The Resilience of the Latin American Right

EDITED BY

Juan Pablo Luna

AND

Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser

The origins of this volume can be traced to August 2010, when the coeditors had an informal meeting in Washington, DC, at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. We discussed the lack of research on the right in Latin America and decided to try to obtain funding to organize an academic workshop on this underexplored topic. Our ambition became a reality thanks to the support of the Fritz Thyssen Foundation, whose generous contribution enabled us to finance a two-day workshop, "Bringing the Right Back in: Exploring the Right and Democracy in Contemporary Latin America," held at the Social Science Research Center Berlin in July 2011. We thank all of those who participated in this event by presenting papers: Sonia Alonso, James D. Bowen, Barry Canon, David Doyle, Heiko Giebler, Riitta-Ilona Koivumaeki, Carlos Meléndez, Alfred P. Montero, Detlef Nolte, Peter M. Siavelis, Nina Wiesehomeier, Laura Wills-Otero, and Steven T. Wuhs. We express our sincere gratitude to three scholars who gave the keynote addresses: Wolfgang Merkel, Kenneth M. Roberts, and Andreas Schedler.

The academic workshop in Berlin was an excellent opportunity to discuss our ideas with a great team of colleagues and to receive valuable feedback, not only to rethink the framework that we originally developed—which, in a substantially improved version, constitutes the introduction to this volume—but also to consider the importance of commissioning special contributions by other scholars. Accordingly, we thank all of those we contacted after the workshop and who accepted our invitation to write a chapter for this book: Kent Eaton, James Loxton, Sergio Morresi, and Gabriel Vommaro. We are also pleased that Kenneth M. Roberts agreed to reformulate his inspiring workshop notes into what now constitutes chapter 1.

After compiling a book manuscript comprising the contributions by the aforementioned authors, we submitted the volume to Johns Hopkins University Press for review. To our fortune, the manuscript was sent to one of the foremost scholars of the right in Latin America—Edward Gibson from Northwestern University. His thorough reading, detailed comments, and insightful remarks helped us to significantly enrich the manuscript. Moreover, he generously agreed to reveal his identity. We thank him for his invaluable feedback and efforts to help us improve the volume. We also thank Suzanne Flinchbaugh at Johns Hopkins University Press, who has been an enthusiastic supporter of our book project and has assisted us with professionalism through all the stages of publication. Ashleigh McKown, Catherine Goldstead, and Dania Straughan have also been of great help throughout the production process.

Last but not least, each of us has counted on the support of friends and colleagues who gave us invaluable comments and ideas. We are particularly grateful to

AD-M-19	Alianza Democrática Movimiento 19
ADN	Acción Democrática Nacionalista
ANEP	Asociación Nacional de Empresa Privada
AR	Acción por la República
ARENA	Aliança Renovadora Nacional (Brazil)
ARENA	Alianza Republicana Nacionalista (El Salvador)
CBA	City of Buenos Aires
CD	Cambio Democrático (El Salvador)
CEDLAS	Centro de Estudios Distributivos, Laborales y Sociales
CEP	Centro de Estudios Políticos Dr. José Antonio Rodriguez Porth
CIDE	Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas
CMP	Comparative Manifesto Project
CONFILAR	Confederación Internacional por la Libertad y Autonomía Regional
CPC	Compromiso para el Cambio
CREO	Movimiento Creando Oportunidades
ELN	Ejército de Liberación Nacional
EPL	Ejército Popular de Liberación
FA	Frente Amplio
FAN	Frente Amplio Nacional
FARC	Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia
FEDECAMARAS	Federación de Cámaras y Asociaciones de Comercio y Producción de Venezuela
FMLN	Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional
FPL	Fuerzas Populares de Liberación Farabundo Martí
FPV	Frente para la Victoria
FREDEMO	Frente Democrático
FREPASO	Frente por un País Solidario
FRG	Frente Republicano Guatemalteco
FSLN	Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional
FUNDE	Fundación Nacional para el Desarrollo
FUSADES	Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social
GBA	greater Buenos Aires
GDP	gross domestic product
ISI	import substitution industrialization

