
Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: Analysis of Recent Period

A economia Solidária na Agenda Governamental no Brasil, Argentina e Urugua: Uma análise do Período Recente

Caio Luis Chiariello¹ 
Sergio Azevedo Fonseca² 

DOI:10.22478/ufpb.2525-5584.2021v6n1.56293

Recebido em: 24/11/2020
Aprovado em: 03/06/2021

Abstract: In this paper, we point the characteristics of Solidary Economy present in three Latin American countries: Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, under the prism of public policies institutionalization and of public policies directed to the development of solidary enterprises in their different modalities. We search to visualize the presence of Solidarity Economy in the governmental agenda of these three countries during the period they were under governmental management considered as progressive, and would commit themselves to stimulate actions aimed at the Solidary Economy. An effort to propose public policies for Solidarity Economy was verified in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, but these public policies took place more as government policies than as State policies, compromising their permanence.

Keywords: Solidary Economy; Governmental Agenda; Brazil Argentina and Uruguay.

Resumo: Neste artigo, serão abordadas as principais características da Economia Solidária presentes em três países da América Latina: Brasil, Argentina e Urugua, sob o prisma da institucionalização das políticas públicas elaboradas e direcionadas para o desenvolvimento dos empreendimentos solidários em suas diferentes modalidades. O que se busca é engendrar um levantamento da presença da Economia Solidária na agenda governamental destes três países no período em que estiveram sob uma gestão governamental tida como progressista, e que em tese se comprometeriam a estimular ações voltadas para a Economia Solidária. O que se verificou foi que embora tenha havido esforço para proposição de políticas públicas para a Economia Solidária no Brasil,

¹ Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados – E-mail: caiochiariello@ufgd.edu.br.

² Professor Livre Docente do Departamento de Administração Pública da UNESP – E-mail: sergio.fonseca@unesp.br.

Argentina e Uruguay, estas se deram mais como políticas de governo do que de Estado, comprometendo sua perenidade.

Palavras-chave: Economía Solidária; agenda governamental; Brasil Argentina e Uruguay

1. Introduction

The Solidarity Economy rescues a communal premise that subsidized the performance of consumer, credit, and agricultural cooperatives, operating since the 19th century in South America. Also recovers the labor dimension, linked to rural and urban workers' movements, as unions, sharing the same tensions and ideologies. However, during the 20th century these experiences abandoned their solidary principles, taking on the competition dynamics of hetero-managed organizations. This distancing from solidary principles and adherence to competitive principles was largely supported and financed by government (Singer, 2000; Laville, 2004).

In order to keep solidary enterprises configuration, was necessary to include Solidarity Economy in the South America governmental agenda, promoting their development and continuity. From the beginning of the 21st century, we can observe the efforts of governments with progressive profile to promote greater development of Solidarity Economy in South America.

Examples of the effort: 2000 - creation of an Institute of Social Economy in Argentina; 2003 - creation of a National Secretary for Solidarity Economy – SENAES in Brazil; 2005 - creation of institutions as INACOOOP and specific laws for Solidarity Economy in Uruguay; 2008 - inclusion of Solidarity Economy as an economic system in Ecuador Constitution; 2008 - inclusion of Solidarity Economy into Venezuela's Constitution with an Organic Law of Common Economic System; 2009 - Solidarity Economy was contemplated in Bolivian's Constitution, with governmental protection to collective activities by indigenous peoples (Coraggio, 2014). Guerra (2012) analyzes two different forms of Solidarity Economy institutionalization into legal-normative in South America, based on their political guidelines: a) public policies creation for the promotion, development and control of Solidarity Economy sector through specific actions; b) Solidarity Economy inclusion under new legal and constitutional frameworks as an economic sector into the national economic dynamic.

This paper objective is comprehend how Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay proposed the inclusion of Solidarity Economy in their governmental agenda, through its institutionalization and specific public policies elaboration. We don't seek to compare the three countries agenda, but just show the contributions in terms of public policies elaboration, directed to Solidarity Economy. The period of analysis covers the progressive management at the three countries, what was expected after inserting Solidarity Economy in their agenda: Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff administrations in Brazil (2002-2016); Tabaré Vázquez and Pepe Mujica administrations in Uruguay (2005-2020); Nestor and Cristina Kirshner administrations in Argentina (2003-2015). Therefore, the paper is structured with this introduction, a section with the inclusion of Solidarity Economy in South American governmental agenda in recent period; a section with the public actions and its limitations in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay to Solidarity Economy public policies implantation; the final considerations.

