2012.
[1228] Razon, January 8th, 2013.
[1229] Razon, November 12th, 2012.
[1230] Razon, April 17th, 2013.
[1231] AI: Georgina Jiménez.
[1232] The parallel leader, Juan Carlos Manuel, was said to be a miner - Pagina Siete, February 7th, 2017.
[1233] Razon, October 7th, 2012.
[1234] Razon, November 14th, 2012.
[1235] Razon, December 12th, 2012.
[1236] Carlos Mamani, who was injured in the attack, said that the leaders of CONAMAQ were convoked to a meeting with government that night – AI: Carlos Mamani.
[1237] AI: Cristobal Huanca.
[1238] Law No. 535, May 19th, 2014.

The outcome has been the fragmentation of the indigenous movements. Ex-Ombudsman Rolando Villena believes they are being "induced into disappearing" through a process of co-option, division and criminalisation[1239]. Cristobal Huanca points to the difficult circumstances facing many indigenous populations, asserting that state supports go to those linked to the government[1240]. Georgina Jiménez concurs, noting that communities are forced to associate themselves with 'official' movements[1241]. Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia confirm that the fallout has "divided families"[1242]. Journalist Roger Cortez asserts that the government has "disintegrated" the indigenous movement[1243]. Those within MAS blame these divisions on movement leaders, arguing that after 2009 they began to pursue "particularistic" goals[1244].

But Salazar's analysis (2015) demonstrates that the government pursued a systematic strategy of fomenting division and supporting uncritical parallel organisations across the social sector. This view is supported by other observers[1245]. Even CSUTCB was subjected to this treatment (Ibid). Anria argues that the mobilisationsal capacity of groups like co-operative miners and *campesinos* can still check government power but acknowledges that these 'social vetoes' are episodic (2016: 106). This is the result of the weakening and division experienced by movements. The exception is the *cocalero* movement, which remains Morales' core base – his "army", according to one scholar[1246] – and retains significant influence. Furthermore, due to the liberalisation of coca and political connections, the leaders of this movement are both powerful and wealthy (Colque, 2018: 146).

Following the demise of the UP, Morales recalibrated his support base, altering policy and deepening his 'switch'[1247]. More specifically, the government forged an alliance with former adversaries, the agro-industrial elite of Santa Cruz[1248]. According to do Alto, this process began in 2010 when MAS displayed "cold pragmatism" by allying with right-wing groups for municipal elections (2011: 110). But it was during the TIPNIS conflict that this "gradual accommodation" (Crabtree & Chaplin, 2013: 31) became a pact (Grugel & Riggirozzi, 2013: 14). The 'Pluri-national Meeting' in Cochabamba in January 2012 was the government's reaction to TIPNIS, convoking social organisations to hear their demands (Mayorga, 2014: 49). With the indigenous movement

[1239] AI: Rolando Villena.
[1240] AI: Cristobal Huanca.
[1241] AI: Georgina Jiménez.
[1242] AI: Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia.
[1243] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1244] AI: Adolfo Mendoza.
[1245] AI: Miguel Lamas; and Georgina Jiménez.
[1246] AI: Carlos Crespo.
[1247] AI: Fredy VillaGómez; and Miguel Lamas.
[1248] AI: Carlos Arze.

absent, private business organisations entered seeking an irony-free "indigenous-business pact" (Ibid: 50).

Agribusiness was represented by CAO, an organisation linked to the 2008 autonomy movement. Then they were viewed as "enemies," even if some felt that the government "exaggerated" the enmity[1249]. But according to head of the Bolivian Confederation of Private Entrepreneurs (CEPB), Rodrigo Agreda, attitudes to business began changing in 2009[1250]. CAO improved its relations with Morales "little by little", developing a "shared interest" in productivity[1251], with the government increasingly directing financial supports to these "producing territories" (Rosales, 2013: 1450). Nevertheless, the meeting in 2012 was a "big change"[1252]. The government made commitments to CAO on land reform, indigenous rights and redistribution that would halt or reverse policies implemented during Morales' first term (Saavedra, 2015: 19-20). Instead of resisting, the government invited CAO to enter CONALCAM (Ibid). These "affable" (Ibid) relations have been maintained and reciprocated: in 2016 CAO President Julio Roda praised Morales for doing "more for Santa Cruz than Banzer"[1253]. Saavedra's analysis reveals why: at the 2015 Agricultural Summit the government agreed to many agribusiness demands, including lower environmental standards, new GM crops, and permits for land clearances (Ibid: 67). A key region targeted by the cattle industry is the northern territory of TIPNIS[1254].

In that context, the division and weakening of social movements was significant. The outcome of Morales' switch has been the expansion of the 'agricultural frontier' at an unprecedented pace, and a deepening of the extractivist model through mining, oil and timber concessions (Jiménez, 2015). The switch from "alternative development" and indigenist discourse to a new policy of "comprehensive development with coca" (Colque, 2018: 143) was exemplified by a 2015 decree allowing hydrocarbon activity in protected areas[1255]. This was something "not even Goni" had done[1256], and overturned another promise. The new "urban-rural popular-business bloc" consolidated by this shift is Morales' new base (Achtenberg, 2017), but its support is contingent on receiving more "gifts"[1257].

[1249] AI: Edilberto Osinaga.
[1250] AI: Rodrigo Agreda.
[1251] AI: Edilberto Osinaga.
[1252] Ibid.
[1253] The quote refers to Hugo Banzer, the former military dictator (1971-78) and later president (1997-2001). Available at: http://agronegocios.com.bo/productores-reconocen-que-morales-hizo-mas-que-banzer-por-santa-cruz/.
[1254] AI: Ruben Martínez.
[1255] Supreme Decree 2366, May 20th, 2015.
[1256] AI: Carlos Crespo.
[1257] AI: Roger Cortez.

In this context, the failure to complete the road through TIPNIS seems anomalous. Some argue it is evidence of a "popular force" capable of preventing the road (Salazar, 2015: 289). Support for this view came in 2017, when the government repealed the 'intangible' status of TIPNIS[1258]. Resistance from a new generation of TIPNIS leaders mobilised in protest, supported by the Catholic Church, environmental and human rights organisations (Achtenberg, 2017). The mobilisations revealed that the urban connection with TIPNIS awakened by the VIII March remains[1259]. Within TIPNIS, divisions have only worsened, however. Research reveals governance there to be a "system of disarticulate actors" (Molina, 2018: 85), with more indigenous communities linked to *cocalero* activities (Colque, 2018). Finally, the removal of 'intangibility' led to a split in the hierarchy of TIPNIS Sub-Central, the heart of the resistance (Molina, 2018: 81).

Others point to electoral concerns as the reason. In preparation for the 2014 general elections, Morales committed over $8.5 million in public services, infrastructure and telecommunications to TIPNIS (Achtenberg, 2017). In an attempt to regain lost legitimacy (Mayorga, 2014), the government announced a two-year moratorium on construction. By 2016, Morales was focussed on a referendum to remove term limits that he eventually lost[1260], although the TC later overruled the outcome[1261].

Some believe that the most significant limitation has been financial, following the withdrawal of BNDES credit in 2013[1262]. However, it is also the case that construction never stopped, it simply slowed down[1263]. According to Agreda, the government continued building, but stopped talking about it[1264]. Phase I was completed by state companies, while Phase III was constructed by a joint venture between the state and the *cocalero* unions (Achtenberg, 2017). The state finally commenced work on Phase II in 2016, constructing a number of bridges within TIPNIS[1265]. These bridges have given *cocaleros* access to "the zones they want most", easing the pressure on Morales[1266]. For Cortez, this may even be sufficient as the goal is not a road, but the colonisation of TIPNIS[1267]. This careful approach echoes comments by Morales in 2017, promising that a road through TIPNIS would be built "sooner or later"[1268].

[1258] Law No. 969, August 13th, 2017.
[1259] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1260] Guardian, February 24th, 2016.
[1261] BBC, November 29th, 2017.
[1262] Ibid.
[1263] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1264] AI: Rodrigo Agreda.
[1265] Morales called them "little bridges" – Los Tiempos, September 18th, 2016.
[1266] AI: Silvia Molina.
[1267] AI: Roger Cortez.
[1268] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yDSHF_nAfDw.

The TIPNIS conflict was a turning point for Evo Morales' presidency, the moment his 'switch' became evident [1269]. It revealed the tension between the president's indigenist, pro-movement discourse on one hand, and his pragmatism and commitments to one particular sector on the other. TIPNIS highlighted the government's "anti-communitarian nature" (Salazar, 2015: 289), both via violent repression and the subsequent dividing of movements. It also revealed that Morales' was not the 'government of the movements', but of one movement in particular[1270]. But the conflict also revealed the limitations of social mobilisation to influence policy: while repression engendered unprecedented solidarity and articulation, it failed to reach national level and proved short-lived[1271]. The VIII March temporarily derailed the road project, but failed to reverse government policy (Andrade, 2015: 160).

7.5 Discussion

Two main points with regard to switching arise from this chapter. Firstly, Evo Morales is universally classified as a non-switching left populist. While this chapter finds qualified support for this view during Morales' first term in office, it reveals that this position changed over time. During his first term, Morales appeared to make good on a number of key electoral promises. Chief among these were substantial land reform, the 'nationalisation' of hydrocarbons, and the convoking of a constituent assembly to rewrite the Constitution. These reforms are evidence of Morales' 'non-switch' during his first term. However, this chapter reveals that Morales' 'switch' began after his re-election in 2009, having overcome right-wing opposition and strengthened his position. Thereafter, Morales' policies began to move away from his original platform. As with the Gutiérrez, Correa and Humala chapters, this analysis highlights the importance of considering the whole period of presidency with regard to switching.

Secondly, this chapter reinforces the importance of examining switching with regard to policy areas than solely economic policies. Morales' switch was confirmed with the conflict over the TIPNIS road project. This was the turning point, when rather than deepen the 'process of change' and honour his campaign promises, Morales privileged the desires of his core movements for increased access to land. In response, the government faced sustained opposition from previously supportive indigenous movements. The government's militarised repression of marchers catalysed public opinion, causing Morales to temporarily switch back on the issue. In time however Morales succeeded in sowing division and confusion, cementing a split with the indigenous movement and

[1269] AI: Carlos Arze.
[1270] According to Fernando Vargas, Morales was "only favouring coca growers and colonisers" – AFP, October 20th, 2011.
[1271] AI: Silvia Molina.

permitting a pact with agribusiness sectors. This period from 2012 saw many of Morales' previous policies either stalled or reversed. In spite of the above, Morales maintained a degree of programmatic continuity, due in part to his ongoing links with a fraction of his peasant social base.

The analysis in this chapter reveals that switches can occur later in a presidents' time in office, can vary from one policy area to another, and can be a partial rather than a complete switch.

Two further points arise with regard to the causal mechanism outlined by this thesis. In the first place, Morales came to power on foot of prolonged social mobilisation that ousted two presidents. Social movements were formally united and remained mobilised in critical support of the government, enabling but also ensuring the introduction of various reforms. When Morales made good on several election promises, he did so on foot of sustained social mobilisation. However, the government's handling of the TIPNIS conflict saw it split with the indigenous movements, which effectively ended the influence of the Unity Pact. While some discord emerged from within movements thereafter, the government played an active role in sowing division. This disarticulation severely weakened the role of civil society as an autonomous check on the government. From 2012 onwards Morales increasingly responded to particularistic interests, primarily his *cocalero* base.

The second point relates to the role of business elites. The election of Morales saw organized business split into two main factions. While those in the highlands took a pragmatic stance, opposition in the lowland regions was ideological, racialised, and focused entirely on ousting Morales. Accordingly, little possibility existed of compromise. Following Morales's re-election in 2009, these business actors adopted an increasingly conciliatory stance toward the president. Furthermore, the weakening of the social movements in the aftermath of TIPNIS permitted the government to pact with agribusiness interests, leading to the halting and even reversal of many earlier policies. Morales's late and partial switch can be best explained with regard to these changes in the correlation of social and business forces.

7.6 Conclusion

This chapter studied the presidency of Evo Morales, who is generally considered an example of a non-switching left populist. An overview of Morales' candidacy reveals that he promised radical reforms in line with social movement demands. Furthermore, analysis of his first term finds that Morales honoured a number of key promises. However, Morales' 'switch' began after he had survived fierce resistance from elites and strengthened his position via electoral victories in 2009. An in-depth study of the TIPNIS conflict reveals that Unity Pact were movements not created equal.

When the wishes of his core *cocalero*/peasant base clashed with those of the indigenous movements, Morales switched in an attempt to force the project through. This switch in turn led Morales to abandon many of his former policy commitments. As discussed in this chapter, these findings contain important lessons for our understanding of when and how policy switching occurs.

Conclusion

This chapter will summarise and draw together the most significant insights, arguments and findings of this research. The chapter will begin by restating the puzzle and central argument of this thesis. It will proceed to outline the main findings from the case studies, drawing them together in a comparative analysis. The chapter will go on to explore the implications of this research, and the contribution this thesis makes to the study of policy switching, left populists, elites and social movements in contemporary Latin America. The final section will consider potential areas for future research, based on the findings of this thesis.

Left Populist Switching and Civil Society in Latin America

The goal of this thesis is to answer the question of why some left populists in Latin America 'switch' on their electoral mandates, while others do not. On its face this question appears a simple one. However, on closer inspection, it raises a number of supplementary questions regarding the precise nature of left populism and switching in Latin America. For example, the question of who these left populists are is extremely challenging, given the confusing and highly normative nature of the concept of Latin American populism. Even where consensus exists regarding who the left populists are, there is divergence regarding what is populist about them or their policy platform. This thesis has developed a framework for identifying left populist electoral offerings in the context of contemporary Latin America which provides a systematic basis for identifying left populists, and serves as a starting point for comparison.

Similarly, the concept of switching is ambiguous, and is usually restricted in a way that clouds our understanding of presidents' behaviour. This thesis has provided some tools to help overcome these issues. In particular, this thesis has 'unpacked' switching in three ways. Firstly, this thesis has expanded the scope of policy switching beyond the strict confines of macro-economic policy that is more typical in this literature (Stokes, 2001; Campello, 2014). Secondly, this thesis considers switching behaviour over a longer time frame than the one-year limit commonly utilised. Finally, rather than stick rigidly to the binary switch/no switch approach of prior studies, this thesis adopts a more nuanced approach with a view to more accurately reflecting the performance of left populists in power. The in-depth qualitative approach adopted by this thesis reveals that switching is more complex than portrayed in the existing literature.

Furthermore, this analysis highlights the limitations of existing explanations for policy switching. These tend to privilege macro-economic factors, while also pointing to the strength or weakness of

institutions as a permissive condition. However, left populist presidents typically front personalistic or poorly organised political parties; they eschew traditional institutional constraints; and they switch even amid favourable economic conditions. This thesis instead proposes an original explanation for switching by left populist presidents in contemporary Latin America.

The central argument of this thesis is that variations in social pressure from mobilised and broadly articulated civil society influences policy switching by left populists. This theory builds on scholarship relating to political accountability in Latin America (O'Donnell, 1999) and in particular, the concept of 'societal accountability' developed by Smulovitz and Peruzzotti (2000). These authors propose that civil society mobilisation acts as a form of non-institutional accountability in Latin America. A similar argument is made in the literature regarding presidential ousters (Valenzuela, 2004; Hochstetler, 2006; Marsteintredet & Berntzen, 2008; Pérez-Linan, 2007). As a result, mobilised civil society is viewed as the new "moderating power" for Latin American presidents in the contemporary period (Hochstetler & Friedman, 2008: 7; Philip & Panizza, 2011: 41). Nevertheless, the influence of social mobilisation is acknowledged to be contingent on specific circumstances (Amenta, 2014: 18). This thesis builds on this literature, and also draws from the literature on Latin American populism, to argue that left populists are particularly vulnerable to pressures of this kind. These presidents typically take power with little or no organised party support, and often face an oppositional legislature, with the result that social mobilisation poses an existential threat.