LAPOP	Latin American Public Opinion Project
MAPU	Movimiento de Acción Popular Unitario
MAS	Movimiento al Socialismo
MDB	Movimento Democrático Brasileiro
MIR	Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria
ML	Movimiento de Libertad
MNR	Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario
MOLIRENA	Movimiento Liberal Republicano Nacionalista
MPN	Movimiento Popular Neuquino
MRTA	Movimiento Revolucionario Túpac Amaru
MUD	Mesa de la Unidad Democrática
NFR	Nueva Fuerza Republicana
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NPC	Nuevo Poder Ciudadano
ORDEN	Organización Democrática Nacionalista
PAN	Partido Acción Nacional (Mexico)
PAN	Partido Autonomista Nacional (Argentina)
PAN	Partido Avanzada Nacional (Guatemala)
PC	Partido Colorado (Uruguay)
PCC	Partido Comunista Colombiano
PCC	Partido Conservador de Colombia
PCN	Partido de Conciliación Nacional
PCS	Partido Comunista Salvadoreño
PDA	Polo Democrático Alternativo
PDC	Partido Demócrata Cristiano (Chile)
PDC	Partido Demócrata Cristiano (El Salvador)
PDS	Partido Democrático Social
PELA	Proyecto de Élites Parlamentarias de América Latina
PFL	Partido da Frente Liberal
PJ	Partido Justicialista
PL	Partido Liberal (Brazil)
PL	Partido Liberal (Colombia)
PMDB	Partido do Movimento Democrático Brasileiro
PN	Partido Nacional
PNP	Partido Nacionalista Peruano
PNUD	Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo
PODEMOS	Poder Democrático y Social
PP	Partido Progresista
PPB	Partido Progressista Brasileiro

PPC	Partido Popular Cristiano
PPR	Partido Progresista Reformador
PR	Radical Party
PRD	Partido de la Revolución Democrática
PRI	Partido Revolucionario Institucional
PRIAN	Partido Renovador Institucional Acción Nacional
PRM	Partido Revolucionario Mexicano
PRO	Propuesta Republicana
PRSC	Partido Reformista Social Cristiano
PS	Partido Socialista
PSC	Partido Social Cristiano
PSDB	Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira
PSUN	Partido Social de Unidad Nacional
PSUV	Partido Socialista Unido de Venezuela
PT	Partido dos Trabalhadores
PTB	Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro
PU	Partido Social de Unidad Nacional
RECREAR	Recrear para el Crecimiento
RN	Renovación Nacional
SNTE	Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación
UCD	Unificación Cristiana Democrática
UCEDE	Unión del Centro Democrático
UCR	Unión Civíca Radical
UCS	Unidad Civíca Solidaridad
UDI	Unión Demócrata Independiente
UJC	Unión Juvenil Cruceñista
UP	Unión Patriótica
VERDES	Verdad y Democracia Social
WVS	World Values Survey

The Right in Contemporary Latin America

A Framework for Analysis

JUAN PABLO LUNA AND CRISTÓBAL ROVIRA KALTWASSER

The 2000s have been difficult years for the right in Latin America. Since the end of the 1990s, left-of-center leaders and parties gained increasing electoral support in the region in what came to be known as "the turn to the left." While this resurgence of the left is related to contingent factors such as the weakening of the US hegemony in the region and rising political discontent in the late 1990s,[1] it is also true that structural factors have played an important role. Latin America's turn to the left can be conceived, at least partially, as a popular reaction against the policies implemented by the right in the 1980s and 1990s. Not by coincidence, scholars have argued that the current turn to the left should be considered as the result of a second crisis of incorporation.[2] Such a crisis resulted from the exhaustion of the conservative modernization project that right-of-center leaders, parties, and technocrats have championed after Latin America's return to democracy.

The conservative modernization project entailed the defense of electoral democracy and of the market economy, in a context in which the range of acceptable policies was limited in such a way that inequality and the uneven distribution of opportunities remained a dominant feature of the region.[3] Although the recent rise of different types of left-of-center forces across Latin America demonstrates that the times are ripe for experimentation with policies that go beyond the so-called Washington Consensus, it would be naive to assume that the right has become irrelevant in the region. Yet the growing academic and public interest in the left has had as a counterpart a lack of scholarly production on the strategies pursued by the right.[4] In our opinion, the exclusive focus on the "turn to the left" is shortsighted for at least two reasons. First, some countries that were governed by the right in the 1990s continued to be ruled by rightist political leaders in the 2000s (e.g., Colombia and El Salvador until 2009). In addition, some countries have "turned right" in recent years (e.g., Mexico in 2000 or Chile in 2009). Second, the exclusive focus on "electoral politics," in particular on the "winners" of the electoral game, tends to produce selection biases. Even if not in the presidential office (as in much of contemporary Latin

America), and even if electorally devastated (as, for instance, in Bolivia or Ecuador), rightist forces can still shape policy outcomes in important ways.