This study's methodology is qualitative-quantitative - Quali-Quantitative - or Mixed. The paper begins with a qualitative approach, followed by a quantitative one. A 'Quali-Quantitative' study uses different methods, in which the qualitative and quantitative information complements each other (CRESWELL, 2010). To Sampieri et al (2013), the Mixed method implies the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, their integration and joint discussion, for a better understanding of the phenomenon. Here a literature about governmental agenda and Solidarity Economy institutionalization in South America represents the qualitative step. The quantitative step shows the most important public policies for Solidarity Economy in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, illustrating the efforts and gaps to Solidarity Economy Institutionalization.

2. Solidarity economy in the governmental agenda

The governmental agenda formulation is an important point to elaborate public policies. The agenda constitutes a set of issues considered important by policy makers and other actors. According to Capella (2017), the government agenda elaboration consists on listing priorities in each area, as health, education, economy, agriculture and social welfare, proposing public policies to improve their situation. In methodological terms, we can cite the Multiple Streams analysis model (KINGDON, 2003), with a sequential approach to public policies, analyzing the processes of establishing the governmental agenda, the alternatives chosen to public policy formulation, and the

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

decision making. Through the public policies profile, we observe the government orientation and its priorities, the resources directed, the time of implementation and results, in other words, the management core. We can also note if public policies are directed to economic and social transformation, or for the status quo maintenance.

Still about Solidarity Economy inclusion in the governmental agenda, Serafim and Dias (2011, p.305) point that “A Análise de Política, ao focar no comportamento dos atores sociais e no processo de formulação da agenda e da política, busca entender o porquê e para quem aquela política foi elaborada”, including the ideological basis for its conformation. Thus, public policies do not start solely from an economic rationality, but from the superposition of many agendas. In Serafim and Dias (2011), it is essential to define a governmental agenda that includes the Solidarity Economy, which should emphasize the values, interests and interaction of actors who participate in the political game, their conflicts and negotiations into the decision-making process by Policy makers. The agenda construction begins with real problems identification, for the public policies definition. In this regard, Capella (2007) teaches that changes usually occur in governmental agendas composition, especially when problems and issues that have not emerged yet are highlighted among the problems that the governments have to solve. The reality of Solidarity Economy, from the beginning of the 1990s, illustrates this theoretical reflection.

In South America, since the 1990s, solidary enterprises expanded in number and activities, indicating both historically dissociated notions - economy and solidarity (França Filho, 2002). Theoretical contributions of South American authors indicate that these enterprises must increase their dimension and build consistent network. They would adopt some guidelines into their internal organization and socio-economic processes: a) production of many goods and services, under self-management of production means, sharing knowledge about work processes ; b) equitable distribution of production results; c) reciprocity in trading systems at familiar, local, regional and national levels; d) responsible production and consumption, preserving the environment; e) democratic coordination of economic activities, combining collective forms of decision and operational efficiency. (Singer, 2002; Gaiger, 2004; Coraggio, 2016).

Solidary enterprises are usually undercapitalized, what difficult their collective production valorization. Further, the enterprises face difficulties to trade, especially when

dealing with monopolistic or monopsonic market (Eid et al, 2015). In this scenario, public policies are important to give them enough capacity to improve the production development, promote training of their staff to management, increasing economic benefits to their associated workers.

Coraggio (2014) argues that a legal framework for the Solidarity Economy institutionalization is essential to build specific public policies. However, shows a problem about the timing of this institutionalization. Coraggio (2014) admits the urgent needs of public policies to Solidarity Economy survival, but considers that some parsimony is required to articulate a more permanent and consistent agenda, with collective appreciation to economic structures construction based on solidarity values. Caruana (2016) and Chavez (2012) observe many challenges to the effectiveness of public policies designed for Solidarity Economy, because of it's institutional, economic and political situation. In addition, the authors show divergent views about Solidarity Economy: 1) if represents just an economic sector able to participate into the capitalist economic system, creating employ an income, or 2) if represents a social, political and economic real transformation. In both cases, Solidarity Economy needs an institutional framework.

3. Solidarity economy institutionalization in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: advances and limitations

The recent political scenario in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay was marked by progressive managements, instead the South American traditional. The Solidarity Economy was received in their governmental agenda, with higher institutionalization. Brazil had progressive administrations from 2003 to 2010, first with Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010), and then with Dilma Rousseff (2011-2016), both linked to the Workers' Party – PT. The social participation and the support for social movement is a PT mark. In 2003 SENAES was created and Solidarity Economy finally incorporated into the governmental agenda. Since the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff in 2016, but especially from 2019 onwards, the progressive platform lost importance and the Solidarity Economy presence in governmental agenda decreased.

