

Original Research Paper

Evaluating State-Capital Legitimacy in Latin American Populism Through Disenfranchised Voices

Lucas Hallberg Fernández^{1*}, Lucinao Scoccola¹, Feresin Gabriela Arrachea¹

¹ Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires. Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Article History

Received:
02.07.2023

Revised:
29.07.2023

Accepted:
03.08.2023

*Corresponding Author:

Lucas Hallberg Fernández

Email:

fernandez.lucas@gmail.com

This is an open access article,
licensed under: [CC-BY-SA](#)



Abstract: This study examines the legitimacy of state-capital relations in Latin American populism by analyzing the contradictions between populist rhetoric and economic governance. While populist leaders claim to champion the marginalized, their economic policies often reveal close ties to corporate interests, raising concerns about the true beneficiaries of populist rule. Through a qualitative comparative approach, this paper explores case studies from Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, and Bolivia to assess how these regimes navigate state intervention and capitalist imperatives. Findings indicate that despite anti-elitist narratives, populist governments frequently sustain economic structures that reinforce existing hierarchies, benefiting political elites and corporate actors. Moreover, the media plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions, either reinforcing or challenging populist legitimacy. Grassroots resistance movements continue to advocate for structural reforms, highlighting the limitations of clientelistic economic policies. This study argues that institutional reforms, increased transparency, and participatory economic models are essential for bridging the gap between populist ideals and economic realities. By addressing these systemic contradictions, Latin American nations can foster a more inclusive and equitable economic future beyond traditional populist paradigms.

Keywords: Economic Governance, Grassroots Resistance, Latin America, Populism, State-Capital Relations.



1. Introduction

The interplay between state power and capitalist interests in Latin America has long been a subject of contention, particularly within populist regimes that claim to champion the disenfranchised while simultaneously engaging with corporate entities. The notion of 'state-capital relations' captures the paradox where populist governments position themselves as anti-elitist yet maintain economic structures that benefit the few [1] [2]. This article examines how these relations manifest in contemporary Latin American politics and how the marginalized segments of society perceive and experience these interactions.

Historically, Latin American populism has emerged as a response to social inequalities, economic dependency, and external capitalist pressures [3]. Leaders have often leveraged nationalist rhetoric and economic interventionist policies to mobilize the masses while, paradoxically, negotiating with transnational corporations and financial institutions [4]. This duality raises questions about the true beneficiaries of populist governance and whether the economic structures they sustain genuinely serve the marginalized or perpetuate existing disparities. Understanding these dynamics requires an analysis of the historical foundations, policy frameworks, and grassroots resistance movements that shape state-capital relations in the region.

Moreover, contemporary discussions on populism have expanded to include the role of globalization, media narratives, and the shifting nature of economic power. The rise of digital economies and foreign direct investment in Latin America further complicates the relationship between populist states and capitalist entities. While some argue that populist policies disrupt neoliberal economic hegemony, others contend that these governments engage in selective capitalism that privileges political elites over broader societal welfare [5]. This article contributes to these debates by examining case studies from Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, and Bolivia, providing a comprehensive exploration of how populist regimes navigate the contradictions between state control and capitalist imperatives.

2. Literature Review

The conceptualization of populism in Latin America has evolved from classical movements led by figures like Juan Perón in Argentina to contemporary leftist leaders such as Evo Morales and Nicolás Maduro. Scholars argue that populist leaders often employ rhetoric against neoliberalism while still engaging with multinational corporations and state-controlled enterprises [6] [7].

Latin American populism has frequently been framed within the context of dependency theory, which critiques the region's subordination within global capitalism [1] [8]. Dependency theorists argue that while populist regimes promise economic redistribution, they often remain constrained by structural economic dependencies on multinational corporations and global financial institutions [9] [10]. This has led to cycles of populist resurgence and decline, as economic crises expose the limitations of state-led redistribution policies [5] [11].

Recent scholarship has highlighted the dual nature of populist regimes, which simultaneously expand social welfare programs while fostering economic alliances that reinforce existing power structures [12] [13]. For example, Petras and Veltmeyer [14] note how leftist populist governments in Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador utilized state-controlled industries to consolidate political power rather than genuinely empower marginalized communities. This paradox has led to a growing critique of the effectiveness of populist economic models in addressing long-term inequality [15].

Moreover, scholars have examined how grassroots movements respond to the contradictions within populist governance [16] [17]. While some movements align with populist leaders in opposition to neoliberalism, others challenge the centralized control of state resources and demand more direct forms of democratic participation. Kalmes [18] argues that neoliberal reforms often co-opt populist rhetoric, creating a complex interplay between economic policy, political ideology, and social activism. This complexity underscores the need for a more nuanced understanding of state-capital relations in Latin America.

