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This paper uses two case studies to explore the modes of interaction between the state and civil society that helped to frame a new generation of public policies aimed at reducing the very pronounced socio-economic inequalities existing in Brazil. A short discussion on the possibilities and risks associated with these policies is presented, highlighting the tension between mobilization and distribution and differentiating between distributive and political gains.

The first signs of reduced inequality were a pleasant and expected surprise in Brazil in the 2000s. On the tail of this news came the debate about what caused this drop. In the end, how much of this had to do with more traditional social policies, such as social security, health, and education? How much was due to income transfer programs and the Bolsa Família plan in particular? And how much could be the result of continued economic growth, along with greater opportunities for formal jobs and microcredit? In this paper, we attempt to shed light on another aspect of this debate, using a sociological perspective to discuss the role played by policies geared specifically towards groups and regions that were traditionally seen as marginal.

Analysis is concentrated on programs that are neither universal nor focused on individual socio-economic characteristics, but which are based on recognition of ethnic and territorial identities. These policies gained wind in the last decade and we understand that it is necessary to analyze how they fit into the more general scheme of social policies offered in Brazil. To do this, we studied the emergence and political mechanisms that made it possible for them to be included in the mix of our social policies. There is a preliminary discussion of both their contribution to making access to services and public investments more equitable as well as the risks they pose in terms of increasing distributive-related conflicts.

1 This paper presents results from the “State-Society Relations in India, Brazil, and South Africa” study,
This discussion is carried out using two case studies. One focuses on the Indigenous Health Subsystem, created in 1999. It is emblematic of a significant rupture in a policy area where the famous ‘systemic community’ of the SUS (Unified Healthcare System) fought enthusiastically and with determination for over 20 years for a universal policy, vehemently rejecting any kind of special focus. The other case concerns inter-sectorial policy for Vale do Ribeira, São Paulo state's most impoverished region. Coordination of this policy began in 2003 at the Food Security Board (CONSAD) and was integrated into the Citizenship Territories (TC) program starting in 2008.

This analysis follows the work of the IBSA-CDRC group\(^2\), focusing on the modes of interaction between the state and civil society in order to better understand the extent to which particular forms of state-society interactions contribute to reducing the extremely pronounced socio-economic inequalities present in Brazil, India and South Africa. By emphasizing the centrality of these interactions, we diverge from the analytical currents that have interpreted the emergence of affirmative and territorial policies as having resulting, more than anything, from either mobilization of systematically marginalized social actors who have begun to put pressure on the government, or from legislation that fostered crystallization of identities among social actors who, using these policies, began to demand their 'new' rights.

The text is written in five parts. In the next section we review literatures that analyze the policy formation process emphasizing the importance of paying more attention to the mechanisms of interaction between government and society. Section 3 presents an overview of the political trajectories that led to the institutionalization of the policies under discussion. In section 4 we explore policy features and impacts. In section 5 we briefly discuss the tensions between mobilization and distribution distinguishing between political and distributive gains.

II. Literature Review

---

\(^2\) The IBSA-CDRC organized the summary of studies carried out by the Citizenship Development Research Center (CDRC)/IDS in Brazil, India, and South Africa.
Political theorists have dug into the ‘black box’ of the state calling attention to how state bureaucracies and institutional designs play a role in perpetuating the historic challenges that bedevil the South, such as poverty, social inequality and economic underdevelopment (Skocpol, 1985; Ostrom, 1990). Other scholars have chosen to focus on capitalism and the unequal opportunities available to the poorest countries in the newly globalized division of labor (Amin, 1976). A third group has moved in yet another direction, finding the origins of democracy’s imperfections in civil society’s lack of organization or absence of ‘democratic culture’ (Putnam, 1993). What these approaches have in common is the shared focus on one of the following entry points: the state, the market, or civil society.  

In this review we suggest that some important problems related to social and economic inequalities are being tackled by coalitions of actors that come together through specific mechanisms of interaction that cannot be understood from a single entry point. Once a more process-oriented approach is adopted, it became clear that there is a long process through which there has been a consolidation of mechanisms of interaction between state and societal actors that play a crucial role in defining their strategies and actions.

Following the work of the CDRC-IBSA group, we link the concept of modes of interaction to the range of literature on Political Opportunity Structures (POS), where these are conceptualized both as moments of engagement and as conditioned by institutions and historical conditions that enable certain types of action and activism over other types and forms. We also refer to the social opportunity structures (SOS) that are required not only in order to take advantage of political opportunity structures, but also to help create more political opportunities.

In addition to the three familiar approaches presented above, we argue that the results of inclusive democracy also depend on transformations in the dynamics and structures of interaction between state and society actors that occur through mobilization and state interaction – for example, new alliances between state and society and new participatory spaces. From this angle we moreover acknowledge the

---

3 The review of literature presented herein is based extensively on work developed in the CDRC-IBSA working group. For more information on this project, see Mohanty, R., Thompson, L. and Schattan Coelho, V. 2010. States of Mobilisation? A comparison of Modes of Interaction between states and social actors in India, Brazil and South Africa, Monograph, University of the Western Cape: African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy Publication.
importance of state and civil society actors in making democracy happen; but, we believe that these factors should be taken into account together, through a model that highlights the specificity of the interactions in question.