In Argentina, progressive administrations began with Nestor Kirchner, from 2003 to 2007, succeeded by his wife, Cristina Kirshner, from 2007 to 2015, both from the Justice Party, linked to Peronism. From 2016 to 2019, Mauricio Macri's administration

adopted a liberal agenda, and in 2020 Alberto Fernandes began a new progressive administration.

In Uruguay, the administrations of Tabaré Vázquez, from 2005 to 2010; 2015-2020, and of Jose Mujica from 2015 to 2020, both from the Frente Amplio party and progressives, bring the Solidarity Economy into the governmental agenda. Mujica is even an emblematic figure in Latin American left wing. In 2020, Lacalle Pou, from the National Party, with a center-right inclination, was elected.

The Solidarity Economy path in the three countries shows differences and similarities that must be observed to understand singularities of public policies for Solidarity Economy in each case, which will be done next.

3.1 Brazil

In Brazil, public policies indirectly contemplated Solidarity Economy projects since the 1990s. But a Solidarity Economy agenda consolidation started in the 2000s, pressured by social movements adherent to workers interest. The SENAES actions were marked by transversal approach on public policies elaboration and execution, structured into a special governmental program: Solidarity Economy in Development. Many Federal agencies contributed with budgeted resources. From 2004 to 2011 the program was present in different areas, supporting Solidarity Economy activities with specific resources lines to technical capacitation, access to markets, production development, public purchases (Faria and Sanches, 2011; Cunha, 2012).

As from 2012, the Solidarity Economy activities came to be seen as a tool to extreme poverty combat, a Brazilian historic problem. Solidary Economy was no longer expressed in a particular Program, but included into territorial, local and integrated approach, mapping diverse demands and themes. The Regional Sustainable Territorial Development and Solidarity Economy Program incorporated most Solidarity Economy actions (Mota, 2017).

With a more transversal and decentralized proposal, Solidarity Economy public policies composed the general government strategies for local and territorial development, establishing some initiatives: a) give support to solidary enterprises and their networks, offering knowledge, credit lines and public resources access, besides organizing fair trade; b) strengthen Solidarity Economic policies institutionalization to promote initiatives in sustainable and territorial development processes (Mota, 2017).

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

Since 2016, the inclusion of Solidarity Economy into the governmental agenda took place at the Forum Dialoga Brasil Interconselhos, but not contemplated by a specific program. It was only mentioned by the Promotion of Decent Work and Solidarity Economy Program, with few actions. However, the budgetary actions of this Program were suppressed along the years, with a drastic reduction. In 2016 SENAES was disfigured and in 2019 extinguished, representing the 'sunset' of Solidarity Economy government agenda in Brazil.

After a brief presentation of the scenario, paying attention to the period between 2003-2015, the Table 1 shows the most important public policies implemented in Brazil.

Table 1: Main Solidarity Economy public policies in Brazil 2003-2015

2003
- Creation of SENAES; - Beginning of Solidarity Economy mapping
2004
- Project Solidarity Economy Etnodevelopment at Quilombolas community - Solidarity Economy Sectorial Plan implementation (PLANSEQ/ Ecosol).
2005
- Aquaculture and Fishing development sustainable plan managed by SEAP
2006
- Project for the Promotion of Local Development and Solidarity Economy (PPDLES); - Support for projects of companies recovered by self-managed workers; - Public Solidarity Economy Centers implementation; - National Solidarity Economy Fair Program Implementation.
2007
- Planseq 2008/2010 implementation, which incorporated issue of fair trade trade into organization strategy of networks and production chains; - launch of a Public Call for partnerships of five Regional Centers and National Center for Training in Solidarity Economy implementation; - Technical Assistance to EESs and Economic Cooperation Networks.
2008
- PPDLES had a new identity, named Programa Brasil Local; - Technical Cooperation Agreement signed between the Ministry of Labor and Employment - MTE, through the National Secretariat for Solidarity Economy - SENAES, and the Ministry of Justice to carry out Solidarity Economy actions to prevent violence and crime, within the scope of PRONASCI; - National Program for Social Cooperativism creation (PRONACOOP SOCIAL); - participation in the Citizenship Territories Program; - Enterprises and Support Entities Registration for the Maintenance and Expansion of Solidarity Economy Information System – SIES; - Solidarity Finances promotion, based on Community Banks and Solidarity Funds and Contributions in the 21 Agenda Program of MMA.
2009
- Centers for Technical Assistance in Solidarity Economy (NEATES) Implementation and technical assistance projects in Cooperation Networks;