In addition to dependency theory, scholars have examined Latin American populism through the lens of neo-Gramscian perspectives, which emphasize the role of hegemony in shaping state-capital relations. Gürsoy [19] argue that populist leaders construct a political project that blends mass mobilization with economic nationalism, thereby maintaining control over state resources while selectively engaging with capitalist interests. This perspective highlights the role of ideology in legitimizing economic policies that may appear redistributive on the surface but ultimately serve to consolidate elite power structures. Moreover, Weyland [20] suggests that populist regimes frequently

employ discretionary economic strategies, such as nationalizations or state subsidies, to maintain political support, often leading to unsustainable fiscal policies and economic crises. Another significant body of literature examines the intersection of populism, corruption, and economic mismanagement. Studies by Acemoglu et al. [21] reveal that while populist leaders often promise to dismantle elite domination, their governance models tend to centralize power, reducing institutional checks and balances. This centralization facilitates rent-seeking behaviors, where state resources are allocated based on political loyalty rather than economic efficiency. Furthermore, comparative studies on Latin American populism and its global counterparts, such as in Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia, indicate that economic nationalism can lead to short-term growth but often results in long-term stagnation due to the lack of structural economic reforms. These insights reinforce the need for a nuanced understanding of state-capital relations in populist regimes, where the rhetoric of economic justice frequently diverges from policy outcomes.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative approach, analyzing political discourses, economic policies, and social movements that respond to state-capital relations in Latin American populist regimes. Data sources include government reports, academic literature, and testimonies from marginalized communities.

4. Finding and Discussion

The findings indicate that despite anti-capitalist rhetoric, populist leaders in Latin America frequently consolidate power by forming alliances with domestic and international corporate entities. The case of Venezuela illustrates how state-owned enterprises, particularly in the oil sector, have been used to sustain political elites while failing to deliver economic justice to the lower classes. Similarly, in Brazil, the Workers' Party (PT) initially pursued wealth redistribution but later became embroiled in corruption scandals involving large construction firms.

Roy's analysis of Argentina's economic policies under populist governance reveals that while short-term welfare programs expanded, long-term structural reforms were often neglected. The emphasis on state-led interventions occasionally resulted in unsustainable fiscal deficits, leading to economic downturns and external debt crises. This cyclical economic instability further alienated the working class, the very demographic populist leaders claimed to uplift.

In Ecuador, the implementation of resource nationalism policies aimed at reclaiming control over natural assets initially appeared beneficial to the economy. However, these policies frequently led to diplomatic conflicts with multinational corporations and a decline in foreign direct investment. As a result, economic growth slowed, and job creation stagnated, disproportionately affecting low-income communities who had placed their hopes in populist promises.

Furthermore, findings suggest that the media plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions of state-capital relations. In Bolivia, state-controlled media often portrayed populist leaders as defenders of national sovereignty, while independent media outlets highlighted corruption scandals and economic mismanagement. This polarization in narratives has influenced public trust in governance and the ability of civil society to hold leaders accountable.

Grassroots movements have been at the forefront of resisting economic inequalities exacerbated by state-capital alliances. In Chile, student-led protests and indigenous activism have demanded greater transparency in resource distribution and economic decision-making. Their demands underscore the persistent gaps between populist rhetoric and the lived realities of marginalized communities.

In Mexico, the rise of populist economic nationalism under recent administrations has resulted in mixed economic outcomes. While state intervention in industries such as energy and infrastructure has generated short-term employment gains, the long-term sustainability of these policies remains uncertain due to inconsistent regulatory frameworks and political instability.

Peru presents another case where populist economic policies have yielded mixed results. Despite efforts to nationalize key industries, government mismanagement and bureaucratic inefficiencies have hindered economic growth, leading to widespread public dissatisfaction and increasing skepticism about state-led economic models.

In Colombia, the interplay between populism and corporate interests has been evident in rural land policies. While government initiatives have sought to redistribute land to marginalized farmers, powerful agribusiness lobbies have resisted reforms, leading to legal disputes and social unrest among disenfranchised rural communities.

Additionally, findings suggest that populist regimes often employ clientelistic economic policies to maintain political support. Direct cash transfer programs, subsidies, and short-term welfare initiatives have been instrumental in securing electoral backing, but they frequently lack structural reforms that could address deeper economic inequalities.

5. Conclusion

The legitimacy of state-capital relations in Latin American populism remains deeply contested. While populist leaders position themselves as defenders of the marginalized, their economic policies often reinforce existing hierarchies. The voices of the disenfranchised provide critical insights into the limitations of populist governance and underscore the need for more inclusive economic alternatives. Future research should explore how grassroots movements can influence policy beyond traditional populist frameworks.