This volume fills the void of comparative analysis of the right in contemporary Latin America. The aim of the book is less to speculate about the chances of an electoral comeback of the right than to shed light on the mechanisms of political action of right-of-center forces in the region. We believe that this perspective is crucial to improve our understanding of contemporary Latin America. That the left is in power in most countries of the region does not preclude the right from having considerable maneuvering room to influence governments, for instance, by building political parties that are well represented in congress, using the mass media to shape the public agenda, mobilizing experts and technocrats to shape the policy-making process, funding electoral campaigns, or lobbying elected officials. By way of illustration, it might be that moderate leftist administrations, such as that of "Lula" da Silva in Brazil (2003–10) or Michelle Bachelet in Chile (2006–10), not only "overlearned" lessons from the 1970s and 1980s but also faced severe constraints from rightwing actors, thereby failing to take advantage of a historic opportunity to bring about far-reaching social change.[5]

Given that there is almost no research on the right in contemporary Latin America,[6] our main task in this introduction is to advance a framework for analysis. We hope this framework turns useful for future and much-needed research of rightwing politics across the region. The remainder of this introduction is organized in five sections. First, we provide a working definition of "the right" and compare it to available alternatives on how to conceive it. Second, on the basis of the conceptualization of the right proposed, we argue that the electoral difficulties of rightist forces in contemporary Latin America are directly related to the levels of economic inequality prevalent in the region. Otherwise stated, the very institutionalization of electoral competition since the 1990s allowed leftist forces to win office by articulating social grievances, calling for economic change, and promoting electoral programs that seek to overcome the conservative modernization project defended by the right. As long as Latin American societies continue to be characterized by high levels of socioeconomic inequality, the right faces structural constraints when seeking to compete electorally.

Third, we turn our attention to the ways in which rightwing forces are trying to defend their ideas and interests in the face of this difficult political environment. We sketch three strategies for rightist political action in the region: engaging in interest representation through nonelectoral means, engaging in electoral politics via the development of nonpartisan or antiestablishment electoral vehicles, and engaging in party building. Although variant across time and space, these three different "vehicles" for rightist political action contribute to shape public policy and yield signifi-

cant (and also variant) political and distributional implications. Fourth, we present a brief account of how the ambivalent relationship between the Latin American right and democratic politics has been studied so far. We claim that researchers should shift attention from the impact of the right on democratic survival to the right's possible impacts on different dimensions related to democratic quality. Finally, we outline the structure of this volume and anticipate the main topics discussed by its contributors.

Defining the Right

The contemporary division between left and right is rooted in an ideological controversy about social equality that traces back to the French Revolution.[7] Even though the cleavage between left and right emerged in eighteenth-century France, this spatial notion of politics spread globally with great success. According to Alain Noël and Jean-Phillipe Thérien, the rise of socialism in the 1890s was pivotal.[8] Socialist ideas paved the way for the formation of a new left, which sought to mobilize the working classes and to organize an international movement. This approach not only pushed the nonsocialist left to the right, but also led to the consolidation of a laissez-faire stance in terms of social and economic development in the "new" right. It was as a result of this particular juncture that "the left-right metaphor took on its contemporary meaning, as a permanent cleavage about *equality*, which is sufficiently open to be redefined with time and allow shifting alliances, without losing its relevance as a collective representation of the enduring conflict that divides democracies."[9]

Norberto Bobbio has provided perhaps the best analysis of the modern conceptualization of the left-right divide. It is worth stressing three central contributions of his work.[10] First, left and right must be conceived as antithetical terms. In other words, the terms are mutually exclusive, and thus one camp exists because of the very existence of the other. The strength of each camp is not constant; it varies in both time and place. Accordingly, the study of the left-right divide is contingent on the national and historical context.