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

- Projects to promote and strengthen Associations and Cooperatives of Recyclable Material Collectors (CATAFORTE), through training actions and technical advice; - Solidarity Economy Training Centers (CFES) Implementation; - Second PLANSEQ/Ecosol.
2010
- Decree No. 7357, of November 17, 2010, which regulates PRONINC; - National Organization for the Marketing of Solidarity Economy Products and Services project.
2011
- Support to Community Development Bank initiatives; - Support to Solidarity Revolving Funds organizations, to make associative and sustainable productive actions viable, including more than 250 Solidarity Funds.
2012
- Family Agriculture Program implementation; - Regional Development, Sustainable Territorial and Solidarity Economy Program implementation, with actions aimed at local development with a focus on territories and Solidarity Economy.
2013
- support for economic organization and promotion of citizenship for rural women into Family Agriculture Program - Solid Waste Program implementation.
2014
- National Association and Social Cooperativism Program (PRONACOOOP Social) creation.
2015
-National Register of Solidarity Economic Enterprises – CADSOL creation, established by MTE Ordinance 1,780 of November 19, 2014.

Source: Mota (2017); Brazil (2019)

Elaborated by author

A legal framework had to be designed to the elaboration and execution of Solidarity Economy public policies. The urgency of a legal framework had always been reinforced by National Conferences on Solidarity Economy resolutions and by National Council of Solidarity Economy – CNES. They established two important needs: 1) recognition, formalization and fair tax for solidary enterprises; 2) more access to public policies, removing legal and bureaucratic obstacles to implementing programs and actions, especially investments for the structuring projects (Brasil, 2019).

The public policies construction presented here comes from a long path of discussions and collective assessments of Solidarity Economy segment demands, applied by progressive governments. The Solidarity Economy insertion in the governmental agenda, in Brazil, as Argentina and Uruguay, was only possible by many actors efforts, as unions, public institutions, researchers, students, and others.

3.2 Argentina

During the 2001 and 2002 crises, Argentine had lots of experiences of Solidarity Economy in many sectors. Argentina already had public policies to cooperativism and associativism along 20th century (Hintze, 2011). After the crisis, a common effort by Solidarity Economy actors and governments took place, at national, provincial and municipal levels, to promote collective activities, generating work and income (Gandulfo, 2012).

Coraggio (2011; 2014) points populist practices at governmental participation in development of Solidarity Economy in Argentina, so usual in South America. For the author, a populist style of management aims to solve popular problems, including unemployment and poverty.

According to Coraggio, Solidarity Economy insertion in governmental agenda respond to immediate concerns, without integrated policies, decentralizing its execution. In this way, government has only a technical function, with low popular participation in public policies conception, implementing a top-down system.

From 2003, even under a populist approach, Argentine government adopted Solidarity Economy public polices, but only to promote self-managed enterprises, focused on poor sectors, unemployment people and market insertion (Coraggio, 2014).

Nation Social Development Ministry- MIDES -, created in 2003, was the first Federal entity to promote initiatives to solve poverty and unemployment. Contributed to new forms of citizen participation, searching for local development, job inclusion and access to goods and services. (Caruana, 2016).

Solidarity Economy integration with public policies was clearly accompanied by new regulations, under a hybrid perspective, but still keeping tensions and lacking articulation with other economic, cultural and social policies (Snerc, 2019).

Blasco and Garcia (2017) argue that many cooperatives were created by public policies, including the peculiar experience of recovering broken factories by their workers, under self-management, that also established networks. For the authors, from 2000 to 2015, the government gave official support, through public purchases, tax facilitation, technical and administrative training programs in partnerships with Universities, in an effort to strengthen the solidary enterprises.

Table 2 presents the main initiatives to insert Solidarity Economy in the government agenda in Argentina.