From the perspective of the social movements, similarly particular circumstances are required in order for the pressure exerted by mobilisation to succeed in conditioning left populists to honour key electoral promises. Social movement theory focuses on three main conditions for movement success: political openings, organisational structures, and framing processes (McCarthy et al, 1999). The formation of horizontal linkages in order to articulate demands and strategies across movements is another key feature in producing the kind of sustained mobilisation that can moderate presidents' behaviour (Hochstetler, 2006; Philip & Panizza, 2011: 49). This kind of articulation was noted by Silva (2009) as a key feature of the waves of contention in Latin America that brought many leftist presidents to power. This thesis considers whether and to what extent these elements persisted in the post-electoral period.

On the basis of the above, the expectation was that where left populists came under pressure via sustained mobilisation from a broadly articulated social sector, switching was less likely to occur. However, where civil society was not mobilised or fragmented, or where mobilisation was geographically or thematically specific, switching by left populists was more likely, including the

possibility of switching in some policy areas but not in others. An extension of this logic is that if levels of mobilisation or articulation recede, late switching is likely to occur.

Two other factors are identified as relevant. Firstly, where elite interests are highly articulated and organised, switching becomes more likely. This path of accommodation with domestic and international elites brought risk in the form of social mobilisation; the path of change similarly carried risks, but also offered opportunities, including enhanced powers via institutional reform and potential re-election. This highlights a second factor, that left populist presidents might ultimately supplant movements by giving movement demands a state form. This in turn could de-mobilise or disarticulate social movements, opening up the possibility of a late switch.

The Findings

The main findings of this thesis relate both to policy switching and the influence of civil society. These will be considered in turn.

1. Policy Switching:

This thesis makes three main findings with regard to policy switching by left populist presidents in Latin America. Firstly, the case studies reveal the existence of partial switches, where presidents substantially honoured some elections promises but abandoned others. In Ecuador, Rafael Correa followed through on a key pledge to convoke a constituent assembly, along with increasing public spending in certain areas, but abandoned promises for agrarian reform and food sovereignty. Regarding Correa's predecessor Lucio Gutiérrez, while he abandoned key promises in the economic sphere, some attempts were made at honouring promises on social policy and the management of natural resources. Furthermore, Gutiérrez's ouster came on foot of his attempts to fulfil electoral promises relating to politico-institutional reform. Similarly in Peru, Ollanta Humala introduced a tax on windfall mining profits and passed a prior consultation law, but abandoned promises to prioritise water over minerals, and resolve conflicts via dialogue. In Bolivia, Evo Morales has remained committed to promises that benefit his *cocalero* and peasant base, but in other areas has dropped or reversed reforms. These findings reveal that policy switching is not a binary concept but is in fact far more complex.

Secondly, this thesis finds that switching and non-switching are not only matters of broad macro-economics. For example, while Evo Morales and Rafael Correa adopted and to some degree adhered to post-neoliberal economic approaches in line with their programmes for government, they switched in other areas. Correa gradually abandoned and later undermined food sovereignty, while

Morales effectively reversed himself on issues of land use and indigenous rights. Although Humala and Gutiérrez moved away from their original economic platforms, they implemented portions of their programmes in other sectors. This finding highlights the need to conceive of switching beyond the realm of macro-economic policy.

Thirdly, the case studies reveal that switching does not only occur during the early stages of a presidency, and often occurs much later. Take for example the case of Evo Morales, who fulfilled many election promises during his first term in office, but thereafter halted and in some cases reversed those policies during his second term. The analysis of Rafael Correa reveals a similar pattern, with his programmatic commitment to substantive reform waning over time. The analysis of food sovereignty policy is a good example of this dynamic. Furthermore, it took more than a year for Ollanta Humala's switch to be cemented, while the chaotic policy direction under Lucio Gutiérrez meant that elements of switching and non-switching remained to the end of his truncated presidency.

Limiting analysis of switching to the start of a presidency also means that instances where presidents switch away from and later switch back to their original policy platforms will not be captured. The example of this phenomenon is the case of Lucio Gutiérrez, who somewhat unevenly moved away from key promises during his first years in office, but later sought to reverse his switch and reclaim his original programme for radical political reform. This thesis therefore finds that switching does not occur only once nor only in one direction, further emphasising the importance of a more nuanced view of switching. These findings reinforce the importance of analysing presidencies as a whole rather than an arbitrarily limited period.

2. The Influence of Civil Society:

This thesis finds strong evidence to support its central contention that pressure from mobilised and articulated civil society was a key determinant of switching and non-switching by left populist presidents in Latin America. More specifically, there are five main findings relating to the overall causal mechanism proposed by this thesis. These findings relate not only to civil society movements, but also to presidents and business elites.

Firstly, Latin American left populist presidents tend to be portrayed as strident figures, incapable of compromise and unwilling to respect the rules of the game (Conaghan, 2011; Philip & Panizza, 2011; De la Torre, 2013c). Yet this thesis finds that all four of the left populist presidents studied began their terms as 'vulnerable targets'. None fronted a well-institutionalised political party. While there was some variation between the pure electoral vehicles assembled by Humala, Correa and

Gutierrez, and the political instrument headed by Morales, all four were held together by the figure of the leader and lacked a clear ideology. All four presidents began their terms with limited formal powers and faced trenchant resistance opposition parties. Accordingly these presidents were vulnerable both to elite co-option and to social movement pressure, and were required to choose a path. Nevertheless, this thesis also finds that the presidents that avoided switching in the early parts of their presidencies – Correa and Morales – succeeded in securing not only survival but increased formal powers and legitimacy that significantly decreased their vulnerability. This change in turn allowed them to gradually switch in different policy areas and over time.

Secondly, this thesis finds that civil society movements were motivated primarily by the programmes for government put forward by left populist presidents rather than their personal appeal. As the work of Silva (2009), Roberts (2008) and others has demonstrated, mobilised social movements did more than pave the way for the election of left populists in Latin America, they also provided ideational foundations (Kirby & Cannon, 2012). This thesis finds that policy proposals that emanated from civil society formed the bases of the electoral programmes put forward by all four presidents studied, and in some cases extended to active participation in writing those programmes. This finding is significant because it helps to explaining why social movements provided support to these presidents, both during and after the campaign, despite frequently harbouring doubts about the candidates. This runs contrary to the predominant view in the literature that assume that movements were motivated by the discourse and figure of the president. This finding emphasises that utilising the lens of policy switching gives this thesis more explanatory power than approaches which centre on the figure of the president.

Thirdly, all four cases reveal that social sectors were overtly conscious of the need to maintain social pressure on the president that they had helped to elect. With Gutierrez, the indigenous movement attempted to apply this pressure from within the government with little success, while trade unions gained some concessions via protest. Learning lessons from that experience, social movements were careful to target Correa during mass mobilisations in support of a ‘full powers’ constituent assembly. In the case of Humala, anti-mining activists were clear that in the absence of an institutionalised party, social pressure via mobilisation was the only available method for influencing policy. As the president most closely linked to movements, Morales was not spared this pressure, with social leaders keen to remind him that others could be put in his place if he failed to deliver on key demands.

Fourthly, this thesis finds that the ability of social movements to achieve that goal was contingent on other factors beyond just mobilisation. In particular, this study finds that a crucial factor was articulation across a broad swathe of civil society. According to Silva, the more broadly articulated

the movement, the greater its influence (2009). Thus mobilisation by a broadly articulated front of civil society actors brought significant pressure to bear on vulnerable presidents. Although Peru experienced high indices of social protest during Humala's presidency, it was confined to specific regions or issues. Gutiérrez took office at a time of high mobilisation by social movements, but his pact with the indigenous movement effectively disarticulated civil society. By contrast, Correa and Morales were confronted with social sectors that were both mobilised and articulated. Furthermore, social movements were highly sensitive to signs of switching and remained so throughout the first terms of both presidents – the period during which they largely fulfilled their electoral promises.

Finally, this thesis finds that the influence exercised by social movements must be considered in relation to other actors, in particular business. Regarding elites, the extent of that influence varied by country and over time and depended also on the level of articulation between business interests. The clearest example of this dynamic was the influence exercised by highly articulated, centralised and pragmatic business sector in Peru. This situation enabled elites to gain huge influence over the Humala government. By contrast, business interests in Ecuador were divided along regional lines. While Gutiérrez sought to placate those interests, Correa succeeded in deepening those divisions to ensure his political survival. Furthermore, in Bolivia business opposition was initially overlaid with racist and nationalist tendencies that made accommodation with Morales highly problematic. This situation began to alter following Morales' re-election.

The correlation of forces in each country was decisive in determining whether or not these presidents switched. Unthreatened by national movements and confronted by a powerful business lobby seeking accommodation rather than his ouster, Humala's was a slow-moving switch up to the point that the Conga Mines conflict forced him to make a clear choice. Gutiérrez's policy preferences altered in response to shifts in pressure from movements and elites, but his attempt to switch back to his original platform and strengthen his position led to his ouster. On the other hand, both Correa and Morales faced social movements that remained sufficiently united to ensure the realisation of key demands. Taken as a whole, this thesis finds strong evidence to support its central contention that policy switching by left populist presidents in Latin America can only be fully understood by taking into account the pressure exerted by mobilised and broadly articulated social movements.

Implications for the Literature on Switching, Left Populists and Social Movements

The findings of this thesis have implications for the study of policy switching, left populist presidents, elites and social movements in Latin America.

(i) The Concept of Switching:

This thesis represents the first systematic qualitative analysis of switching in Latin America from a comparative perspective. The implications of these findings for the study of switching are significant. Indeed, the findings call into question the usefulness of the concept as previously operationalised. Previous studies of policy switching in Latin America have imposed a number of artificial restrictions that were primarily motivated by the authors' preference for large-N comparative analyses using quantitative methodologies. Yet in choosing to limit the time period and policy spectrum studied, and in reducing all outcomes to a binary switch/non-switch, this literature arguably loses not only depth but accuracy, thereby undermining its claims for generalisability.

The findings of this thesis suggest that this conception fails to capture at least three kinds of switching behaviour. Firstly, there are 'partial' switches, when presidents abandon parts of their electoral mandate but fulfil others. The exclusive focus on macroeconomic policy employed in the literature on policy switching means that switches and non-switches in other policy areas are not considered. As the findings of this thesis indicate, however, macroeconomic policies are not necessarily reliable proxy variables for the study and classification of a presidency. In the particular context of the contemporary left in Latin America, the central electoral offerings prioritised substantive politico-institutional reform over economic factors.

Secondly, there are 'late' switches that occur when the correlation of forces facing a president change substantially, either permitting or forcing them to switch. While the primary motivation for this time limit is to avoid issues of continuous coding (Campello, 2014), the findings of this thesis suggest that the trade-off for this choice may be the failure to accurately assess the fulfilment of election promises. These findings point to significant changes that fall outside of the arbitrary one-year time limit most commonly used in the literature. A particular problem with this approach is that it can only reflect the fulfilment of certain kinds of promises. In particular, it privileges the honouring of electoral pledges that can be implemented via executive action and are relatively straightforward to achieve, such as increasing a poverty bond or passing a law. The context of the new left in Latin America was candidates offering significant structural reforms that by their nature required more than one year to implement.

Finally, this thesis also finds evidence of that presidents can 'switch back' and seek to pursue all or portions of their original progamme for government when the correlation of forces permits or requires it. Not only is this tendency often missed due to the timeframe in which switching is typically studied, this finding also highlights the limitations of the binary switch/non-switch

approach utilised by previous analyses. While these dynamics are difficult to capture using quantitative methodologies, nevertheless they are of crucial importance to voters and therefore to the idea of switching more generally.

These findings therefore point to the importance of adopting an in-depth qualitative approach to the study of policy switching in Latin America and underscore the importance of unpacking the concept. Examining switching and non-switching over time and across policy areas provides a more detailed and accurate picture of left populist presidents in Latin America.

Furthermore, while all approaches to the study of political phenomena suffer from limitations, the inability of the prevailing approach to account for these outcomes raises serious questions about the predominant approach to policy switching in the literature. The findings in this thesis call into question previous categorisations of presidents in Latin America as switchers and non-switchers. The limited nature of the evidence relied upon renders such determinations highly suspect. It is contended that in the absence of more in-depth analyses over longer time frames, such determinations should be treated as indicative at best.

In fact, the findings of this study raise the issue of whether the concept of switching as currently studied should be abandoned altogether. This study notes three reasons to support such an approach. Firstly, the binary approach risks the creation of misleading narratives around certain presidents that can hamper our understanding of their behaviour. Secondly, the excessive focus on economic indicators as both data source and explanatory factor raises the issue of endogeneity. Thirdly, studying Latin American presidents in this way is inherently limited, as the information it provides is confined to the early period of a president's term, and assumes that tendencies demonstrated during that period are determinative. These shortcomings underscore the need switching to be understood as a complex political phenomenon that requires an in-depth qualitative approach.

(ii) Presidents:

With regard to the study of these presidents, this thesis contributes to an existing literature that goes beyond the study of formal institutional powers to consider the other factors that influence behaviour. The context of Latin America is a suitable testing-ground for studies of this nature, given the acknowledged fragility of institutions (Weyland, 2002b) and the influence of *de facto* powers (Roberts, 2006). More recent scholarship has tended to frame these analyses in terms of the wider political economy, typically categorised as 'post-neoliberal' governments (Grugel & Riggirozzi, 2012; Kennemore & Weeks, 2011; Ramírez Gallegos, 2015). Other authors have advocated the use of a relational approach to understanding the dynamics of leftist governance in

contemporary Latin America (Silva, 2009; Hunt, 2016). This thesis builds upon this literature with a systematic comparative analysis of the influence of non-institutional actors on specific policy areas and strategic decisions.

In spite of these recognised traits of polities in the region, relatively little scholarly attention has been paid to these non-institutional influences on presidents. This relative lacuna is due in large part to the predominance of the concept of populism in accounting for the behaviour of presidents that are elected with little institutionalised party support, or in countries like the Andean region which have generally weak or collapsing party systems. Yet as this thesis has demonstrated, the concept of populism in Latin America frequently serves to obscure underlying dynamics due to its confusing nature, normative baggage, and excessive focus on the figure of the president.

The findings of this thesis raise questions regarding assumptions inherent to the study of 'left populists'. For example, by developing a clear framework with which to evaluate whether an electoral platform may be properly classified as left populist in the contemporary Latin American context, the similarities between the electoral offerings of these four presidents becomes clear, and include a tendency to moderate the tone and content of their offerings during the campaign. These findings challenge the assumption of automatic continuity between a populist election campaign and populist governance. Instead we can observe that left populists make political calculations and respond to the correlation of forces they face, both during and after the electoral period. Similarly, this thesis addresses a tendency to re-classify such leaders as non-populist. Instead, it finds, they should be analysed in the context of their fulfilment of their electoral promises via public policy.

Finally, this thesis finds that contrary to how they are typically portrayed in the literature, left populist leaders should be thought of as vulnerable presidents, in particular at the commencement of their time in office. While typically portrayed in 'strongman' terms, as leaders that refuse to yield to pressure, this thesis reveals that this is often not the case. These leaders typically take office with little or no legislative support, forcing them to forge alliances. The question of which actors they choose to ally with is key to deciding whether or not they switch, and their subsequent political legacies. These findings demonstrate that far from being uniquely uncompromising political figures, left populists respond to the correlation of forces that confront them.