Second, according to Bobbio, the left and right distinction is based on the conception and ideal of equality. Whereas the right conceives most inequalities as natural and difficult (or even inconvenient) to eradicate, the left conceives most inequalities as socially constructed and as a target for progressive social change. Third, by analyzing the left-right axis as an ideological conflict between different attitudes toward equality, Bobbio assumes explicitly that there can be other conflicts orthogonal to the left and right distinction. In this respect, he takes authoritarianism as an example because the latter can be defended by leftwing (e.g., Castro in Cuba) and rightwing

(e.g., Pinochet in Chile) dictators. In a similar vein, Pierre Ostiguy maintains that issues related to social order and authority, as well as moral conservatism and liberalism, constitute a related (yet distinct and sometimes orthogonal) dimension to the left-right divide.[11]

In line with Bobbio's work, and its interpretation by Cas Mudde, we define the right as a political position distinguished by the belief that the main inequalities between people are natural and outside the purview of the state.[12] By contrast, we define the left as a political position characterized by the idea that the main inequalities between people are artificial and should therefore be counteracted by active state involvement.[13] It is worthwhile noting that this definition does not imply that the left is egalitarian and the right is not. The key difference between both camps lies in a dissimilar standard of equality.[14] This conceptualization of the left-right axis follows a deductive approach, by which it is possible to identify an ideological core that represents the substantive meaning of left and right in abstract terms. As Detlef Jahn has recently indicated, this conceptualization has the advantage of providing a definition of left and right that is valid and stable over time and context but at the same time has to be complemented with other elements in order to explain the particularities of the left-right axis in specific countries and periods.[15]

While agreeing with Scott Mainwaring, Rachel Meneguello, and Timothy Power's view that programmatic standings are continuously evolving and relational, we believe that anchoring ideological demarcations on the relative status of inequality provides a useful way to efficiently map programmatic platforms along the left-right spectrum and across time.[16] The proposed *ideological* definition of the right—understood as a political stance rooted in the belief that the main inequalities between the people are natural and outside the purview of the state—offers a substantive starting point. Because the definition in question is a minimal one, it can "travel" across different national and historical contexts while avoiding conceptual stretching.[17] But this does not preclude the need to complement our proposed definition when applying to particular cases (or at lower steps in the *ladder of abstraction*).

Our definition of the right (and the left) differs from others'. Alternative definitions of the right could be organized in three groups. The first pursues ideological definitions, such as the one we proposed above. The second assumes that the (empirical) distinction between left and right refers to (contingent) policy positions on issues such as economic preferences and moral values. The third and last approach defines the right in sociological terms; that is, on the basis of parties' core constituencies and electoral bases. To what extent is our definition compatible with, or different from, these approaches? We explore this below.

Ideological Definitions

A long-standing intellectual tradition defines the Latin American right as a conservative ideology that is in favor of the status quo and defended by the traditional sectors of society. For instance, José Luis Romero maintains that the roots of the Latin American right lie in the rural elites of the colony.[18] Given that the latter were opposed to the process of modernization, they defended traditional institutions and an essentialist point of view regarding the nation.[19]

Ideological definitions of the right have been developed to study not only the past, but also contemporary Latin America. Power's study on the right in postauthoritarian Brazil proposes to classify political actors along a "democratic-authoritarian" cleavage, by which parties of the right usually align and carry the heritage of an authoritarian alternative.[20] From this viewpoint, the right alludes to those politicians who are veterans of an authoritarian power structure and remain active after the (re)establishment of democracy. Given that this definition is based on the identification of a cohort of politicians who shared a common ideological position in the past (i.e., defense of the authoritarian system in Brazil), we are dealing with an approach that is more retrospective than prospective and that, as such, was set to expire.[21] Power's definition would not apply to cases lacking a recent authoritarian experience or where the (semi)authoritarian system was commanded by a nonrightist party, like that of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (Partido Revolucionario Institucional, or PRI) in Mexico.

Michael Coppedge, in his expert survey characterization of political parties in Latin America, also resorted to ideology to refer to the left-right axis.[22] Assuming that the right varies along time, he proposes to differentiate between four types of rightwing parties, which have emerged in Latin America in the twentieth century. First, some rightwing parties have their roots in the oligarchic parties of the nineteenth century. Those parties did not moderate their political platform at the same time as they appealed to mass support from the lower classes after the expansion of suffrage (e.g., Chilean Conservative Party). A second type of rightwing party is characterized by the adherence to the fascist ideology (e.g., Chilean Nazi Party). Those who support a current or a former authoritarian regime and have origins in such an authoritarian past (e.g., the National Renovating Alliance in Brazil) comprise a third group. Finally, center-right parties are those that seek to incorporate middle- and lower-class support to their traditional base by promoting ideas related to private-public strategic cooperation, public security, morality, or the prioritizing of economic growth over distribution (e.g., the Argentine Union of the Democratic Center).