Table 2: Main Solidarity Economy public policies in Argentina 2003-2012

2003
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Economy and Local Development Secretary criation; - “National Plan for Local Development and Social Economy ‘Manos a la Obra’” implementation, for social inclusion through socio-productive projects based on associative and self-managed work in projects with at least 5 people; - Integration of National Institute of Asociativism and Social Economy - INAES, created in 1996, in charge of legislating, controlling and promoting the Solidarity Economy, to MIDES.
2004
Creation of the National Registry of “Local Development ans Social Economy Effectors” with Law 25865, registering social micro-entrepreneurs to leave informality.
2005
- Administrative decision to expand debit cards, streamlining business for small producers, including Solidarity Economy.
2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Law 26,117 promulgation, “From the promotion of microcredit to the development of the social economy”, and National Microcredit Commission – CONAMI creation; - Education Ministry promoted technical training programs; - Turism Ministry, through the program Red Argentina of rural and communitarian tourism, articulated community organizations in associations to promote and carry out rural tourism activities to generate employment and income.
2007
-Pro-Huerta Program Implementation, of the National Institute of Agricultural Technology - INTA- and the Social Agricultural Program - PSA/Ministry of Agriculture.
2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expansion of Pró-Huerta Program, with territorial capillarity, as a Solidarity Economy development and promotion policy; - Institute of Industrial Technology – INTI - and the Ministerio de Trabajo begin to provide training and assistance programs; - Ministry of Federal Planning, Investment and Services created the Federal Plan of Social Integration by Cooperatives.
2009
- Promulgation of Law 26,355, of 'Collective Brand', which would allow products and services produced by design associations.
2010
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Inversion Program – PRIS implementation, which encouraged the creation of cooperatives to carry out small municipal public works; - Social Ingress Program by Work - PRIST – Creation, with Argentina Works and Ellas Hacen actions.
2011
- bankruptcy Law, establishing priorities for workers to acquire credit to continue activities.
2012
- Establishment of many training and advisory programs by INTI and Ministry of Work, Employ and Social Security.

Source: Coraggio (2014); Caruana (2016); Blasco & Garcia (2017)

Elaborated by author

In terms of legal framework, Torres (2019) shows the need for a National Law to regulate public policies for to Solidarity Economy. The author emphasizes that during the last decades, the Solidarity Economy segment was absent of national legal framework.

Analyzing the provincial laws, Both Torres (2019) and Blasco & Garcia (2017) noted an advance of Solidarity Economy in provinces governmental agenda at, but with an asymmetrical development. In addition to the fact that some provinces have regulations for Solidarity Economy and others not, their particularities accentuate this asymmetry. Despite the Solidarity Economy actions and programs insertion in public policies, and government effort to institutionalization, the fact is that Argentina doesn't have a Federal Law for Social and Solidarity Economy. This discussion about the need of a National Law has been addressed for years, but didn't advance (Torres, 2019). The Argentine Constitution doesn't even mention Social or Solidarity Economy on its text, appearing only at provinces constitution. It is also demanded a new law to regulate cooperatives activities – the actual one dates from 1973, it in order to contemplate collective enterprises particularities.

But, according to Caruana (2016), the main obstacles to Solidarity Economy strength do not come from legal limitations, but from economic, social and political ones. According to Snerc (2019), the Solidarity Economy has been seen as a utopian project. In this way, Government uses Solidarity Economy on a top down system, to increase the enterprises number, generate some work and income, but don't really their development.

3.3 Uruguay

In Uruguay, at 2005 Frente Ampla administration faced an economic crisis that had begun in previous years, with more than 30% of people living in poverty situation, besides a wide social inequality. In this context, government prioritized this delicate situation reversion, creating in 2005 a Social Development Ministry – MIDES – and implementing the National Assistance Plan for Social Emergency – PANES. From then on, Solidarity Economy began to be more intensely discussed in governmental agenda, as a tool for job and income generation, as the inclusion of the most vulnerable workers. In this way, Solidarity Economy could partially mitigate negative externalities, as exclusion and informality. The public policies for financing programs of production and self-employment, cooperatives and associativism really took place, but without continuity perspectives (Rieiro, 2016).

The main public policies were oriented to urban and rural solidary enterprises. Were also linked to action plans, projects and programs, applied singly or under integration. This represented some ambiguity, as several public policies were

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

implemented with a few or a lot of resources, including since small local until large projects with a strong impact on the development of collective enterprises. However, as noted Torrelli et al (2019), the resources allocated to Solidarity Economy public policies represented in most cases around 1% of the budget of the government entities.

Between 2013 and 2015 a large mapping of Solidarity Economy in Uruguay was carried out, with more than 600 enterprises. The project “Mapping, characterization and challenges of Solidarity Economy”, was based on the demand of Solidarity Economy Coordination, an organization focused on individual and family small businesses (UEC, 2016). During this period, the National Institute of Cooperativism – INACOOOP was also established, based on articulation between Solidarity Economy actors and the government, including Solidarity Economy into public policies, even at the international level. The General Law on Cooperatives, of 2008, establishes that “el Estado promoverá la aprobación de políticas públicas orientadas al sector cooperativo y de la economía social en general” (Art. 185), and it’s up to INACOOOP “impulsar el estudio y la investigación de otras formas de la economía social y solidaria y realizar propuestas sobre su alcance y regulación, de modo de favorecer la formación de un marco jurídico que facilite su desarrollo y promoción” (Art. 187).

Table 3 presents the main public policies directed to Solidarity Economy from 2003 to 2014.