Overall, the findings of this thesis point to the importance for scholars in going beyond the discourse and image of presidents to examine their policy output and consider the actors that stand to benefit from those policies.

(iii) Elites:

This thesis does not discount the influence of macro-economic factors, international financial institutions, and transnational corporations over policy in these countries. The economic power of China in relation to these three countries, for example, has risen significantly during the period being studied (Grugel & Riggirozzi, 2012). Nevertheless, the similarities between the political economies of the selected countries means that such pressures would be expected to be reasonably constant. Furthermore, the findings of this thesis indicate that domestic political and economic dynamics appear to more directly impact policy outcomes in these countries. All four presidents responded to the influence of business elites, although the timing and form of their accommodation varied significantly.

The literature on switching notes the influence of international and domestic business actors on presidents during the period between election and inauguration (Stokes, 2001). Recent scholarship has extended this analysis to focus on the influence of business elites on government in Latin America – and in particular left populists (Ramírez Gallegos, 2015; Wolff, 2016) – over a longer time period (Fairfield, 2015; Crabtree & Durand, 2017). This thesis builds upon these studies by further contributing to our understanding of the mechanisms for influencing policy in different sectors such as agribusiness. Furthermore, the findings of this thesis highlight the need to closely examine the dynamics of business elites in comparative context. Business is not monolithic, and its influence varies across countries and over time. In particular, the level of articulation and choice of tactics are key elements that determine the extent of that influence. This thesis has found evidence of a variety of approaches to left populist presidents, covering both organised channels and direct contact by individual companies. Among the tactics employed were: campaign donations, private meetings, and the provision of perks, but also notes a degree of congruence around extractivism that helped open channels for collaboration.

(iv) Civil Society:

The findings of this thesis indicate that the variation in switching behaviour by the presidents studied was largely conditioned by levels of articulation and mobilisation within civil society. This thesis therefore also has implications for the study of social movements in Latin America. In general terms, this thesis finds evidence that all three of the central foci of social movement theory (McCarthy et al, 1999) – political opportunities, mobilisation structures and framing processes – impacted on switching behaviour in the cases studied. Nevertheless, the findings regarding the manner, order and importance of their impact on policy outcomes have implications for our understanding of social movements.

While some recent studies have focussed on the relationship between movements and left populist governments (Prevost el al, 2012), much of the scholarship has used the framework of the 'second incorporation' (Roberts, 2008; Silva, 2017; Silva & Rossi, 2018) that applies a predominantly top-down perspective. The findings of this thesis indicate a need to consider the interaction between movements and these leaders as more dynamic. In this way this thesis also builds upon recent literature regarding the political impacts of social movements (Amenta, 2014).

A political mediation approach indicates that the support of social movements is important to left populist presidents during election campaigns, with all four of the presidents studied entering into formal agreements with sections of civil society. The value of such agreements in the post-election period depends however on the ability of movements to bring pressure to bear on those presidents of an order as to override other influences. This was particularly the case during the early stages when the presidents studied were more vulnerable and in need of support. Thus the political opportunity for movements was greater in cases of left populist presidents on either side of an election.

These findings suggest that the most important factor from the point of view of movements was the level of articulation. In cases where a broad range of civil society actors united behind common demands and were prepared to mobilise in support of them, presidents were more likely to fulfil promises. This finding highlights the importance of framing and brokerage mechanisms not only in terms of formulating shared demands, but in organising in the face of strong resistance from elite interests and maintaining social pressure even on 'friendly' presidents.

Another key implication of these findings is that the apparent political opportunity presented by vulnerable left populist presidents can also pose an existential threat to the social movements themselves. The findings in the cases of Correa and Morales suggest that as these presidents strengthened their positions, some movements came to be viewed as obstacles rather than building blocks. Yet a crucial element of these changes was the growing division within and between movements. Differences about how to relate to these presidents, and power more generally, saw fractures emerge. Both presidents took advantage of emerging divisions, or actively created them where none existed, in order to neutralise the threat they posed.

Future Research

While it is difficult to make broad generalisations on the basis of four cases in three countries, the findings of this research could nonetheless serve as the basis for future research. With regard to the political influence of civil society, this study could be replicated in other small-n studies in Latin

America or, with some changes, in other parts of the world. The nexus between civil society and politics is an increasingly prevalent global phenomenon. Contemporary examples include the environmental movement – which plays a role in both institutionalised and non-institutionalised forms; international movements for gender rights and representation; and social mobilisations around issues of race equality. While social media and other technology have facilitated transnational linkages across global civil society, the roots of these movements remain in the national arena (Silva, 2013). This thesis provides the means to better understand the dynamics of that relationship, and in particular the challenge of building and maintaining influence over political actors, that can be applied to other contexts.

This thesis also provides a framework for more qualitative analyses of policy switching in Latin America. While Cunha et al (2013) use qualitative methods, their approach mirrors follows that used elsewhere in the literature. Furthermore, there is an absence of comparative case study analyses. The approach used in this thesis could be applied to other comparative cases within the region, including historical analyses of past switches. Furthermore, the approach taken of unpacking switching also opens up possibilities for other single-case studies that examine switching in close detail over time and across policy sectors. This latter approach could feasibly be applied to the study of politics in other parts of the world.

Furthermore, the findings of this thesis could also provide the basis for the wider study of politics in Latin America. While the 'pink tide' in the region has begun to recede, some leftist governments remain. Furthermore, the election of leftist Andres Manuel López Obrador in Mexico indicates that left populist governance may remain a factor in Latin American politics. More broadly, the institutional, social and economic impacts of left populist presidents in these countries persist. This thesis provides some bases for continued research into those impacts. Additionally, the decade-plus reign of leftist presidents across the region has left a series of puzzles that remain unexplained, among them the interactions between presidents and non-institutional actors. This thesis charts a path for studying the underlying power dynamics of left populist governance while avoiding the historic confusion associated with that concept in Latin American politics.

While this thesis has focussed primarily on the influence of social movements, politics in Latin America increasingly happens outside its formal institutional pathways. The political influence of the military in the region remains strong and is frequently exercised to defend unpopular extractive projects. Meanwhile the scale and influence of the drugs trade is growing, creating new actors and elites that are in turn seeking to play a role in the political game. These are dynamics that are relatively under-studied, and for which this thesis can provide building blocks. Finally, if suitably adapted, the findings and framework of this thesis could be applied to the study of right-wing

presidential populism. The election of superficially populist presidents such as Donald Trump in the US, Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines, and Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil, point to the need for further studies that go beyond the discourse and figure of the president to examine the actors that sustain and influence them.

Bibliography

Abente-Brun, Diego, 2009. 'Paraguay: The Unraveling of One-Party Rule,' Journal of Democracy 20(1): 143-156.

Aberbach, Joel D., and Bert A. Rockman, 2002. 'Conducting and coding elite interviews,' Political Science & Politics 35(4): 673-676.

Achtenberg, Emily, 2011. 'Road Rage and Resistance: Bolivia's TIPNIS Conflict', NACLA Report on the Americas 44(6): 3-4.

Achtenberg, Emily, 2013. 'Contested Development: The Geopolitics of Bolivia's TIPNIS Conflict', NACLA Report on the Americas 46(2): 6-10.

Achtenberg, Emily, 2017. 'Why is Evo Morales Reviving Bolivia's Controversial TIPNIS Road?,' Rebel Currents, 21 August. Available at: https://nacla.org/blog/2017/08/22/why-evo-morales-reviving-bolivia%E2%80%99s-controversial-tipnis-road, [10 September 2018].

Acosta, Alberto, 2005. 'Ecuador: ecos de la rebelión de los forajidos', Nueva Sociedad 98: 42-54.

Acosta, Alberto, 2008. 'El Buen Vivir, una oportunidad para construir,' Ecuador Debate 75: 33-48.

Acosta, Alberto, 2009. 'Ecuador: A propósito de un veto contradictorio. Sobre la ley de soberanía alimentaria,' Rebelión, 5 May. Available at: http://www.rebelion.org/noticia.php?id=84851, [12 May 2017].

Acosta, Alberto, 2013. 'A modo de prólogo: El correísmo – Un nuevo modelo de dominación burguesa,' in Juan Cuvi, Decio Machado, Atawallpa Oviedo and Natalia Sierra (eds.), El Correísmo al Desnudo. Quito: Montecristi Vive.

Almaraz, Alejandro, 2014. 'Hilarión Mamani y la Ley de Minería,' Semanario Aquí, 9 April. Available at: http://www.semanarioaqui.com/index.php/opinion1/2483-hilarion-mamani-y-la-ley-de-mineria, [8 September 2018].

Alpert, Alexandra, Miguel Centellas, and Matthew M. Singer, 2010. 'The 2009 presidential and legislative elections in Bolivia,' Electoral Studies 29: 757-761.

Amenta, Edwin, 2014. 'How to analyse the influence of social movements,' Contemporary Sociology 43(1): 16-29.

Amenta, Edwin, Neal Caren, Elizabeth Chiarello, and Yang Su, 2010. 'The Political Consequences of Social Movements,' Annual Review of Sociology 36: 287-307.

Andrade, Pablo, 2005. Constitucionalismo autoritario: Los regímenes contemporáneos en la Región Andina. Quito: Corporación Editorial Nacional.

Andrade, Pablo, 2015. 'El Gobierno de la Naturaleza: La gobernanza ambiental posneoliberal en Bolivia y Ecuador,' in Fabio de Castro, Barbara Hogenboom and Michiel Baud (eds.), Gobernanza Ambiental en América Latina. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Anria, Santiago, 2016. 'More Inclusion, Less Liberalism in Bolivia,' Journal of Democracy 27(3): 99-108.

Araujo, Saulo, 2010. 'The Promise and Challenges of Food Sovereignty Policies in Latin America,' Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal 13: 493-506.

Arce, Moisés, 2015. La extracción de recursos naturales y la protesta social en el Perú. Lima: Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Archondo, Rafael, 2007. 'La ruta de Evo Morales,' Nueva Sociedad 209: 82-100.

Arnson, Cynthia J., 2007. 'Introduction,' in Cynthia J. Arnson with José Raúl Perales, (eds.), The New Left and Democratic Governance in Latin America. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Arrojo Agudo, Pedro, 2012. Informe sobre la Gran Marcha Nacional por el Derecho al Agua en Perú. Misión de Observación Internacional en la Marcha por el Derecho al Agua.

Arze Vargas, Carlos, and Javier Gómez, 2013. 'Bolivia: El "proceso de cambio" nos conduce al Vivir Bien?,' in Promesas en su laberinto: Cambios y continuidades en los gobiernos progresistas de América Latina. Quito: El Fuego y La Palabra.

Ávila Paulette, Diana, 2012. ‘Perú: Mirando a la izquierda,’ América Latina en Movimiento, 475: 21-24.

Avilés, William, and Yolima Rey Rosas, 2017. ‘Low-Intensity Democracy and Peru’s Neoliberal State: The Case of the Humala Administration,’ Latin American Perspectives 44(5): 162-182.

Barr, Robert R., 2003. ‘The Persistence of Neopopulism in Peru? From Fujimori to Toledo,’ Third World Quarterly 24(6): 1161-1178.

Barr, Robert R., 2009. ‘Populists, Outsiders and Anti-Establishment Politics,’ Party Politics 15(1): 29-48.

Barrera, Augusto, 2004. Entre la Utopía y el Desencanto: Pachakutik en el Gobierno de Gutiérrez. Quito: Editorial Planeta del Ecuador.

Barrett, Patrick, Daniel Chávez and Cesar Rodríguez-Garavito, 2008. The New Latin American Left: Utopia Reborn. London: Pluto Press.

Beamer, Glenn. ‘Elite Interviews and State Politics Research,’ State Politics & Policy Quarterly 2(1): 86-96.

Bebbington, Anthony, 2012. Social Conflict, Economic Development and Extractive Industry: Evidence from South America. New York/London: Routledge.

Becker, Marc, 2011. ‘Correa, Indigenous Movements, and the Writing of a New Constitution in Ecuador,’ Latin American Perspectives 38(1): 47-62.

Becker, Marc, 2012: ‘Social movements and the government of Rafael Correa: confrontation or cooperation?,’ in Gary Prevost, Carlos Oliva Campos, and Harry E. Vanden (eds.), Social Movements and Leftist Governments in Latin America. London/New York: Zed Books.

Becker, Marc, 2013a. ‘The stormy relations between Rafael Correa and social movements in Ecuador,’ Latin American Perspectives 40(3): 43-62.

Becker, Marc, 2013b. ‘Ecuador’s *Buen Vivir* Socialism,’ in Roger Burbach, Michael Fox, and Federico Fuentes (eds.), Latin America’s Turbulent Transitions: The Future of Twenty-First Century Socialism. London/New York: Zed Books.

Becker, Marc, 2015. ¡Pachakutik! Movimientos indígenas, proyectos políticos y disputas electorales en el Ecuador. Quito: FLACSO/Abya-Yala.

Beckerman, Paul, and Andres Solimano, 2002. Crisis and dollarisation in Ecuador: Stability, growth, and social equity. Washington DC: World Bank Publications.

Bejarano, Ana Maria, 2006. 'Stuck in the "Gray Zone": States, Societies, and Democracy in the Andes – A Review Essay,' Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies 31(62): 259-274.

Bejarano, Ana Maria, 2013. 'Politicising Insecurity: Uribe's Instrumental Use of Populism,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bernal, Angélica M., 2014. 'The Meaning and Perils of Presidential Refounding in Latin America,' Constellations 21(4): 440-456.

Bowen, James D., 2010. 'Ecuador's 2009 presidential and legislative elections,' Electoral Studies 29: 171-195.

Brading, Ryan, 2014. 'From Passive to Radical Revolution in Venezuela's Populist Project,' Latin American Perspectives 41(6): 48-64.

Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke, 2013. Successful Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide for Beginners. London: Sage Publications.

Burbach, Roger, Michael Fox, and Federico Fuentes, 2013. Latin America's Turbulent Transitions: The Future of Twenty-First Century Socialism. London/New York: Zed Books.

Burbano, Felipe, 1998. El Fantasma del Populismo: Aproximación a un tema (siempre) actual. Caracas: Editorial Nueva Sociedad.

Burbano, Felipe, 2002. 'El nacimiento de un nuevo sujeto político,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 15: 6-10.

Burron, Neil, 2012. 'Ollanta Humala and the Peruvian Conjuncture: Democratic Expansion or "Inclusive" Neoliberal Redux?,' Latin American Perspectives 39(1): 133-139.

Buxton, Julia, 2003. 'Economic policy and the rise of Hugo Chávez,' in Steve Ellner and Daniel Hellinger (eds.), Venezuelan Politics in the Chávez Era: Class, Polarisation and Conflict. London/Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Cameron, Maxwell A., 2007. 'Peru's Ollanta Humala: The Rise and Limits of a Left-Wing Political Outsider.' LASA Paper. Available at: http://works.bepress.com/maxwell_a_cameron/5, [26 October 2018].

Cameron, Maxwell A., 2009. 'Latin America's Left Turns: Beyond Good and Bad,' Third World Quarterly 30(2): 331-348.

Cameron, Maxwell A., 2014. 'Book Review: Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century,' Journal of Latin American Studies 46(4): 787-789.

Cameron, Maxwell A., and Eric Hershberg, 2010. Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner.

Cammack, Paul, 2000. 'The Resurgence of Populism in Latin America,' Bulletin of Latin American Research, 19: 149-161.

Campello, Daniela, 2014. 'The Politics of Financial Booms and Crises: Evidence from Latin America,' Comparative Political Studies 47(2): 260-286.