In addition, the role of institutional reforms in mitigating the contradictions of populist governance warrants further investigation. Strengthening democratic accountability, increasing transparency in resource allocation, and fostering political participation among marginalized groups may provide alternative pathways to equitable economic development. These structural adjustments could enhance the legitimacy of populist regimes and ensure that their policies align more closely with the needs of the disenfranchised.

Ultimately, the future of state-capital relations in Latin America will depend on the ability of political institutions to balance economic growth with social justice. By addressing systemic inequalities and fostering more participatory economic models, governments can build more resilient and inclusive societies that genuinely uplift marginalized communities rather than merely offering short-term populist solutions.

References

- [1] F. H. Cardoso, "Dependency and development in Latin America," in *Introduction to the Sociology of "Developing Societies"*, H. Alavi and T. Shanin, Eds. London: Palgrave, 1982.
- [2] Z. Öniş and M. Kutlay, "The global political economy of right-wing populism: Deconstructing the paradox," *Int. Spect.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 108–126, 2020.
- [3] K. M. Roberts, "Latin America's populist revival," *SAIS Rev. Int. Aff.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 3–15, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26999339>. [Accessed: Feb. 9, 2023].
- [4] The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *The Economics and Politics of Transition*, OECD, Sep. 1998. [Online]. Available: <https://www.oecd.org/oecd/reports/1998/09>. [Accessed: Feb. 9, 2023].
- [5] J. Lawson, "Mounting turbulence in neoliberal globalization: Political economy, populist discourse, and policy in Alberta, Canada," *Soc. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 221, May 2022.
- [6] L. Campos and A. Casas, "Rara Avis: Latin American populism in the 21st century," *Eur. J. Polit. Econ.*, vol. 70, Dec. 2021.
- [7] D. Tripathi, "Latin America," in *Modern Populism*, Springer Studies on Populism, Identity Politics and Social Justice, Cham: Springer, 2023.
- [8] O. Sánchez, "The rise and fall of the dependency movement: Does it inform underdevelopment today?," *E.I.A.L.*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2003.
- [9] S. Stöckl and M. Rode, "The price of populism: Financial market outcomes of populist electoral success," *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, vol. 189, pp. 51–83, Sep. 2021.
- [10] G. Scheiring, "Varieties of dependency, varieties of populism: Neoliberalism and the populist countermovements in the Visegrád Four," *Eur.-Asia Stud.*, vol. 73, no. 9, pp. 1569–1595, 2021.
- [11] C. A. Hartwell and T. Devinney, "Populism, political risk, and pandemics: The challenges of political leadership for business in a post-COVID world," *J. World Bus.*, vol. 56, no. 4, p. 101225, Jun. 2021.
- [12] D. Andrade, "Populism from above and below: The path to regression in Brazil," *J. Peasant Stud.*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 1470–1496, 2019.
- [13] A. Grosman, G. Schnyder, A. Cuervo-Cazurra, and I. Okhmatovskiy, "Rethinking state capitalism: A cross-disciplinary perspective on the state's role in the economy," *Ann. Corp. Gov.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 250–327, Apr. 2023.
- [14] J. Petras and H. Veltmeyer, *What's Left in Latin America? Regime Change in New Times*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

- [15] M. Marzetti and R. Spruk, "Long-term economic effects of populist legal reforms: Evidence from Argentina," *Comp. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 60–95, 2023.
- [16] A. Rodríguez-Pose, J. Terrero-Dávila, and N. Lee, "Left-behind versus unequal places: Interpersonal inequality, economic decline and the rise of populism in the USA and Europe," *J. Econ. Geogr.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 951–977, Sep. 2023.
- [17] J. Essletzbichler, F. Disslbacher, and M. Moser, "The victims of neoliberal globalisation and the rise of the populist vote: A comparative analysis of three recent electoral decisions," *Cambridge J. Reg. Econ. Soc.*, vol. 11, pp. 73–94, 2018.
- [18] S. Phelan, "The discourses of neoliberal hegemony: The case of the Irish Republic," *Crit. Discourse Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 29–48, Apr. 2007.
- [19] Y. Gürsoy, "Moving beyond European and Latin American typologies: The peculiarities of AKP's populism in Turkey," *J. Contemp. Asia*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 157–178, 2019.
- [20] S. E. Aytaç and Z. Öniş, "Varieties of populism in a changing global context: The divergent paths of Erdoğan and Kirchnerismo," *Comp. Polit.*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 41–59, 2014.
- [21] D. Acemoglu, J. Robinson, and R. Torvi, "Why do voters dismantle checks and balances?," *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 80, no. 3, Aug. 2011.