Table 3: Main Solidarity Economy public policies in Uruguay 2003-2014

2003
- Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries - MGAP – actions for agricultural development to generate financing for small rural producers, including cooperatives;
2004
- Rural Microcredit Program, actions of the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP), providing rural population access to credit, fostering community organizations of credit committees;
2005
- Program Social Economy Support, from Canelones department; - Action for Land Regularization, promoted by the National Colonization Institute (INC);
2006
- Uruguay Classification Program, developed by MIDES, contributed to social integration and inclusion of recycled materials collectors in urban areas; - Action Support to Enterprises, prepared by MIDES, sought to strengthen productive integration; - Program for Strengthening Productive Enterprises, linked to MIDES, contributed to the integration of autonomous production; - Social Cooperatives, also linked to MIDES, offered a legal instrument for collective urban organizations formalization.
2007

- Local Development Project, promoted by the Montevideo Department; - Organizational Institutional Strengthening – Montevideo Rural, linked to MGAP.
2009
- Strengthening and Implementation of Productive Specialization Policies, promoted by Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM);
2010
- Local development, promoted by MIEM, to reinforce local urban capacities through the promotion of collective enterprises; - Mipymes, promoted by Canelones department, to strengthen individual and collective urban enterprises; - INACCOOP, training and research program to promote associative processes.
2012
- Fundes (technical unit), technical advice on projects for solidary and self-managed enterprises formation in urban and rural areas; - Paeyc – Artigas Entrepreneur and Cooperative Program, promoted by Artigas department, sought to promote collective entrepreneurship in urban and rural areas.
2013
- Rural Strategy, linked to MIDES, sought rural population's access to goods and services, thus strengthening local and associative networks, with the objective of promoting collective purchases, production and services provision.
2014
- Social Brand – PROVAS subprogram – promoted by MIDES; - Uruguay Más Cerca (local economic development), linked to the OPP, aimed reducing economic territorial imbalance between urban and rural areas, strengthening economic development processes.

Source: Torrelli et al (2019); Mapeo EcSol Uruguay 2014/15

Elaborated by author

Most of the mentioned public policies were implemented along first Frente Amplia governments, between 2005 to 2014, but most ripping from 2005 to 2009 in terms of implementation, although from 2010 to 2015 we observed the higher resources directed to Solidarity Economy. According to Torrelli et al (2019), public policies became more present from 2005, seeking to reduce poverty and exclusion through initiatives to generate work, income and local development.

Guerra & Reyes (2019) point out the construction of an entire legal framework for regulating associative activities in Uruguay since the beginning of the 20th century. But just after 2005 we observed a new legal framework to cooperative system, with the creation of social cooperatives and more legal support to Solidarity Economy. The authors point the relevance of articulation between executive and parliament to overcome party and ideological barriers to include of Solidarity Economy in legal framework.

One of the most important normative constructions was the Law 17978/2006, named 'Social Cooperatives' Law, within a set of social policies led by the newly created MIDES. The Law 17,978 presents some characteristics of Social Cooperatives: a) at least 75% of its members must be classified as socially vulnerable; b) are free from national

taxes and social security contributions; c) the members remuneration must be equal to the labor market levels; d) management activities cannot be remunerated differently than operational activities; d) its services can be directly contracted by public sector; e) its constitution and operations must be authorized by MIDES.

As a recent effort to advance towards unifying the Solidarity Economy legal framework, in September 2019, Cooperative Special Commission of Parliament received a General Law Project. The Project defines, in its articles: a) the principles of Solidarity Economy; b) the solidary enterprises modalities; c) the government support forms; d) the enterprises organization and their representation within the government; e) the national registration and control of Solidarity Economy entities.

In the Law Project elaboration, the legal framework can better characterize the solidary enterprises, contributing to specific public policies. Can bring a budget and social visibility increase, strength the enterprises, contributing to solidary and collective activities in Uruguay.

4. Final Considerations

In this study we tried to present reflections about the construction of Solidarity Economy in South America, as the historic and the recent demands of collective initiatives in the region. In general, progressive governments in the beginning of the 2000s onwards included Solidarity Economy at the governmental agenda, resulting in public policies elaboration. But these public polices took place only as moment government policies, not permanent policies.

In the Brazilian case, SENAES creation represented institutional insertion of a policy platform focused on Solidarity Economy. For more than 13 years, SENAES spearheaded, under transversal approach, the Solidarity Economy agenda, having own budget, which grew from 2004 to 2013, but decreased year after year, until SENAES extinction in 2019. During this time, a legal framework has been established to support solidary enterprises and public policies directed to them. However, even with greater institutionalization and regulation, Solidarity Economy demands was only part of the governments of that moment agenda, without a long-term perspective. The sad proof of this, SENAES just disappeared and Solidarity Economy public policies were abandoned by the current government, with ultra-liberal inclination.