Cannon, Barry, 2009. Hugo Chávez and the Bolivarian Revolution: Populism and Democracy in a Globalised Age. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.

Cannon, Barry, and Peadar Kirby. 2012. Civil Society and the State in Left-Led Latin America: Challenges and Limitations to Democratisation. London/New York: Zed Books.

Canovan, Margaret, 1999. 'Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy,' Political Studies, 47: 2-16.

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, 2006. 'More than Ideology,' Harvard International Review, 28(2): 14-17.

Caritas Boliviana, 2013. Resultados de la visita al TIPNIS. Como se realizó la 'consulta' del Gobierno? Informe de la Comisión Interinstitucional Iglesia Católica y Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos de Bolivia. La Paz: Pastoral Social Caritas Bolivia.

Carrión, Diego, 2013. 'Estructura agrícola y modelo de acumulación en el Ecuador: interacción entre campesinos, agroindustria y Estado,' in Francisco Hidalgo, Pierril Lacroix, and Paola Román (eds.), Comercialización y Soberanía Alimentaria. Quito: SIPAE.

Carrión, Diego, and Stalin Herrera, 2013. Ecuador rural del Siglo XXI: Soberanía alimentaria, inversión pública y política agraria. Quito: Instituto de Estudios Ecuatorianos.

Castañeda, Jorge G., 2006. 'Latin America's Left Turn,' Foreign Affairs, 85(3): 28-43.

Castañeda, Jorge G., and Marco A. Morales, 2007. 'The Left Turn Continues,' Brown Journal of World Affairs 13(2): 201-210.

Centellas, Miguel, 2015. 'The 2014 presidential and legislative elections in Bolivia,' Electoral Studies 38: 94-97.

Chávez Ángeles, Noelia Solange, 2012. 'Que pasó con el impuesto a las sobreganancias mineras?,' Boletín Perú Debate 1(3): 9-13.

Chehade, Omar, 2016. La Gran Usurpación: Memorias de Gobierno. Lima: Adrus Editores.

Chuji, Monica, and Nelly Shihuango, 2004. 'Indígenas amazónicas en la encrucijada', Tintají 53: 7.

Clark, Patrick, 2016. 'Can the State Foster Food Sovereignty? Insights from the Case of Ecuador,' Journal of Agrarian Change 16(2): 183-205.

Cleary, Matthew R., 2006. 'A "Left Turn" in Latin America? Explaining the Left's Resurgence,' Journal of Democracy, 17(4): 35-49.

Close, David, 2011. 'Nicaragua: The return of Daniel Ortega,' in Geraldine Lievesley and Steve Ludlam (eds.), Reclaiming Latin America: Experiments in Radical Social Democracy. London/New York: Zed Books.

Coffey, Gerard, 2002. 'Adicción al petróleo: el FMI, la deuda externa y el OCP,' Tintají 8: 4-5.

Coffey, Gerard, 2003a. 'La serpiente también es flexible,' Tintají 34: 4.

Coffey, Gerard, 2003b. 'Chao Petroecuador…,' Tintají 23: 10.

Coffey, Gerard, 2003c. 'Noche oscura en Petroecuador,' Tintají: 8-9.

Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier, 1991. Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Collins, Jennifer N., 2014. 'New Left Experiences in Bolivia and Ecuador and the Challenge to Theories of Populism,' Journal of Latin American Studies 46(1): 59-86.

Colque, Gonzalo, 2018. 'Los cocaleros en el conflicto del TIPNIS,' Cuestión Agraria 4: 125-147.

Colque, Gonzalo, Efraín Tinta and Esteban Sanjinés, 2016. Segunda Reforma Agraria: Una historia que incomoda. 2nd edition. La Paz: TIERRA.

Conaghan, Catherine, 2007a. 'Ecuador's Gamble: Can Correa Govern?,' Current History, 106(697): 77-82.

Conaghan, Catherine, 2007b. 'The 2006 presidential and congressional elections in Ecuador,' Electoral Studies 26: 823-828.

Conaghan, Catherine, 2008. 'Ecuador: Correa's Plebiscitary Presidency,' Journal of Democracy, 19(2): 46-60.

Conaghan, Catherine, 2011. 'Ecuador: Rafael Correa and the Citizens' Revolution,' in Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts (eds.), The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Conaghan, Catherine, and Carlos de la Torre, 2008. 'The Permanent Campaign of Rafael Correa: Making Ecuador's Plebiscitary Presidency,' The International Journal of Press/Politics, 13(3): 267-284.

CONAIE, 2007a. Somos poder constituyente: Mandato y Carta de Compromiso Al Presidente Rafael Correa A los pueblos y ciudadanos-as del Ecuador, Alainet, 12 February. Available at: http://www.alainet.org/active/15577 [8 March 2017].

CONAIE, 2007b. Propuesta de la CONAIE frente a la Asamblea Constituyente. Quito: CONAIE.

CONAIE, 2008. Mandato para Correa, Asociación Piatsaw, 11 March. Available at: http://piatsaw.blogspot.ie/2008/03/mandato-para-correa.html [2 May 2018].

Conga No Va, 2015. An Assessment of the Conga Mining Project in Light of World Bank Standards. Available at: http://www.conganova.com/, [12 September 2018].

Conniff, Michael L., 2012. Populism in Latin America. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Contreras Baspineiro, Alex, 2012. Coraje: Memorias de la Octava Marcha Indígena en Defensa del TIPNIS. La Paz: Industria Grafica.

Coragio, José Luis, 2004. 'Al servicio de la deuda y en contra del país', Tintají 43: 8.

Corrales, Javier, and Michael Penfold-Becerra, 2007. 'Venezuela: Crowding Out the Opposition,' Journal of Democracy 18(2): 99-113.

Correa, Rafael, 2014. Ecuador: de Banana Republic a la No República. 3rd edition. Medellín: Debolsillo.

Crabtree, John, 2013. 'From the MNR to the MAS: Populism, Parties, the State, and Social Movements in Bolivia since 1952,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Crabtree, John, 2015. 'Building Governability? Some Lessons from Morales' Bolivia,' paper presented at Congress of Latin American Studies Association (LASA), San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 27-30. Available from LASA website [10 October 2017].

Crabtree, John, and Ann Chaplin, 2013. Bolivia: Processes of Change. London/New York: Zed Books.

Crabtree, John, and Isabel Crabtree-Condor, 2012. 'The politics of extractive industries in the Central Andes,' in Anthony Bebbington (ed.), Social Conflict, Economic Development and Extractive Industry: Evidence from South America. New York/London: Routledge.

Crabtree, John, and Francisco Durand, 2017. Peru: Elite Power and Political Capture. London: Zed Books.

Crandall, Russell, and Akilah Jenga, 2004. 'New Complications in the Andes,' Strategic Survey 104(1): 84-99.

Cunha Filho, Clayton M., André Luiz Coelho, and Fidel I. Pérez Flores, 2013. 'A Right-to-Left Policy Switch? An Analysis of the Honduran Case under Manuel Zelaya,' International Political Science Review 34(5): 519-542.

Dargent, Eduardo, and Paula Muñoz, 2012. 'Perú 2011: Continuidades y cambios en la política sin partidos,' Revista de Ciencia Política 32(1): 245-268.

Dávalos, Pablo, 2006a. 'De las sombras en el espejo: Una deconstrucción necesaria a propósito de la candidatura de Rafael Correa,' Llacta, 11 May. Available at: http://www.llacta.org/notic/2006/not0511f.htm, [19 November 2016].

Dávalos, Pablo, 2006b. 'Elecciones en Ecuador: de la izquierda y los fuegos de artificio,' Revista Mariategui, 10 October. Available at: http://www.nodo50.org/mariategui/eleccionesecuador-entreizqu.htm, [13 April 2017].

Dávalos, Pablo, 2006c. 'Alianza Pais y la política como simulacro,' Alainet, 4 July. Availabe at: http://www.alainet.org/es/active/12119, [13 April 2017].

Dávalos, Pablo, 2016. Alianza PAIS o la reinvención del poder: Siete ensayos sobre el posneoliberalismo en el Ecuador. Bogotá: Desde abajo.

Davies, Philip H.J., 2001. 'Spies as Informants: Triangulation and the Interpretation of Elite Interview Data in the Study of the Intelligence and Security Services,' Politics 21(1): 73-80.

Davila, Luis Ricardo, 2000. 'The rise and fall and rise of populism in Venezuela,' Bulletin of Latin American Research 19: 223-238.

De Echave, José, 2011. La minería peruana y los escenarios de transición. Lima: CooperAcción.

De Echave, José, and Alejandro Diez, 2013. Más allá de Conga. Lima: RedGE/ CooperAcción.

Defensoría del Pueblo, 2011. Informe Defensorial: Respecto a la violación de los derechos humanos en la Marcha Indígena. La Paz: Defensoría del Pueblo.

Deheza, Grace Ivana, 2007. 'Bolivia 2006: reforma estatal y construcción del poder,' Revista de ciencia política 27(ESP): 43-57.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2007. 'The Resurgence of Radical Populism in Latin America,' Constellations 14(3): 384-397.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2010. Populist Seduction in Latin America. Athens: Ohio University Press.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2013a. 'El Tecnopopulismo de Rafael Correa: ¿Es Compatible el Carisma con la Tecnocracia?' Latin American Research Review 48(1): 24-43.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2013b. 'In the Name of the People: Democratisation, Popular Organisations, and Populism in Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador,' European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies 95: 27-48.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2013c. 'El Populismo Latinoamericano, Entre la Democratización y el Autoritarismo,' Nueva Sociedad 247: 1-17.

De la Torre, Carlos, 2015. De Velasco a Correa: Insurrecciones, populismos y elecciones en Ecuador, 1944-2013. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar/Corporación Editora Nacional.

De la Torre, Carlos, and Cynthia J. Arnson, 2013. Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

De la Torre, Carlos, and Catherine Conaghan, 2009. 'The Hybrid Campaign: Tradition and Modernity in Ecuador's 2006 Presidential Election,' International Journal of Press/Politics 14(3): 335-352.

De la Torre, Carlos, and Andrés Ortiz Lemos, 2016. 'Populist polarisation and the slow death of democracy in Ecuador,' Democratisation 23(2): 221-241.

Díaz, Fernanda Daniela, 2012. 'El inicio de la era Humala: Ruptura, cambio o continuidad?,' Centro de Estudios Sudamericanos: IRI Working Paper.

Do Alto, Hervé, 2011. 'Un partido campesino en el poder: una mirada sociológica del MAS boliviano,' Nueva Sociedad 234: 95-111.

Doyle, David, 2011. 'The Legitimacy of Political Institutions: Explaining Contemporary Populism in Latin America,' Comparative Political Studies 44(11): 1447-1473.

Drake, Paul W., 1991. 'Comment,' in Rudiger Dornbusch and Sebastian Edwards (eds.), The Macroeconomics of Populism in Latin America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Drake, Paul W., and Eric Hershberg, 2006. State and Society in Conflict: Comparative Perspectives on Andean Crises. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Durand, Francisco, 1998. 'Collective Action and the Empowerment of Peruvian Business,' in Francisco Durand and Eduardo Silva (eds.), Organised Business, Economic Change, and Democracy in Latin America. Coral Gables, Florida: North-South Centre Press.

Durand, Francisco, 2006. 'El Vuelo de los Cóndores: Despliegues etnonacionalistas y temores empresariales,' Nueva Sociedad 202: 143-156.

Durand, Francisco, 2010. 'Empresarios a la Presidencia,' Nueva Sociedad 225: 68-85.

Durand, Franciso, 2012. 'Punto de Vista: El Señor de los Anillos,' Con Nuestro Perú, 8 April. Available at: http://www.connuestroperu.com/actualidad/punto-de-vista/15-opinion/26029-el-senor-de-los-anillos-, [2 September 2017].

Durand, Francisco, 2016a. Cuando el Poder Extractivo Captura el Estado: Lobbies, Puertas Giratorias y Paquetazo Ambiental en Perú. Lima: Oxfam.

Durand, Francisco, 2016b. ‘Ollanta y los empresarios,’ in Perú Hoy: Ni Gran Transformación ni Hoja de Ruta. Lima: DESCO.

Eaton, Kent, 2013. ‘The Centralism of “Twenty-First-Century Socialism”: Recentralising Politics in Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia,’ Journal of Latin American Studies 45(3): 421-450.

Echevarría, Julio, 2006. El Desafío Constitucional: Crisis Institucional y Proceso Político en el Ecuador. Quito: Abya Yala.

Echevarría, Julio, 2007. ‘La democracia difícil: neopopulismo y antipolítica en Ecuador,’ Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 27: 27-35.

ECLAC, 2007. Panorama social de América Latina 2007. Santiago: Naciones Unidas.

Ecuador Decide, 2015. TLC/Acuerdo Comercial con la Unión Europea: Lo que Ecuador negocio. Quito: H&D Imprenta.

Ellner, Steve, 2003. ‘The Contrasting Variants of the Populism of Hugo Chávez and Alberto Fujimori,’ Journal of Latin American Studies 35(1): 139-162.

Ellner, Steve, 2012. ‘The Distinguishing Features of Latin America’s New Left in Power: The Chávez, Morales, and Correa Governments,’ Latin American Perspectives 39(1): 96-114.

Ellner, Steve, 2014. Latin America’s Radical Left: Challenges and Complexities of Political Power in the Twenty-First Century. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Elster, Jon, 2007. Explaining Social Behaviour: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Escobar, Arturo, and Sonia E. Álvarez, 1992. The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy and Democracy. Boulder/San Francisco/Oxford: Westview Press.

Fairfield, Tasha, 2015. ‘Structural power in comparative political economy: Perspectives from policy formulation in Latin America,’ Business and Politics 17(3): 411-441.

FAO, 2006. 'Food Security,' Policy Brief 2, June. Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/faoitaly/documents/pdf/pdf_Food_Security_Cocept_Note.pdf, [31 October 2018].

Fara, Carlos, 2005. 'Bolivia 2005: elecciones y comunicación,' Diálogo Político 28(2): 117-145.

Farthing, Linda C., and Benjamin H. Kohl, 2014. Evo's Bolivia: Continuity and Change. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fassi, Mariana C., 2010. Paraguay en su Laberinto: Qué Cambió con Fernando Lugo. Buenos Aires: Capital Intelectual.

Fernández, Roberto, 2012. 'El reacomodo del poder petrolero transnacional en Bolivia,' in La MAScarada del Poder. Cochabamba: Textos Rebeldes.

FIAN Ecuador, 2013. Monitoring Report on Land Policies and the Right to Food in Ecuador 2013. Quito: FIAN Ecuador.

FIDH, 2013. Bolivia: Informe de Verificación de la Consulta Realizada en el Territorio Indígena Parque Nacional Isiboro-Sécure. Paris: Federación Internacional de Derechos Humanos.

Flores-Macías, Gustavo A., 2010. 'Statist vs. Pro-Market: Explaining Leftist Governments' Economic Policies in Latin America,' Comparative Politics 42(4): 413-433.

Freidenberg, Flavia, 2008a. 'El Flautista de Hammelin: Liderazgo y Populismo en la Democracia Ecuatoriana,' in Carlos de la Torre and Enrique Peruzzotti (eds.), El Retorno del Pueblo: Populismo y Nuevas Democracias en América Latina. Quito: Flacso-Sede Ecuador.

Freidenberg, Flavia, 2008b. 'El Sueño Frustrado de la Gobernabilidad: Instituciones, Actores y Política Informal en Ecuador,' Documentos CIDOB: América Latina 24.

Fundación Tierra, 2012. Marcha indígena por el TIPNIS: La lucha en defensa de los territorios. La Paz: Fundación Tierra.