Undoubtedly, Coppedge's distinction between these four types of right parties can be useful for undertaking a historical overview of the Latin American right. But the approach is problematic for at least two reasons. First, it is not clear which ideological features the above-mentioned parties have in common, and thus on what ground they can be labeled as "right." Second, this definition is excessively broad, and, by following the Wittgensteinian principle of "family resemblance," it runs the risk of stretching the concept we want to define.[23] By contrast, the minimal concept we proposed has the advantage of setting a benchmark that not only can be used as a starting point to differentiate left and right, but also can be complemented in order to identify the configuration of different types of right across time and space.

Identifying the Right through Policy Positions

A second approach for identifying left and right is based on the analysis of the policy positions that different political parties and leaders promote. This approach has been developed on the basis of two methodological strategies: the comparison of party manifestos and the analysis of survey instruments applied to different types of relevant respondents (e.g., party elites, political experts, or partisan electorates and voters).

The first strategy has rarely been used in Latin America because the so-called Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP) has mostly focused in other world regions so far. Even so, Kathleen Bruhn maintains that CMP data compiled for the case of Mexico match qualitative assessments of policy positions in the Mexican party system, placing the National Action Party (Partido Acción Nacional, or PAN), PRI, and the Party of the Democratic Revolution (Partido de la Revolución Democrática, or PRD) regularly as right, center, and left, respectively.[24] Meanwhile, on the basis of a new manifesto database for Chile, López Varas and Baeza Freer argue that since the return to democracy the Chilean right has increasingly shifted its political positions toward the center.[25]

The second method has been applied more frequently in Latin America on the basis of data collected through regional public opinion barometers such as the Latinobarómetro and the Latin American Public Opinion Project. On this basis, for instance, Morales argues that although Latin Americans tended to identify more with the right in the 1990s and seemed to shift to the left during the 2000s, the majority of the population has stuck to centrist ideological identities.[26] Furthermore, the database of the Latin American Congressional Elites Project developed by the Universidad de Salamanca has provided valuable information on legislators' ideological positioning and issue preferences across Latin America and over time. According to available results, the state-market divide is the substantive dimension

that displays the greater correlation to the left-right axis in Latin America.[27] Nina Wiesehomeier reaches a similar conclusion while replicating such analysis, but on the basis of an original expert survey data set.[28]

In general, available works in this line suggest that the state-market dimension is crucial to distinguish left and right party positions in Latin America, while other dimensions—such as moral values or positions on the issue of globalization—are not equally important. While we agree on stressing the centrality of state-market issues for identifying leftist and rightist forces, we instead proceed deductively than inductively. Both of the methodological approaches described here are either applied inductively (i.e., identifying rightist parties as those that are empirically placed to the right) or on the basis of preexisting (and oftentimes implicit) criteria regarding the relative ideological position of parties for which issue positions are then empirically analyzed.

Sociological Definitions

The third approach to defining the right follows a sociological approach, and it is most notably represented by Edward Gibson's monograph on Argentine conservatism.[29] This type of definition, which Gibson proposes to apply in comparative works on the subject, was then adopted in Kevin J. Middlebrook's edited volume on the right in Latin America.[30] Gibson anticipated this definition in his chapter in Chalmers et al. (1992), thus also influencing the theoretical framework of the earlier edited volume on the right and democracy.[31] Gibson's definition is based on the identification of each party's core constituency and on the assumption that to become electorally viable, the right needs to engage in multiclass electoral coalition making. In his words:

> as a minimal definition, conservative parties are parties that draw their core constituencies from the upper strata of society . . . A party's core constituencies are those sectors of society that are most important to its political agenda and resources. Their importance lies not necessarily in the number of votes they represent, but in their *influence* on the party's agenda and capacities for political action. A party's core constituencies shape its identity; they are necessary to its existence. However, given the competitive imperatives of mass politics, they are usually not enough. A party's political leadership must usually forges alliances between its core constituencies and other social sectors if it is to succeed at the polls. This is especially so when, as is the case with conservative parties, their core constituencies constitute a small share of the population. The study of conservative party politics is, therefore, the study of the construction of polyclassist coalitions.[32]