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

In Argentina, Solidarity Economy public policies were elaborated to decrease effects of 2000s crisis, linking Solidarity Economy to work and income generation programs, as a temporary strategy to reduce poverty. At Kirchners governments, Solidarity Economy was included on the agenda, through Social Economy Secretary and actions aimed at local development, microcredit, finance and support for recovered companies.

There is a perception that Solidarity Economy in Argentina orbited in the political sphere as a mechanism for mitigating the economic crisis and as an electoral populist platform, without a real institutionalization advance.

There was also a low participation and interlocution between government, workers and society about public policies definition, on a top down perspective.

However, different from Brazil, even after a center-right orientation government, public policies for Solidarity Economy didn't disappear.

In Uruguay, associative and cooperative organizations, especially in rural areas, were supported by the state since a long time ago. The Frente Amplia governments introduced Solidarity Economy in their agenda, to reduce the economic crisis, like Argentine, and generate work and income, but also to sophisticate the legal framework, with a General Law of Cooperatives, to qualify public policies to Solidarity Economy, on many levels as technical improvement, microcredit, marketing and local development. The Government's actions tried to expand the scope of solidary enterprises, regulating their activities with public support. Transversal approach was also verified with the participation of several government entities elaborating public policies, including partnership with the provinces. Even with this greater integration, the demands of the Solidarity Economy segment in the country were just partial satisfied. A short note: Frente Amplia government lasted until 2019, a new government begun and the question is if there will be continuity of Solidarity Economy presence in the governmental agenda.

At least, the three countries peculiarities must also be considered on Solidarity Economy agenda composition in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay. Here we point out the lesson that institutionalization, regulation and an intense dialogue between government and solidary enterprises, their workers, with all of society, is essential. It makes possible that Solidarity Economy became an everlasting government public policy itself, seeking for the work generation, income and citizenship, as a strong economy sector. Can even help to surpass contradictions of work, production and distribution of wealth under the capitalism hegemony.

References

Blasco, L. & Garcia, A. (2017). Economía social y solidaria y agenda gubernamental: alcances, actores y objetivos en experiencias provinciales de Argentina a principios de Siglo XXI. *Saberes*. 9(2), 177-195.

Brasil. Ministério do Trabalho. Secretaria Nacional de Economia Solidária. (2012) *Avanços e Desafios para as políticas públicas de economia solidária. no governo federal 2003/2010*. 8 anos de economia solidária no governo federal, Brasília.

Capella, A. (2007). Perspectivas teóricas sobre o processo de formulação de políticas públicas. In G. Hochman et al. (Org.), *Políticas públicas no Brasil*. 87-121. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz.

Capella, A. (2017). *Formulação de Políticas Públicas. Coleção Governo e Políticas Públicas*. Brasília, DF: ENAP.

Caruana, M. (2016). Las políticas públicas y su visión de la economía social y solidaria en Argentina. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*. Nueva Época.

Chaves, R. (2012). Las políticas públicas y las cooperativas. *Ekonomiaz*. 79, 168-199.

Comision de trabajo por ley de EES. (2019). Anteproyecto de Ley de EES. Montevideo: Inacoop, 2019.

Coraggio, J. L. (2011). *Economía social y solidaria: el trabajo antes que el capital*, Abya Yala: Quito.

Coraggio, J. L. (2014). La presencia de la economía social y solidaria y su institucionalización en América latina. *UNRISD Occasional Paper: Potential and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy*. Recuperado de: [https://www.unrisd.org/80256B42004CCC77/\(httpInfoFiles\)/6C316ABB64A13A7CC1257B720034103A/\\$file/JL%20Coraggio.pdf](https://www.unrisd.org/80256B42004CCC77/(httpInfoFiles)/6C316ABB64A13A7CC1257B720034103A/$file/JL%20Coraggio.pdf)

Coraggio, J. L. (2016). La economía social y solidaria (ESS): niveles y alcances de acción de sus actores. El papel de las universidades. In: Puig, C. *Economía Social y Solidaria: conceptos, prácticas y políticas públicas*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.

Creswell, J. (2010). *Projeto de pesquisa: métodos qualitativo, quantitativo e misto*. Porto Alegre: Artmed.

Cunha, G. C. (2012). *Outras políticas para outras economias: contextos e redes na construção de ações do governo federal voltadas à economia solidária (2003-2010)* (Tese de Doutorado em Sociologia). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília. Recuperado de: https://repositorio.unb.br/bitstream/10482/11178/1/2012_GabrielaCavalcantiCunha.pdf

Decreto n. 8.163, de 20 de dezembro de 2013. Institui o Programa Nacional de Apoio ao Associativismo e Cooperativismo Social - Pronacoop Social, e dá outras providências.