Gachet, Francisco, and Diego Carrión, 2014. 'Ámbito de la Economía,' in Francisco Muñoz Jaramillo (ed.), Balance Crítico del Gobierno de Rafael Correa.

Gana Perú, 2010. La Gran Transformación: Plan de Gobierno 2011-2016.

Gana Perú, 2011. Lineamientos Centrales de Política Económica y Social para un Gobierno de Concertación Nacional.

Garcés, Fernando, 2011. 'The Domestication of Indigenous Autonomies in Bolivia: From the Pact of Unity to the New Constitution,' in Nicole Fabricant and Bret Gustafson (eds.), Remapping Bolivia: Resources, Territory, and Indigeneity in a Plurinational State. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research.

García Álvarez, Santiago, 2014. 'Ámbito de la Política Económica,' in Francisco Muñoz Jaramillo (ed.), Balance Crítico del Gobierno de Rafael Correa. Quito: Universidad Central del Ecuador.

Giunta, Isabella, 2014. 'Food sovereignty in Ecuador: Peasant struggles and the challenge of institutionalisation,' Journal of Peasant Studies 41(6): 1201-1224.

Gómez, Emma, 2013. 'Continuidades y rupturas de la minería en el país,' in Raphael Hoetmer, Miguel Castro, Mar Daza, José de Echave, and Clara Ruiz (eds.), Minería y movimientos sociales en el Perú: Instrumentos y propuestas para la defensa de la vida, el agua y los territorios. Lima: PDTG.

Grompone, Romeo, and Martin Tanaka, 2009. Entre el Crecimiento Económico y la Insatisfacción Social: Las Protestas en el Perú Actual. Lima: IEP.

Grugel, Jean, and Pía Riggirozzi, 2012. 'Post-neoliberalism in Latin America: Rebuilding and reclaiming the State after crisis,' Development and Change 43(1): 1-21.

Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel, 2011. 'Los ritmos del Pachakuti: Cómo conocemos las luchas de emancipación y su relación con la política de la autonomía,' Desacatos 37: 19-32.

Guzmán, Ismael, 2012. Octava Marcha Indígena en Bolivia: Por la defensa del territorio, la vida y los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. La Paz: CIPCA.

Handlin, Samuel, and Ruth Berins Collier, 2011. 'The Diversity of Left Party Linkages and Competitive Advantages,' in Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts (eds.), The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hawkins, Kirk A., 2003. 'Populism in Venezuela: The Rise of Chavismo,' Third World Quarterly 24(6): 1137-1160.

Hawkins, Kirk A., 2009. 'Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective,' Comparative Political Studies 42(8): 1040-1067.

Helmke, Gretchen, and Steven Levitsky, 2006. Informal Institutions and Democracy: Lessons from Latin America. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hernández, Virgilio, 2004. 'Gutiérrez: el signo de la frustración,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 18: 10-17.

Hidalgo, Francisco, 2013. 'Sembrando la soberanía alimentaria en Ecuador,' in Francisco Hidalgo, Pierril Lacroix, and Paola Román (eds.), Comercialización y Soberanía Alimentaria. Quito: SIPAE.

Hochstetler, Kathryn, 2006. 'Rethinking presidentialism: Challenges and presidential falls in South America,' Comparative Politics 38(4): 401-418.

Hochstetler, Kathryn, and Elisabeth Jay Friedman, 2008. 'Can Civil Society Organisations Solve the Crisis of Partisan Representation in Latin America?,' Latin American Politics and Society 50(2): 1-32.

Hunt, Sarah, 2016. 'Rethinking the Politics of the Shift Left in Latin America: Towards a Relational Approach,' Bulletin of Latin American Research 35(4): 437-451.

Hurtado, Osvaldo, 2006. Los costos del populismo. Quito: CORDES.

ILDIS, 2003. Análisis de coyuntura económica: Primer semestre del 2003. Quito: ILDIS.

Jansen, Robert S., 2015. 'Populist Mobilisation: A New Theoretical Approach to Populism,' in Carlos de la Torre (ed.), The Promise and Perils of Populism: Global Perspectives. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Jiménez, Georgina, 2015. 'Territorios en sacrificio: Geografía del extractivismo en Bolivia,' Petropress 35: 4-21.

Johnson, Gregg B., and Sooh-Rhee Ryu, 2010. 'Repudiating or Rewarding Neoliberalism? How Broken Campaign Promises Condition Economic Voting in Latin America,' Latin American Politics and Society 52(4): 1-24.

Kaufman, Robert R., 2011. 'The Political Left, the Export Boom, and the Populist Temptation,' in Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts (eds.), The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kaufman, Robert R., and Barbara Stallings, 1991. 'The Political Economy of Latin American Populism,' in Rudiger Dornbush and Sebastian Edwards (eds.), The Macroeconomics of Populism in Latin America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kemp, Deanna, John Owen, Miguel Cervantes, Diana Arbelaez-Ruiz, and Jaime Benavides Rueda, 2013. Listening to the city of Cajamarca. Research Paper, CSRM, Sustainable Minerals Institute. Brisbane: University of Queensland

Kennemore, Amy, and Gregory Weeks, 2011. 'Twenty-First Century Socialism? The Elusive Search for a Post-Neoliberal Development Model in Bolivia and Ecuador,' Bulletin of Latin American Research 30(3): 267-281.

Knight, Alan, 1998. 'Populism and Neo-populism in Latin America, Especially Mexico,' Journal of Latin American Studies, 30: 223-248.

Kohl, Benjamin, and Linda Farthing, 2012. 'Material Constraints to Popular Imaginaries: The Extractive Economy and Resource Nationalism in Bolivia,' Political Geography 31(4): 225-235.

Laclau, Ernesto, 1977. Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory. London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto, 2005. 'Populism: What's in a Name?,' in Francisco Panizza (ed.), Populism and the Mirror of Democracy. London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto, 2006. 'La Deriva Populista y la Centroizquierda Latinoamericana,' Nueva Sociedad 205: 56-61.

Lancaster, Kari, 2017. 'Confidentiality, anonymity and power relations in elite interviewing: conducting qualitative policy research in a politicised domain,' International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 20(1): 93-103.

Lander, Edgardo, 2008. 'Venezuela. Populism and the Left: Alternatives to Neo-Liberalism,' in Patrick Barrett, Daniel Chávez and Cesar Rodríguez-Garavito (eds.), The New Latin American Left: Utopia Reborn. London: Pluto Press.

Landman, Todd, 1995. '"El Chiripero" Wins: the Venezuelan Elections of 1993,' Electoral Studies 14(1): 100-104.

Larrea, Carlos, 2006. 'Petróleo y estrategias de desarrollo en el Ecuador: 1972-2005,' in Guillaume Fontaine (ed.), Petróleo y Desarrollo Sostenible en el Ecuador (3): Las ganancias y pérdidas. Quito: FLACSO.

Larrea Maldonado, Ana María, 2004. 'El Movimiento Indígena Ecuatoriano: participación y resistencia,' OSAL 13: 67-76.

Laserna, Roberto, 2007. 'El caudillismo fragmentado,' Nueva Sociedad 209: 100-117.

Latinobarómetro, 2007. Informe, Santiago: Corporación Latinobarómetro.

Lehoucq, Fabrice, 2008. 'Bolivia's Constitutional Breakdown,' Journal of Democracy 19(4): 110-124.

Leiras, Marcelo, 2007. 'Latin America's Electoral Turn: Left, Right, and Wrong,' Constellations, 14(3): 398-408.

León, Xavier, and María Rosa Yumbla, 2010. El agronegocio en Ecuador: El caso de la cadena del maíz y la empresa Pronaca. Quito: IICD.

Lerner, Salomón, 2016. 'El quinquenio perdido: una visión antipolítica en la gestión de Humala,' in Perú Hoy: Ni Gran Transformación ni Hoja de Ruta. Lima: DESCO.

Levitsky, Steven, 2011. 'A Surprising Left Turn,' Journal of Democracy 22(4): 84-94.

Levitsky, Steven, and Maxwell A. Cameron, 2003. 'Democracy Without Parties? Political Parties and Regime Change in Fujimori's Peru,' Latin American Politics and Society 45(3): 1-33.

Levitsky, Steven, and James Loxton, 2013. 'Populism and Competitive Authoritarianism in the Andes,' Democratisation 20(1): 107-136.

Levitsky, Steven, and Kenneth M. Roberts, 2011. The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lievesley, Geraldine, 2009. 'Is Latin America moving leftwards? Problems and prospects,' in Geraldine Lievesley, and Steve Ludlam, 2009. Reclaiming Latin America: Experiments in Radical Social Democracy. London/New York: Zed Books.

Lijphart, Arend, 1971. 'Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method,' The American Political Science Review 65(3): 682-693.

Lluco, Miguel, 2004. 'La capitulación de un presidente y la ruptura de una alianza,' in Augusto Barrera (ed.), Entre la Utopía y el Desencanto: Pachakutik en el Gobierno de Gutiérrez. Quito: Editorial Planeta del Ecuador.

López, Adrian A., and Paula Cubillos Celis, 2009. 'Análisis del Referéndum Constitucional 2008 en Ecuador,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 33: 13-20.

López, Sinesio, 2012. 'Si Humala no hubiera tirado la toalla antes de pelear,' El Zorro de Abajo, 25 May. Available at: http://blog.pucp.edu.pe/blog/sinesio/2012/05/18/si-humala-no-hubiera-tirado-la-toalla-antes-de-pelear/, [9 November 2018].

López, Sinesio, 2013. Alan García: Los años del perro del hortelano. Lima: Lapix Editores.

López Maya, Margarita, 2003. 'Hugo Chávez Frías: His Movement and his Presidency,' in Steve Ellner and Daniel Hellinger (eds.), Venezuelan Politics in the Chávez Era: Class, Polarisation and Conflict. London/Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

López Maya, Margarita, 2011. 'Venezuela. Hugo Chávez and the Populist Left,' in Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts (eds.), The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

López Maya, Margarita, 2013. 'Populism, Rentierism and Socialism in the Twenty-First Century: The Case of Venezuela,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American

Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Lucas, Kintto, 2002. 'El difícil camino de la izquierda hacia el gobierno,' IPS – Inter Press Service, October 26th.

Lucas, Kintto, 2003a. 'Ministerio de Educación y maestros empujados al pozo,' Tintají 22: 6.

Lucas, Kintto, 2003b. 'El otro yo de Lucio Gutiérrez,' Tintají 19: 8-9.

Lucas, Kintto, 2003c. 'Ecuador: Minister's dismissal pushes government alliance to brink,' IPS – Inter Press Service, July 25th.

Lucas, Kintto, 2003d. 'Ecuador: Indians pull out of alliance leaving government weak,' IPS – Inter Press Service, August 7th.

Lucas, Kintto, 2003e. 'Indigenous say Gutiérrez has failed on promises,' IPS – Inter Press Service, February 21st.

Lucas, Kintto, 2004a. 'El retorno de los ponchos?,' Tintají 39: 8-9.

Lucas, Kintto, 2004b. 'Pozo sin fondo,' Tintají 42: 8.

Lucas, Kintto, 2004c. 'Atrapados sin salida,' Tintají 43: 6-7.

Lucas, Kintto, 2004d. 'Juicio político o política sin juicio?,' Tintají 56: 2.

Lucas, Kintto, 2007. Rafael Correa: Un Extraño en Carondelet. Quito: Editorial Planeta del Ecuador.

Lucas, Kintto, 2015. Ecuador cara y cruz: Del levantamiento del noventa a la Revolución Ciudadana. Tomo III: Luces y sombras de la Revolución Ciudadana (2007-2015). Quito: Ediciones CIESPAL.

Lucio, Laura, 2013. 'Entrevista con Gregorio Santos Guerrero,' in Raphael Hoetmer, Miguel Castro, Mar Daza, José de Echave, and Clara Ruiz (eds.), Minería y movimientos sociales en el Perú: Instrumentos y propuestas para la defensa de la vida, el agua y los territorios. Lima: PDTG.

Luders, Joseph E., 2010. The Civil Rights Movement and the Logic of Social Change. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Luna, Juan Pablo, 2010. 'The Left Turns: Why They Happened and How They Compare,' in Maxwell A. Cameron and Eric Hershberg (eds.), Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change. London/Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Lupu, Noam, 2012. 'The 2011 general elections in Peru,' Electoral Studies 31: 621-624.

Lynch, Nicolás, 2007. 'What the 'Left' Means in Latin American Now,' Constellations 14(3): 373-383.

Lynch, Nicolás, 2017. Populismo: dictadura o democracia? Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.

Machado, Fabiana, Carlos Scartascini, and Mariano Tommasi, 2011. 'Political Institutions and Street Protests in Latin America,' Journal of Conflict Resolution 55(3): 340-365.

Madrid, Raúl L., 2008. 'The Rise of Ethnopopulism in Latin America,' World Politics 60(3): 475-508.

Madrid, Raúl L., 2010. 'The Origins of the Two Lefts in Latin America,' Political Science Quarterly 125(4): 587-609.

Mainwaring, Scott, Ana María Bejarano, and Eduardo Pizarro Mejía Gómez, 2006. The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Marsteintredet, Leiv, and Einar Berntzen, 2008. 'Reducing the Perils of Presidentialism in Latin America Through Presidential Interruptions,' Comparative Politics 41(1): 83-101.

Martínez, Esperanza, 2014. 'Yasuní: democracia en extinción', in Juan Cuvi (eds.), La Restauración Conservadora del Correismo, Quito: Montecristi Vive.

Martínez González, Adriana Paola, 2010. 'Elecciones en Bolivia: Mas allá de los números,' Willka Revista Anual 4(4): 117-134.

MAS, 2005. Por una Bolivia Digna, Soberana y Productiva para Vivir Bien. Programa de Gobierno – MAS-IPSP.

MAS, 2009. Bolivia País Líder. Programa de Gobierno 2010-2015 – MAS-IPSP

Mayorga, Fernando, 2007. Encrucijadas: Ensayos sobre democracia y reforma estatal en Bolivia. La Paz: Editorial Gente Común.

Mayorga, Fernando, 2008. 'El gobierno de Evo Morales: entre nacionalismo e indigenismo,' Nueva Sociedad 206: 4-13.

Mayorga, Fernando, 2014. 'Bolivia: segundo gobierno de Evo Morales y dilemas del proyecto estatal del MAS,' in Yusuke Murakami (ed.), La actualidad política de los países andinos centrales en el gobierno de izquierda. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruano y Center for Integrated Area Studies, Kyoto University.

Mayorga, Rene Antonio, 2006. 'Outsiders and Neopopulism: The Road to Plebiscitary Democracy,' in Scott Mainwaring, Ana Maria Bejarano, and Eduardo Pizarro Leongómez (eds.), The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Mazzuca, Sebastián L., 2013. 'The Rise of Rentier Populism,' Journal of Democracy 24(2): 108-122.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, 1999. Movimientos sociales: perspectivas comparadas. Oportunidades políticas, estructuras de movilización y marcos interpretativos culturales. Madrid: Itsmo.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly, 2004. Dynamics of Contention. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, Doug, and Sidney Tarrow, 2010. 'Ballots and barricades: On the reciprocal relationship between elections and social movements,' Perspectives on Politics 8(2): 529-542.

McClintock, Cynthia, 2006. 'An Unlikely Comeback in Peru,' Journal of Democracy 17(4): 95-109.

McClintock, Cynthia, 2013. 'Populism in Peru: From APRA to Ollanta Humala,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

McKay, Ben, Ryan Nehring, and Marygold Walsh-Dilley, 2014. 'The 'state' of food sovereignty in Latin America: political projects and alternative pathways in Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia,' Journal of Peasant Studies 41(6): 1175-1200.

Mejía Acosta, Andres and John Polga-Hecimovich, 2011. 'Coalition Erosion and Presidential Instability in Ecuador,' Latin American Politics and Society 53(2): 87-111.

Meléndez, Carlos, and Paolo Sosa Villagarcía, 2013. 'Perú 2012: ¿atrapados por la historia?,' Revista de Ciencia Política 33(1): 325-350.

Mendoza, Iván, 2016. 'Cambios y frustraciones en la gestión de los conflictos 2011-2016,' in Perú Hoy: Ni Gran Transformación ni Hoja de Ruta. Lima: DESCO.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman, 1994. Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. London: Sage Publications.

Millones, Jorge, 2016. 'Conga Mines: Development as Conflict in Peru,' The South Atlantic Quarterly 115(3): 640-647.

Moffitt, Benjamin, and Simon Tormey, 2013. 'Rethinking Populism: Politics, Mediatisation and Political Style,' Political Studies.

Molina, Wilder, 2018. 'Carretera, desarrollo y transformaciones de la gobernabilidad del TIPNIS,' Cuestión Agraria 4: 67-87.

Monge, Carlos, 2012. 'Humala y las industrias extractivas. Poca transformación y mucha continuidad,' in Perú Hoy: La Gran Continuidad. Lima: Desco.

Montúfar, César, 2006. 'Lucio Gutiérrez y el fracaso de un proyecto autoritario: Reflexiones sobre la crisis de legitimidad política en el Ecuador', UASB Research Report.

Montúfar, César, 2008. 'El Populismo Intermitente de Lucio Gutiérrez,' in Carlos de la Torre and Enrique Peruzzotti (eds.), El Retorno del Pueblo: Populismo y Nuevas Democracias en América Latina. Quito: FLACSO Ecuador.

Montúfar, César, 2013. 'Rafael Correa and His Plebiscitary Citizens' Revolution,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Morales, Waltraud Q., 2012. 'Social movements and revolutionary change in Bolivia,' in Gary Prevost, Carlos Oliva Campos, and Harry E. Vanden (eds.), Social Movements and Leftist Governments in Latin America. London/New York: Zed Books.

Moreano, Alejandro, 1992. 'Las Diversas Lecturas del Populismo y su Función Política,' in Populismo. Quito: ILDIS.

Moreano, Alejandro, 2003. 'La política de "navegar al garete",' Tintají 25: 2.

Moreno-Brid, Juan Carlos, and Igor Paunovic, 2010. 'Macroeconomic Policies of the New Left: Rhetoric and Reality,' in Maxwell A. Cameron and Eric Hershberg (eds.), Latin America's Left Turns: Politics, Policies and Trajectories of Change. London/Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Motta, Sara C., 2011. 'Populism's Achilles' Heel: Popular Democracy Beyond the Liberal State and the Market Economy in Venezuela,' Latin American Perspectives 38(1): 28-46.

MPD, 2006. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo: Bolivia digna, soberana, productiva y democrática para Vivir Bien. La Paz: Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo.

Müller, Wolfgang C., and Kaare Strøm, 1999. Policy, Office, or Votes? How Political Parties in Western Europe Make Hard Decisions. London: Cambridge University Press.

Muñoz Jaramillo, Francisco, 2014. 'Ámbito de la Economía,' in Francisco Muñoz Jaramillo (ed.), Balance Crítico del Gobierno de Rafael Correa. Quito: Universidad Central del Ecuador.

Murakami, Yusuke, 2012. 'Política Peruana después de Fujimori: Fragmentación política y poca institucionalización,' in Yusuke Murakami (ed.), Dinámica político-económica de los países andinos. Lima/Kyoto: IEP/CIAS.

Murakami, Yusuke, 2013. 'Desigualdad, conflictos sociales y el proceso electoral de 2011 en Perú,' in Yusuke Murakami (ed.), América Latina en la ere posneoliberal: Democracia, conflictos y desigualdad. Lima/Kyoto: IEP/CIAS.

Murakami, Yusuke, 2014. 'Perú: dinámica política de "entrar por la izquierda y salir por la derecha"', in Yusuke Murakami (ed.), La actualidad política de los países andinos centrales en el gobierno de izquierda. Lima: IEP/CIAS.

Murillo, Maria Victoria, Virginia Oliveros & Milan Vaishnav, 2011. 'Economic Constraints and Presidential Agency,' in Steven Levitsky and Kenneth M. Roberts (eds.), The Resurgence of the Latin American Left. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Murillo Ramírez, Oscar, 2012. 'Oro y Agua: Dilemas y Giros Políticos de Ollanta Humala,' Nueva Sociedad 240: 4-15.

Nyéléni, 2007. Declaration of the Forum for Food Sovereignty, Nyéléni 2007, 27 February. Available at: https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290, [31 October 2018].

O'Donnell, Guillermo, 1999. 'Horizontal Accountability and New Polyarchies,' in Andreas Schedler, Larry Diamond, and Marc F. Plattner (eds.), The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies. London/Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, 2001. 'Reflections on Contemporary South American Democracies,' Journal of Latin American Studies 33(3): 599-609.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, 2003. 'Horizontal Accountability: The Legal Institutionalisation of Mistrust,' in Scott Mainwaring and Christopher Welna (eds.), Democratic Accountability in Latin America. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Olivera, Oscar, 2012. 'Palabras contra el olvido, el desprecio y la soberbia de los patrones, partidos y caudillos,' in La MAScarada del Poder. Cochabamba: Textos Rebeldes.

Olivera, Oscar, and Tom Lewis, 2004. Cochabamba! Water War in Bolivia. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Ortiz, Santiago, 2003. 'Lucio o la nostalgia,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 16: 11-16.

Ortiz, Santiago, 2008. 'Participación ciudadana: la Constitución de 1998 y el nuevo proyecto constitucional,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 32: 13-17.

OSAL, 2003. 'Región Andina: Ecuador (Cronología mayo-agosto 2003)', OSAL 11: 163-170.

OSAL, 2004a. 'Región Andina: Ecuador (Cronología enero-abril 2004)', OSAL 13: 184-191.

OSAL, 2004b. 'Región Andina: Ecuador (Cronología mayo-agosto 2004)', OSAL 14: 170-177.

OSAL, 2004c. 'Región Andina: Ecuador (Cronología septiembre-diciembre 2004)', OSAL 15: 178-185.

OSAL, 2004d. 'Región Andina: Bolivia (Cronología septiembre-diciembre 2004)', OSAL 15: 161-167.

OSAL, 2005a. 'Región Andina: Ecuador (Cronología enero-abril 2005)', OSAL 16: 158-166.

OSAL, 2005b. 'Región Andina: Bolivia (Cronología mayo-agosto 2005)', OSAL 17: 159-167.

OSAL, 2005c. 'Región Andina: Bolivia (Cronología septiembre-diciembre 2005)', OSAL 18: 174-181.

OSAL, 2006. 'Región Andina: Bolivia (Cronología enero-abril 2006)', OSAL 19: 186-192.

Ospina Peralta, Pablo, 2013. '"Estamos haciendo mejor las cosas con el mismo modelo antes que cambiarlo": La revolución ciudadana en Ecuador (2007-2012)', in Promesas en su laberinto: Cambios y continuidades en los gobiernos progresistas de América Latina. Quito: El Fuego y La Palabra.

Ospina Peralta, Pablo, 2015. 'Grandes empresas, crisis económica y Revolución Ciudadana,' CEP Informe de Coyuntura: November.

Ospina Peralta, Pablo, Mónica Mancer, Cristina Burneo Salaza, and Juan Cuvi, 2015. Sobre el agotamiento del progresismo: el caso de Ecuador, Rebelión, 18 October. Available at: http://www.rebelion.org/noticia.php?id=204564, [19 May 2017].

Ostrander, Susan A., 1995. '"Surely you're not in this just to be helpful": Access, rapport and interviews in three studies of elites,' in R. Hertz and J. Imber (eds.), Studying elites using qualitative methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Oxhorn, Philip, 1998. 'The Social Foundations of Latin America's Recurrent Populism: Problems of Popular Sector Class Formation and Collective Action,' Journal of Historical Sociology 11(2): 212-246.

Pachano, Simón, 2006. 'Ecuador: The Provincialisation of Representation,' in Scott Mainwaring, Ana Maria Bejarano, and Eduardo Pizarro LeonGómez (eds.), The Crisis of Democratic Representation in the Andes. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Pachano, Simón, 2009. 'Ecuador: El fracaso de loa que nunca existió,' in Martin Tanaka (ed.), La nueva coyuntura crítica en los países andinos. Lima: IEP.

PAIS, 2006a. Plan de Gobierno del Movimiento PAIS 2007-2011: Un primer gran paso para la transformación radical del Ecuador. Alianza PAIS. Dated: May 12.

PAIS, 2006b. Plan de Gobierno del Movimiento PAIS 2007-2011: Un primer gran paso para la transformación radical del Ecuador. Alianza PAIS. Dated: November 22.

Panizza, Francisco, 2000. 'Neopopulism and its Limits in Collor's Brazil,' Bulletin of Latin American Research 19(2): 177-192.

Panizza, Francisco, 2005. 'Unarmed Utopia Revisited: The Resurgence of Left-of-Centre Politics in Latin America,' Political Studies 53(4): 716-734.

Panizza, Francisco, 2013. 'What Do We Mean When We Talk About Populism?', in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore/Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University/Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Panizza, Francisco, and Romina Miorelli, 2009. 'Populism and Democracy in Latin America,' Ethics & International Affairs 23(1): 39-46.

Patriau, Enrique, 2012. '¡El Populismo en Campaña! Discursos Televisivos en Candidatos Presidenciales de la Región Andina (2005-2006),' Colombia Internacional 76: 293-325.

Peña, Karla, 2016. 'Social movements, the State, and the making of Food Sovereignty in Ecuador,' Latin American Perspectives 43(1): 221-237.

Peñaherrera Padilla, Blasco, 1992. 'Elaboración y Características del Populismo en el Ecuador: El Velasquismo,' in Populismo. Quito: ILDIS.

Pérez-Liñán, Aníbal, 2007. Presidential impeachment and the new political instability in Latin America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peruzzotti, Enrique, 2013. 'Political Debates in Latin America after Democratic Consolidation: Diverging Views on How to Strengthen Democractic Rule in the Region,' Taiwan Journal of Democracy 9(2): 139-151.

Petkoff, Teodoro, 2005. Dos Izquierdas. Caracas: Editorial Alfadil.

Petras, James, and Henry Veltmeyer, 2005. Social Movements and State Power: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador. London: Pluto Press.

Petras, James, and Henry Veltmeyer, 2009. What's Left in Latin America? Regime Change in New Times. Burlington: Ashgate.

Philip, George, 1998. 'The New Populism, Presidentialism and Market-Orientated Reform in Spanish South America,' Government and Opposition 33(1): 81-97.

Philip, George, and Francisco Panizza, 2011. The Triumph of Politics: The Return of the Left in Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador. Cambridge/Malden: Polity Press.

Politai, Comisión de Investigaciones, 2013. 'Los límites de la articulación de los movimientos antimineros en el Perú,' Politai: Revista de Ciencia Política 4(6): 89-109.

Poole, Deborah, and Gerardo Renique, 2011. 'The Ollanta Humala Victory in Peru: Moving Beyond Neoliberalism?,' NACLA Blog, 24 June. Available at: https://nacla.org/blog/ollanta-humala-victory-peru-moving-beyond-neoliberalism, [12 September 2018].

Prevost, Gary, Carlos Oliva Campos, and Harry E. Vanden, 2012. Social Movements and Leftist Governments in Latin America: Confrontation or Co-optation? London/New York: Zed Books.

Przeworski, Adam & Henry Teune, 1970. The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Przeworski, Adam, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin, 1999. Democracy, accountability, and representation: Volume 2. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Quiñón, Aarón, Almendra Rodríguez, and Jair Alva, 2016. 'Presidentes en problemas: Aprobación presidencial de Alan García (2005-2011) y Ollanta Humala (2011-2016), Politai: Revista de Ciencia Política 7(13): 93-119.

Quintero, Rafael, 1980. El Mito del Populismo. Quito: FLACSO.

Quintero, Rafael, 2005. Electores contra Partidos en un Sistema Político de Mandos. Quito: Abya Yala.

Quintero, Rafael, 2007. 'Conflictos y significados en torno a la Asamblea Nacional Constituyente en Ecuador 2007,' in Enrique Ayala Mora and Rafael Quintero (eds.), Asamblea Constituyente: Retos y oportunidades. Quito: Ediciones La Tierra.

Quintero, Rafael, 2009. Nueva crítica al Populismo: Debate en las Ciencias Sociales. Quito: Abya-Yala.

Quisbert, Máximo, 2010. 'Histórica victoria de Evo Morales y compleja formación en la decisión electoral,' Willka Revista Anual 4(4): 47-115.

Quito, Julián, 2005. 'El parto de los montes,' Tintají 62: 8-9.

Raby, D. L., 2006. Democracy and Revolution: Latin America and Socialism Today. London: Pluto.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, 2005. La insurrección de abril no fue solo una fiesta. Quito: Taller El Colectivo.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, 2006. 'Mucho Mas Que Dos Izquierdas', Nueva Sociedad, 205: 30-44.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, 2010. ‘Desencuentros, convergencias, polarización (y viceversa): El gobierno ecuatoriano y los movimientos sociales,’ Nueva Sociedad 227: 83-101.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, 2015. ‘Political Change, State Autonomy, and Post-Neoliberalism in Ecuador, 2007–2012,’ Latin American Perspectives 43(1): 143-157.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, and Analía Minteguiaga, 2007. ‘El nuevo tiempo del Estado. La política posneoliberal del correísmo,’ OSAL 7(22): 87-103.

Ramírez Gallegos, Franklin, and Marc Saint-Upery, 2003. ‘Los azares de la alianza y el futuro,’ Tintají 25: 4-5.

Ramos, Mario, 2005. La rebelión forajida. Quito: Editorial Ecuador.

Recalde, Paulina, 2007. ‘Elecciones presidenciales 2006: una aproximación a los actores del proceso,’ Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 27: 15-25.

Red Muqui, 2016. Balance y propuestas para el funcionamiento de los procesos de diálogo en el Perú. Lima: Oxfam.

Remmer, Karen L., 2012. ‘The Rise of Leftist-Populist Governance in Latin America: The Roots of Electoral Change,’ Comparative Political Studies 45(8): 947-972.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia, 2015. Mito y desarrollo en Bolivia: El giro colonial del gobierno del MAS. La Paz: Piedra Rota/Plural Editores.

Rivera Velez, Fredy, and Franklin Ramírez Gallegos, 2005. ‘Ecuador: Democracy and Economy in Crisis,’ in Russell Crandall, Guadalupe Paz, and Riordan Roett (eds.), The Andes in Focus: Security, Democracy & Economic Reform. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 1995. ‘Neoliberalism and the Transformation of Populism in Latin America: The Peruvian Case,’ World Politics, 48(1): 82-116.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 2003. ‘Social correlates of party system demise and populist resurgence in Venezuela,’ Latin American Politics and Society 45(3): 35-57.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 2006. 'Populism, Political Conflict, and Grass-Roots Organisation in Latin America,' Comparative Politics 38(2): 127-148.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 2007. 'Latin America's Populist Revival,' SAIS Review 27(1): 3-15.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 2008. 'The Mobilisation of Opposition to Economic Liberalisation,' Annual Review of Political Science 11: 327-349.

Roberts, Kenneth M., 2013. 'Market reform, programmatic (de)alignment, and party system stability in Latin America,' Comparative Political Studies 46(11): 1422-1452.