Chiariello & Fonseca. *Solidary Economy in Governmental Agenda in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay*

Recuperado de: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2013/decreto/d8163.htm

Eid, F; Addor, F; Chiariello, C.L.; Laricchia, C. & Kawakami, A. (2015). Políticas de agroindustrialização em assentamentos da reforma agrária: uma análise do diálogo entre a prática das cooperativas do MST e as políticas governamentais. *Revista Tecnologia e Sociedade*, 11(1).

Faria, M. S. & Sanches, F. J. B. (2011). A economia solidária no Governo federal: intersectorialidade, transversalidade e cooperação internacional. In: Benini, E. A.; Faria, M. S.; Novaes, H. T. & Dagnino, R. *Gestão pública e sociedades: fundamentos e políticas de economia solidária*. Outras Expressões: São Paulo, 413-425.

França Filho, G. C. (2002). Terceiro setor, economia social, economia solidária e economia popular: traçando fronteiras conceituais. *Bahia Análise & Dados*. Salvador, 9-19.

Gaiger, L. I. (2004). *Sentidos e experiências da economia solidária no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.

Gandulfo, A. (2012). Nuevos desafíos para el desarrollo de la Economía Social y Solidaria en la Argentina. In: Lianza, S. & Henriques, F. C. *A Economía Solidária Na América Latina: realidades nacionais e políticas públicas*. Rio de Janeiro: RILESS, SENAES.

Hintze, S. (2011). *La política es un arma cargada de futuro: La economía social y solidaria en Brasil y Venezuela*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO. CICCUS.

Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. 2. Ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Laville, J. L. (2004). El marco conceptual de la Economía Solidaria. In: Laville, J. L., *Economía Social y Solidaria: Una visión europea*. Buenos Aires: Altamira.

Mota, C. R. S. (2017). *Processo de formulação das políticas públicas de economia solidária nos governos Dilma Rousseff (2011-2016): Uma análise a partir da percepção dos policy-makers* (Dissertação de Mestrado em Ciências Políticas). Universidade Federal de Pelotas. Pelotas, RS, Brasil. Recuperado de: <http://guaiaca.ufpel.edu.br:8080/handle/prefix/4126>

Projeto de Lei da Câmara n. 137, de 2017. Dispõe sobre a criação da Política Nacional de Economia Solidária (PNES) e o Sistema Nacional de Economia Solidária (Sinaes). Recuperado de: <https://legis.senado.leg.br/sdleg-getter/documento?dm=7874615&disposition=inline>

Rieiro, A. (2016). *Gestión colectiva en producción relaciones sociales a partir de las empresas recuperadas por sus trabajadores en el Cono Sur*. (Tese de Doutorado em Sociologia). Universidad de la República Uruguay. Montevideo. Recuperado de: <https://www.colibri.udelar.edu.uy/jspui/handle/20.500.12008/21739>

Sampieri, R.; Collado, C. & Lucio, M. (2013). *Metodologia de pesquisa*. Porto Alegre: Penso.

Serafim, M. P. & Dias, R. B. (2011). Conceitos e ferramentas para análise de política pública. In: Benini, E. A.; Faria, M. S.; Novaes, H. T. & Dagnino, R. (2011). *Gestão pública e sociedades: fundamentos e políticas de economia solidária*. São Paulo: Outras Expressões, 305-337.

Singer, P. & Souza, A. R. (2000). *A Economia Solidária no Brasil: A autogestão como resposta ao desemprego*. São Paulo: Editora Contexto.

Singer, P. (2002). *Introdução à Economia Solidária*. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo.

Snerc, C. (2019). Las políticas públicas de inclusión social en la Argentina 2003-2015 ¿desde la economía social hacia una economía civil? *Ciencias Administrativas*, 13, 1-14.

Torrelli, M.; de Giacombi, B.; Falkin, C. & Sarachu, G. (2019). Mapeo de las políticas públicas vinculadas a la ESS en Uruguay (2015): Una perspectiva sobre su naturaleza y orientaciones a diez años de la asunción del gobierno progresista. *Geograficando*, 15(1),1-18.

Torres, M. A. (2019). La Economía Social y solidaria en los Ordenamientos Jurídicos Provinciales de Argentina. *Cooperativismo & Desarrollo*. 27,1 – 27.

Unidad de estudios cooperativos – UEA. (2016). *Mapeo, Caracterización y Desafíos de la Economía Solidaria en Uruguay (2013/15)*. Montevideo: UEA.