Román, Paola, 2013. 'Marco general de la política pública ecuatoriana en la comercialización de productos agropecuarios,' in Francisco Hidalgo, Pierril Lacroix, and Paola Román (eds.), Comercialización y Soberanía Alimentaria. Quito: SIPAE.

Rosales, Antulio, 2013. 'Going Underground: The Political Economy of the "Left Turn" in South America,' Third World Quarterly 34(8): 1443-1457.

Rosero, Fernando, 2008. 'La Asamblea Nacional Constituyente: tensiones entre la utopía deseada y el cambio posible,' IRG, December. Available at: http://www.institut-gouvernance.org/es/analyse/fiche-analyse-448.html, [12 May 2017].

Rosero, Fernando, 2011. 'Tierra y conflicto social en tiempos de Rafael Correa,' La Tendencia. Revista de Análisis Político 11: 82-88.

Rosero, Fernando, Yolanda Carbonell Yonfá, and Fabián Regalado, 2011. Soberanía alimentaria, modelos de desarrollo y tierras en Ecuador. Quito: CAFOLIS.

Rovira Kaltwasser, Cristóbal, 2013. 'The Responses of Populism to Dahl's Democratic Dilemmas,' Political Studies 62(3): 470-487.

Rovira Kaltwasser, Cristóbal, 2014. 'Latin American Populism: Some Conceptual and Normative Lessons,' Constellations 21(4): 494-504.

Roxborough, Ian, 1984. 'Unity and Diversity in Latin American History,' Journal of Latin American Studies 16(1): 1-26.

Ruiz Acosta, Miguel and Pablo Iturralde, 2013. La alquimia de la riqueza: Estado, petróleo y patrón de acumulación en Ecuador. Quito: Centro de Derechos Económicos y Sociales.

Runge, C. Ford and Benjamin Senauer, 2007. 'How Biofuels Could Starve the Poor,' Foreign Affairs 86(42): 41-53.

Saavedra, José Luis, 2014. 'Segunda parte: Crónica del ataque a la sede del CONAMAQ,' Nueva Crónica 140, 15 March. Available at: http://www.nuevacronica.com/politica/segunda-parte-cronica-del-ataque-a-la-sede-del-conamaq/, [8 September 2018].

Saavedra, José Luis, 2015. El MAS abraza el modelo capitalista: Notas críticas en torno a la Cumbre Agropecuaria 'Sembrando Bolivia'. Bolivia.

Saint-Upery, Marc, 2002. 'Ecuador: el coronel tiene quien le escuche', Nueva Sociedad 182: 4-11.

Salazar Lohman, Huáscar, 2015. Se han adueñado del proceso de lucha: Horizontes comunitario-populares en tensión y la reconstitución de la dominación en la Bolivia del MAS. Cochabamba: SOCEE.

Saltos Galarza, Napoleón, 2002. 'Lucio Gutiérrez: un proyecto en disputa,' Íconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales 15: 11-14.

Sánchez, Paola, 2013. 'Resistencia, consenso y disputa; reflexión sobre el conflicto social en el Ecuador (1990-2012),' in Nahiara Morán (ed.), A Quien le Importa los Guayacanes? Acumulación, Gobierno y Conflictos en el Campo. Quito: IIE/CDES.

Sánchez-Sibony, Omar, 2012. 'The 2011 presidential election in Peru: a thorny moral and political dilemma,' Contemporary Politics 18(1): 109-126.

Sánchez-Urribarri, Raul A., 2008. 'Venezuela: Turning Further Left?,' in Jorge G. Castañeda and Marco A. Morales (eds.), Leftovers: Tales of the Latin American Left. New York: Routledge.

Savage, Ritchie, 2014. 'A Comparison of "New Institutionalised" Populism in Venezuela and the USA,' Constellations 21(4): 518-534.

Schamis, Hector E., 2006. 'Populism, Socialism, and Democratic Institutions,' Journal of Democracy 17(4): 20-34.

Schamis, Hector E., 2013. 'From the Perons to the Kirchners: 'Populism' in Argentine Politics,' in Carlos de la Torre and Cynthia J. Arnson (eds.), Latin American Populism in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schilling-Vacaflor, Almut, 2013. 'Prior Consultations in Plurinational Bolivia: Democracy, Rights and Real Life Experiences,' Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies 8(2): 202-220.

Schilling-Vacaflor, Almut, and Riccarda Flemmer, 2015. 'Conflict Transformation through Prior Consultation? Lessons from Peru,' Journal of Latin American Studies 47(4): 811-839.

Schmidt, Gregory D., 2012. 'AIDS or cancer? The 2011 Peruvian elections,' Electoral Studies 31: 624-628.

Seligson, Mitchell A., 2007. 'The Democracy Barometers: The Rise of Populism and the Left in Latin America,' Journal of Democracy, 18(3): 82-95.

SENPLADES, 2007. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2007-2010. Quito: SENPLADES.

SENPLADES, 2009. Plan Nacional para el Buen Vivir: Construyendo un Estado Plurinacional e Intercultural. Quito: SENPLADES.

SENPLADES, 2013. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo/Plan Nacional para el Buen Vivir 2013-2017. Quito: SENPLADES.

Siavelis, Peter, 2004. 'Democracy and Political Institutions in Latin America: Reconciling Approaches,' Latin American Research Review 39(2): 275-290.

Silva, Eduardo, 2009. Challenging Neoliberalism in Latin America. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, Eduardo, 2012. 'Política y conflictividad en Bolivia,' Comentario Internacional Revista del Centro Andino de Estudios Internacionales 12: 27-41.

Silva, Eduardo, 2013. Transnational Activism and National Movements in Latin America: Bridging the Divide. New York: Routledge.

Silva, Eduardo, 2017. 'Reorganising Popular Sector Incorporation: Propositions from Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela,' Politics and Society 45(1): 91-122.

Silva, Eduardo, and Federico M. Rossi, 2018. Reshaping the Political Arena in Latin America. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Silva Santisteban, Rocío, 2013. 'Porque son perros. Protestas, discursos autoritarios e industrias extractivas: el caso Conga,' in Raphael Hoetmer, Miguel Castro, Mar Daza, José de Echave, and Clara Ruiz (eds.), Minería y movimientos sociales en el Perú: Instrumentos y propuestas para la defensa de la vida, el agua y los territorios. Lima: PDTG.

Singer, Matthew M., 2007. 'The presidential and parliamentary elections in Bolivia, December 2005,' Electoral Studies 26(1): 200-205.

Singer, Matthew M., and Kevin M. Morrison, 2004. 'The 2002 presidential and parliamentary elections in Bolivia,' Electoral Studies 23(2): 172-182.

Smith, Peter H., 2005. Democracy in Latin America: Political Change in Comparative Perspective. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Smulovitz, Catalina, and Enrique Peruzzotti, 2000. 'Societal Accountability in Latin America,' Journal of Democracy 11(4): 147-158.

Sonntag, Heinz R., 1997. 'Venezuela: El difícil curso de la transición,' Nueva Sociedad 151: 17-26.

Sotillo, Isrrael, y Edith Franco, 2002. 'Ecuador, tierra volcán que ya madura,' Rebelion, 17 November. Available at: http://www.rebelion.org/hemeroteca/internacional/sotillo171102.htm, [29 October 2018].

Spronk, Susan, 2008. 'Mapping regional tensions in Correa's Ecuador and Evo's Bolivia,' Relay 23, July/September: 39-43.

Stokes, Susan C., 2001. Mandates and Democracy: Neoliberalism by Surprise in Latin America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stokes, Susan C., 2003. 'Do Informal Institutions Make Democracy Work? Accounting for Accountability in Argentina,' paper presented at the conference, "Informal Institutions in Latin America" University of Notre Dame, April 23-24.

Stokes, Susan C., 2009. 'Globalisation and the Left in Latin America,' Unpublished Paper. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Political Science.

Sullivan, Lynda, 2013. 'Andean Self-determination Struggles against Extractive Capitalism,' Upside Down World, 19 September. Available at: http://upsidedownworld.org/archives/peru-archives/peru-andean-self-determination-struggles-against-extractive-capitalism/, [2 November 2018].

Tanaka, Martín, 2008. 'The Left in Peru: Plenty of Wagons and No Locomotion,' in Jorge G. Castañeda and Marco A. Morales (eds.), Leftovers: Tales of the Two Latin American Lefts. New York/London: Routledge.

Tanaka, Martín, 2011. 'A Vote for Moderate Change,' Journal of Democracy 22(4): 75-83.

Taylor-Robinson, Michelle M., 2010. Do the poor count? Democratic institutions and accountability in a context of poverty. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Tintají, 2002. 'Editorial: Por qué Lucio Gutiérrez?,' Tintají 11: 2.

Tintají, 2004. 'Editorial: Estado de Derecho o Estado de Derecha,' Tintají 58: 2.

TIPNIS, 2012. Sub-Central TIPNIS-Comisión de Recorrido. Informe del recorrido realizado por las comunidades del TIPNIS: El proceso de consulta propio y la visión de desarrollo para el territorio indígena. La Paz: Red Jurídica Amazónica – Fundación Construir.

Tockman, Jason, 2017. 'The Hegemony of Representation: Democracy and Indigenous Self-government in Bolivia,' Journal of Politics in Latin America 9(2): 121-138.

Triscritti, Fiorella, 2013. 'Mining, development and corporate-community conflicts in Peru,' Community Development Journal, 48(3): 437-450.

Valenzuela, Arturo, 2004. 'Latin American Presidencies Interrupted,' Journal of Democracy 15(4): 5-19.

Vargas Llosa, Alvaro, 2007. 'The Return of the Idiot,' Foreign Policy 160(May-June): 54-61.

Vásquez, Mirtha, 2013. 'La criminalización de la protesta social como estrategia de desarticulación del movimiento social en le Perú,' in Raphael Hoetmer, Miguel Castro, Mar Daza, José de Echave, and Clara Ruiz (eds.), Minería y movimientos sociales en el Perú: Instrumentos y propuestas para la defensa de la vida, el agua y los territorios. Lima: PDTG.

Vega, Fernando, 2013. 'El carácter del Estado en la Revolución Ciudadana,' in Juan Cuvi, Decio Machado, Atawallpa Oviedo and Natalia Sierra (eds.), El Correísmo al Desnudo. Quito: Montecristi Vive.

Vergara, Alberto, and Aaron Watanabe, 2016. 'Peru since Fujimori,' Journal of Democracy 27(3): 148-157.

Villavicencio, Fernando, 2003. 'La privatización del petróleo en Ecuador,' Alainet, 7 July. Available at: http://www.alainet.org/es/active/4017, [18 November 2016].

Weyland, Kurt, 1996. 'Neopopulism and Neoliberalism in Latin America: Unexpected Affinities,' Studies in Comparative International Development, 31 (3): 3-31.

Weyland, Kurt, 2001. 'Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics,' Comparative Politics: 1-22.

Weyland, Kurt, 2002a. The Politics of Market Reform in Fragile Democracies: Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Venezuela. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Weyland, Kurt, 2002b. 'Limitations of Rational-Choice Institutionalism for the Study of Latin American Politics,' Studies in Comparative International Development 37(1): 57-85.

Weyland, Kurt, 2004. 'Neoliberalism and Democracy in Latin America: A Mixed Record,' Latin American Politics and Society 46(1): 135-157.

Weyland, Kurt, 2009. 'The Rise of Latin America's Two Lefts: Insights from Rentier State Theory,' Comparative Politics 41(2): 145-164.

Weyland, Kurt, 2010. 'The Performance of Leftist Governments in Latin America,' in Kurt Weyland, Raúl L. Madrid, and Wendy Hunter (eds.), Leftist Governments in Latin America. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weyland, Kurt, 2013. 'The Threat from the Populist Left,' Journal of Democracy 24(3): 18-32.

Wolff, Jonas, 2007. '(De-)Mobilising the Marginalised: A Comparison of the Argentine *Piqueteros* and Ecuador's Indigenous Movement', Journal of Latin American Studies 39: 1-29.

Wolff, Jonas, 2016. 'Business Power and the Politics of Postneoliberalism: Relations Between Government and Economic Elites in Bolivia and Ecuador,' Latin American Politics and Society 58(2): 124-147.

World Bank, 2006. 'Ecuador Country Economic Memorandum: Promoting Stable and Robust Economic Growth,' World Bank, 15 May. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEXPCOMNET/Resources/2463593-1213987636514/02_Ecuador.pdf, [7 October 2018].

Yashar, Deborah, 2005. Contesting citizenship in Latin America: The rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zaldumbide, Diego, 2007. 'De la burocracia de cuotas políticas a la tecno burocracia: Los 100 primeros días de gobierno de Gutiérrez y Correa', Observatorio Político CELA: 1-28.

Zambrano, Ela, 2003a. 'Las acrobacias de Lucio Gutiérrez', Tintají 24: 8-9.

Zambrano, Ela, 2003b. 'Petroecuador bajo ataque!,' Tintají 21: 4-5.

Zúquete, José Pedro, 2008. 'The Missionary Politics of Hugo Chávez,' Latin American Politics and Society 50(1): 91-121.

APPENDIX

List of Interviewees

Ecuador:

No.	Name	Biographical Notes	Type	Interview Date; Length
1	Alberto Acosta	Former Minister for Energy and Mines (2007); President of Constituent Assembly (2007-08); founding member of Alianza PAIS (2006); presidential candidate (2013); economist at FLACSO Ecuador.	Political	Quito; 22 July 2015; 40 mins.
2	Pablo Andrade	Political Scientist at Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar.	Academic	Quito; 16 July 2015; 75 mins.
3	Luis Andrango	Former President of FENOCIN campesino/indigenous movement (2008-2012); Secretary of CLOC transnational indigenous organisation (2010-13).	Social	Quito; 16 July 2015; 60 mins.
4	María Belén Arroyo	Quito Editor, Vistazo current affairs magazine.	Media	Quito; 24 July 2015; 35 mins.
5	Roberto Aspiazu	President of Business Committee of Ecuador.	Business	Quito; 26 August 2016; 25 mins.
6	Augusto Barrera	Former Secretary of SENPLADES (2007-08); former Mayor of Quito for Alianza PAIS (2009-14); former PK member and Secretary of NSPD; sociologist based at FLACSO Ecuador.	Political	Quito; 26 August 2016; 55 mins.
7	Omar Bonilla	Spokesperson for YASunidos social movement; lecturer at Central University.	Social	Quito; 26 August 2016. 45 mins.

8	Elizabeth Bravo	Professor of Biodiversity, Universidad Politecnica Salesiana; food sovereignty expert.	Academic	Quito; 14 July 2015; 5 mins.
9	Ricardo Buitrón	Member of Accion Ecologica environmentalist collective.	Social	Quito; 14 July 2015; 105 mins.
10	Eduardo Cadena	Executive Director of Quito Chamber of Commerce.	Business	Quito; 25 August 2016; 30 mins.
11	Cristian Castillo	Counsel to the President (2010-16).	Political	Quito; 16 July 2015; 60 mins.
12	Pablo Cevallos	Former Vice-Minister of Education (2010-13); lecturer at Universidad San Francisco de Quito.	Political	Quito; 21 July 2015; 65 mins.
13	Mónica Chuji	Former Minister for Communications (2007); member of Constituent Assembly on the Natural Resources Commission (2007-08).	Political	Telephone interview; 25 August 2016; 35 mins.
14	Julio Clavijo	Political advisor to Mae Montano, congresswoman with CREO political party; former member of Fundacion Ecuador Libre liberal think tank.	Political	Quito; 22 July 2015; 100 mins.
15	Gerard Coffey	Editor of "La Linea del Fuego" political blog.	Media	Skype interview; 2 November 2015; 75 mins.
16	Esteban Daza	Coordinator at Observatory of Rural Change; researcher at the Institute of Ecuadorian Studies.	Social	Quito; 22 July 2015; 30 mins.
17	Marcelo del Pozo	General Manager at TV Ecuador (state television channel).	Media	Quito; 21 July 2015; 35 mins.
18	Juan Carlos Díaz-Granados	Executive Director of Guayaquil Chamber of Commerce (GCC).	Business	Guayaquil; 22 August 2016; 55 mins.

19	Ramón Espinel	Former Minister for Agriculture (2009 -11); Dean of Life Sciences at ESPOL University.	Political	Guayaquil; 22 August 2016; 40 mins.
20	Ramiro Galarza	Former Vice-Minister for the Economy (2002-03); Technical Secretary to the Plurinational and Intercultural Conference on Food Sovereignty; mayoral candidate for the Socialist Party.	Political	Quito; 13 July 2015; 40 mins.
21	Roberto Gortaire	Member of the Plurinational and Intercultural Conference on Food Sovereignty (COPISA) (2010-15); member of Utopia community organisation.	Social	Skype interview; 24 August 2016; 40 mins.
22	Richard Intriago	Former member of the Plurinational and Intercultural Conference on Food Sovereignty (COPISA) (2010-13); candidate for Constituent Assembly for Alianza PAIS; President of National Peasant Movement (FECAOL).	Social	Guayaquil; 12 July 2015; 70 mins.
22a	Richard Intriago	As above	Social	Skype interview; 11 April 2017; 20 mins.
23	Pablo Iturralde	Coordinator and researcher at the Centre for Economic and Social Rights.	Social	Quito; 23 July 2015; 50 mins.
24	Cristóbal Lagos	Advisor at National Assembly; member of political planning institute of Alianza PAIS.	Political	Quito; 22 July 2015; 70 mins.
25	Mario Macías	Executive Director of FIAN Ecuador NGO.	Social	Quito; 13 July 2015; 55 mins.
26	Esperanza Martínez	Director of Oilwatch NGO; member of Accion Ecologica collective.	Social	Quito; 15 July 2015; 70 mins.

27	Mónica Maruri	Director of Educa TV; experienced journalist and broadcaster.	Media	Quito; 21 July 2015; 50 mins.
28	Daniel Ortega	Former Minister of the Environment (2015); advisor at Ministry of Foreign Relations (2012-15); Director General of Environment and Climate Change (2010-12); Director of Centre for Public Policy Development at ESPOL University.	Political	Guayaquil; 22 August 2016; 80 mins.
29	Santiago Ortiz	Sociologist at FLACSO Ecuador.	Academic	Quito; 20 July 2015; 50 mins.
30	Pablo Ospina	Sociologist at Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar.	Academic	Quito; 24 August 2016; 65 mins.
31	Simón Pachano	Political Scientist at FLACSO Ecuador.	Academic	Quito; 13 July 2015; 45 mins.
32	Cecilia Ponce	Co-ordinator of Commercial Networks at the Ministry of Agriculture.	Political	Quito; 13 July 2015; 15 mins.
33	Máximo Ponce	Political Scientist at University of Guayaquil.	Academic	Guayaquil; 10 July 2015; 90 mins.
34	Franklin Ramírez	Sociologist at FLACSO Ecuador.	Academic	Quito; 15 July 2015; 70 mins.
35	Jamill Ramón	Vice-Minister for Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture.	Political	Quito; 26 August 2016; 45 mins.
36	Francisco Rhon	Director of Centro Andino de Accion Popular; researcher on agrarian themes.	Academic	Quito; 23 August 2016; 65 mins.
37	Rosa Rodríguez	Ecuador Director of Heifer International transnational NGO.	Social	Quito; 24 July 2015; 40 mins.
38	Alejandra Santillana	Executive Director of Institute of Ecuadorian Studies.	Social	Quito; 24 July 2015; 60 mins.

39	Severino Sharupi	Vice-President of CONAIE indigenous movement.	Social	Quito; 23 July 2015; 40 mins.
40	Juan Toapanta	Public opinion pollster at CEDATOS.	Pollster	Quito; 21 July 2015; 25 mins.
41	Betty Tola	Minister for Economic and Social Inclusion (2014-2016); former Secretary of Politics for PAIS (2012-14); member of Constituent Assembly (2007-08) and National Assembly; former PK member.	Political	Quito; 23 July 2015; 40 mins.
42	Mario Unda	Political scientist and sociologist at Central University and Catholic University.	Academic	Quito; 24 August 2016; 85 mins.

Peru:

No.	**Name**	**Biographical Notes**	**Type**	**Interview Details**
1	José Álvarez	Director General of Biological Diversity at Ministry of the Environment.	Political	Lima; 9 August 2016; 35 mins.
2	Carlos Alza	Director of School of Government and Public Policy, Catholic University of Peru.	Academic	Lima; 9 July 2015; 40 mins.
3	Marco Arana	Congressman and spokesman for the Frente Amplio party (2016); founder of Movimiento Tierra y Libertad party; anti-mining activist and founder of NGO GRUFIDES; former Catholic priest.	Political	Lima; 8 August 2016; 50 mins.
4	Pilar Arroyo	Analyst at Instituto Bartolome de las Casas.	Social	Lima; 2 August 2016; 45 mins.
5	Manuel Benza Pflucker	Member of the Frente Amplio political party and congressional candidate in 2016 elections;	Political	Lima; 28 July 2015; 60 mins

		Congressman for Izquierda Unida political party (1985-90); sociologist and university lecturer.		
6	Hugo Blanco	Historic left-wing and *campesino* activist; former leader of the Confederacion Campesina de Peru; Director of Lucha Indigena organisation.	Social	Celendin; 7 August 2016; 25 mins.
7	Mariano Castro	Former Vice-Minister at Ministry of the Environment (2012-16)	Political	Telephone interview; 23 August 2016; 30 mins.
8	Gladiz Marilú Chillón Gutiérrez	Local organiser in Plataforma Interinstitucional Celendina (PIC).	Social	Celendin; 7 August 2016; 40 mins.
9	José de Echave	Former Vice-Minister of Environmental Management at Ministry of the Environment (2011); Director of Cooperaccion; co-author of book on Conga conflict.	Political	Lima; 9 July 2015; 35 mins.
10	Felix de Witte	Peru representative of Fondo de Cooperacion al Desarrollo Solidaridad Socialista Belgica.	Social	Lima; 7 July 2015; 70 mins.
11	Alejandro Diez	Head of School of Social Sciences at Catholic University of Peru.	Academic	Lima; 4 August 2016; 25 mins.
12	María D'jalma Torres	Human rights lawyer and former member of IIDS; lecturer on indigenous rights at Catholic University of Peru.	Social	Skype interview; 13 September 2017; 30 mins.
13	Francisco Durand	Professor at Catholic University of Peru; researcher at DESCO.	Academic	Skype interview; 4 August 2016; 40 mins.
14	Roberto Espinoza	Advisor to AIDESEP indigenous movement; sociologist.	Social	Lima; 9 August 2016; 60 mins.

15	Carlos Gálvez	President of the National Society for Mining, Petroleum and Energy; Chief Financial Officer and Vice-President of Buenaventura Mining.	Business	Lima; 4 August 2016; 50 mins.
16	Romeo Grompone	Researcher at the Institute for Peruvian Studies.	Academic	Lima; 9 July 2015; 20 mins.
17	Raphael Hoetmer	Researcher and activist associated with the Programme for Global Democracy and Transformation.	Social	Lima; 9 August 2016; 35 mins.
18	Javier Jahncke	Coordinator of the Red Muqui network of organisations across Peru that work on issues of mining.	Social	Lima; 10 July 2018; 60 mins.
19	Salomón Lerner	Former Prime Minister (2011) in the Humala government; campaign chief for Ollanta Humala (2006 and 2011); businessman.	Political	Lima; 9 August 2016; 50 mins.
20	Sinesio López	Professor of politics at the Catholic University of Peru; advisor to Salomon Lerner (2011).	Academic	Lima; 9 July 2015; 45 mins.
21	Rolando Luque	Associate for the Prevention of Social Conflicts, Office of the Ombudsman.	Social	Lima; 9 August 2016; 30 mins.
22	Carlos Monge	Prominent member of the Tierra y Libertad political party; researcher at DESCO.	Political	Lima; 9 August 2016; 55 mins.
23	Israel Muñoz	Coordinator of the Programme for Governability and Political Management at the Department of Economics, Catholic University of Peru.	Academic	Lima; 8 July 2015; 55 mins.
24	Enrique Patriau	Journalist at Republica newspaper; lecturer in politics and media at Catholic University of Peru.	Media	Lima; 10 July 2015; 45 mins.
25	Martín Pérez	President of the National Confederation of Private Business Institutions (CONFIEP); former	Business	Lima; 9 August 2016; 55 mins.

		Minister of Trade and Tourism (2009-10).		
26	Erik Pozo	Anthropologist and lecturer at Catholic University of Peru.	Academic	Lima; 8 July 2015; 35 mins.
27	Manuel Ramos	Secretary of the organisation of peasant councils (*rondas campesinas*) in Bambamarca/El Tambo; Regional Counsellor at Regional Government of Cajamarca.	Social	Lima; 3 August 2016; 30 mins.
28	Freya Róndelez	Coordinator of Belgian NGO 11.11.11.	Social	Lima; 7 July 2015; 85 mins.
29	Blanca Rosales	Director of Social Communication and advisor (2011-16); Communications Director for Humala presidential bid (2011).	Political	Lima; 8 August 2016; 70 mins.
30	Milton Sánchez	General Secretary of the Plataforma Interinsitucional Celendein (PIC).	Social	Celendin; 7 August 2016; 40 mins.
31	Rocío Silva Santisteban	Former Executive Secretary of the National Coordinator of Human Rights.	Social	Lima; 3 August 2016; 65 mins.
32	Pablo Secada	Chief Economist at Instituto Peruano de Economia (think tank linked to CONFIEP).	Business	Lima; 5 August 2016; 65 mins.
33	Lynda Sullivan	Anti-mining activist based in Celendin/Cajamarca.	Social	Dublin; 27 January 2016; 65 mins.
34	Rocío Verastegui	Lecturer in politics at Catholic University of Peru.	Academic	Lima; 29 July 2015; 45 mins.
35	Luis Vittor	Advisor to the Andean Coordinator of Indigenous Organisations; economist.	Social	Lima; 27 July 2015; 105 mins.
36	Raquel Yrigoyen	Former Director of INDEPA (2011); human rights lawyer and	Political	Lima; 3 August 2016; 20 mins.

		Director of International Institute on Law and Society (IIDS).		
37	Zulma Villa Vilchez	Human rights lawyer, member of International Institute on Law and Society (IIDS).	Social	Lima; 4 August 2016; 65 mins.

Bolivia:

No.	**Name**	**Biographical Notes**	**Type**	**Interview Details**
1	Rodrigo Agreda	Executive Director of Bolivian Confederation of Private Entrepreneurs (CEPB).	Business	La Paz; 15 August 2016; 75 mins.
2	Alejandro Almaraz	Former Vice-Minister of Lands (2006-11).	Political	Telephone interview; 13 August 2016; 40 mins.
2a	Alejandro Almaraz	As above.	Political	Cochabamba; 28 July 2018; 150 mins.
3	Carlos Arze	Researcher at CEDLA.	Academic	La Paz; 11 August 2016; 85 mins.
4	Ruth Bautista	Staff at Instituto para el Desarrollo Rural de Sudamerica.	Social	La Paz; 11 August 2016; 20 mins.
5	David Birbuet	Coordinator at Red UNITAS NGO network.	Social	La Paz; 15 August 2016; 75 mins.
6	Tomas Candia	Youth Secretary of CIDOB indigenous movement.	Social	Santa Cruz; 18 August 2016; 20 mins.
7	Sergio Colque	Head of Sustainable Public Debt Unit, Ministry of Economy and Public Finances.	Political	La Paz; 15 August 2016; 20 mins.

8	Qhapaj Conde	Former advisor to CONAMAQ indigenous movement.	Social	La Paz; 12 August 2016; 70 mins.
9	Roger Cortez	Journalist at Pagina Siete.	Media	Skype interview; 30 July 2018; 20 mins.
10	Carlos Crespo	Researcher at Centro de Estudios Superiores Universitarios of the Universidad Mayor de San Simon.	Academic	Cochabamba; 17 August 2016; 25 mins.
11	Cristóbal Huanca	Chief authority of CONAMAQ indigenous movement.	Social	La Paz; 25 July 2018; 20 mins.
12	Georgina Jiménez	Researcher at Centro de Documentacion e Informacion Bolivia (CEDIB).	Academic	Skype interview; 20 September 2016; 30 mins.
13	Suzanne Kruyt	Coordinator of BD Bolivia NGO.	Social	La Paz; 15 August 2016; 40 mins.
14	Miguel Lamas & María Lohman	Coordinators of Somos Sur NGO.	Social	Cochabamba; 16 August 2016; 70 mins.
15	Carlos Mamani	Advisor to COICA and CAUI indigenous movements; close supporter of CONAMAQ; lecturer at Universidad Mayor San Andres.	Social	La Paz; 15 August 2016; 60 mins.
16	Rubén Martínez	Communications Director at Fundacion Tierra.	Social	La Paz; 12 August 2016; 40 mins.
17	Fernando Mayorga	Researcher at Centro de Estudios Superiores Universitarios of Universidad Mayor de San Simon.	Academic	Cochabamba; 17 August 2016; 55 mins.

18	Erick Meave	Sub-Director of Social Policy at the state policy think tank Unidad de Analisis de Politicas Sociales y Economicas (UDAPE).	Political	La Paz; 12 August 2016; 20 mins.
19	Adolfo Mendoza	Senator for the MAS political party (2010-2016); advisor to social organisations in the 'Unity Pact' (2002-10); advisor to the Constituent Assembly.	Political	Cochabamba; 16 August 2016; 25 mins.
20	Wilma Mendoza and Tomas Candia	Vice-President of Confederación Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Bolivia (CNAMIB); as above.	Social	Santa Cruz; 18 August 2016; 105 mins.
21	Rodrigo Meruvia	Coordinator of Gaia Pacha NGO.	Social	Cochabamba; 17 August 2016; 40 mins.
22	Silvia Molina	Researcher at CEDLA.	Academic	La Paz; 11 August 2016; 100 mins.
22a	Silvia Molina	As above.	Academic	La Paz; 19 July 2018; 60 mins.
23	Edilberto Osinaga	General Manager of Eastern Agricultural Chamber (CAO).	Business	Santa Cruz; 18 August 2016; 50 mins.
24	Sarela Paz	Anthropologist at Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social and lecturer at Universidad Mayor de San Simon.	Academic	Cochabamba; 16 August 2016; 110 mins.
25	Rafael Puente	Former Vice-Minister of Government (2006-07); presidential representative and interim Governor of Cochabamba for MAS;	Political	Cochabamba; 17 August 2016; 80 mins.

		campaign spokesman of MAS (2007-11); researcher at CEDIB.		
26	Pedro Quiroz	Secretary General of the *campesino* organisation Federacion Sindical Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos de Cochabamba (FSUTCC).	Social	Cochabamba; 17 August 2016; 20 mins.
27	Fernando Vargas	President of Sub-Station TIPNIS; former presidential candidate for the Green Party.	Social	Skype interview; 16 August 2016; 35mins.
28	Fredy Villagómez	Head of the Political Action Unit of Centro de Investigaciones y Produccion del Campesinado (CIPCA).	Social	La Paz; 11 August 2016; 35 mins.
29	Rolando Villena	Former Ombudsman of Bolivia.	Social	La Paz; 24 July, 2018; 20 mins.