Mobilization and state interaction illustrate how these two paradoxical trends (taking place simultaneously, and with reference to each other) shape state-society relationships. In this sense, actors from both fields are constantly engaging with each other, thus shaping and reshaping their identities and the society-state relationship.

In defining political opportunity structures we borrow from Tarrow (1994), Gaventa and McGee (2009), and Thompson and Tapscott (2010). As these authors have shown, political opportunity structures are particular political environments in which social and state actors define their struggle; yet, political structures are not structures given from ‘above’ to which social actors merely respond. Rather, such political opportunity structures are themselves conditioned by, and therefore are a result of, historical processes (including struggles) that shape the behavior of social and state actors. Hence, what may appear as a ‘given’ political opportunity structure at a particular instant may have evolved over time through historical struggles. As such, political opportunity structures refer to those political mechanisms that are available (for example, constitutions, policies, institutions, legislation) as well as historical opportunities, or moments at which political coalitions are challenged – before and after elections, or around international events such as the International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People, proposed by the United Nations in 1995, which helped to strengthen the indigenous movement.

Likewise, social opportunity structures are those enabling or constraining conditions for mobilization which are socially located, such as social inequalities, cultural features, the nature of associational life and the history of mobilization in the region (Thompson and Tapscott 2010; Coelho and von Lieres 2010). In this sense, from society’s point of view, aspects such as religious disputes or historic exclusion of certain groups may work as bonds or impediments, determining the capacity of these groups to form networks of solidarity that are fundamental for their mobilization in relation to the state.

In adopting a more process-oriented approach we argue that mechanisms of interaction are building blocks of state-society relations and we explore how they are conditioned over time, by features of representative democracy and histories of social mobilization.
III. Mechanisms, coalitions, and new policies

The two cases to be analyzed in this paper, health policy for indigenous people consolidated in the Indigenous Health Subsystem and the territorial development policy consolidated in the Citizenship Territories Program, show processes that alternate between social mobilization, establishment of legal opportunities, definition of governmental programs and policies, and involvement of participative levels.

Health policy for indigenous populations

In the case of the indigenous health subsystem, progressive “involvement” by anthropologists in the struggle of the indigenous people took place starting in the 1970s (Azanha). This contributed to the first nationally-based indigenous organization being formed in 1979: the Union of Indigenous Nations (UNI) with some indigenous leaders such as Mário Juruna (Xavante), Angelo Kretan (Kaingang), and Raoni (Txukarramãe) becoming consolidated on the national scenario as ethnic and political references. The birth of the indigenous movement in Brazil is thus mixed with the process of mobilization of Brazil’s organized civil society for democratic rights.

In 1986 the National Coordination – Indigenous Tribes and the Constitution was formed; it included many organizations, among them UNI, and its goal was to advise and oversee the work of the National Constitution Meetings in relation to indigenous rights. In the same year, the 8th National Health Conference, which provided a space for the first formal encounter between the Health and Indigenous Movements, was held. It was this event that first gave official expression to the demand that the Brazilian Public Health System (SUS) should pay specific attention to the health rights and needs of indigenous Brazilians.

In the following years, the movement, despite its many internal divisions, was galvanized by its engagement with the Constituent Assembly. Combining a rare display of unity with support from a broad network of Brazilian and international civil society groups, the Indigenous Movement succeeded in ensuring that indigenous land and
cultural rights were enshrined in the Constitution, as well as in securing constitutional recognition of indigenous people as full citizens (Shankland 2009)\(^4\).

In short, an over ten year process of mobilization preceded both the formation of the National Coordination – Indigenous Tribes and the Constitution and their participation in the 7th National Health Conference.

From 1991 on, the National Health Foundation (FUNASA), an executive agency of the Ministry of Health, was created and would take responsibility for indigenous healthcare. In 1992, the first “Special Indigenous Health Districts” were created in an area where the Yanomami people of the Northern Amazon live. This was an effort to stop the ongoing process of decimation of this population after their lands were invaded by wildcat gold miners. At that time the Yanomami were suffering from extremely high levels of mortality from malaria and other infectious diseases.

Starting in 1993, the indigenous issue gained steam on the international scene as well and particularly in Latin America. It was in this year that the United Nations declared the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (1995-2004), which among its many objectives was aimed at strengthening international cooperation to tackle the health problems of these populations. That same year, the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) proposed a more careful consideration of the health and well-being of indigenous people in the Americas\(^5\).

After 1994 teams of public health workers from the Health Ministry, linked to the public health movement (sanitarista movement), began to go into the field to promote basic health care and started to mobilize the indigenous communities to press for better health conditions\(^6\). The work of public health workers (sanitaristas) and anthropologists in the villages and the funding of small projects that were then

\(^4\) Brazilian legislation defines “traditional communities and tribes” as all of the “culturally differentiated groups that are recognized as such, which have their own methods of social organizations, which occupy and use territories and natural resources as a condition for their cultural, social, religious, ancestral and economic reproduction, using knowledge, innovations, and practices generated and transmitted by tradition” (Decree 6 040, Art. 3, 2007). In addition to indigenous and Quilombola (slave descendents) people, traditional communities include: Caiçara and Jangadeiro populations, gypsies, Pantaneiros, riparian inhabitants, Geraizeiros (inhabitants of the Sertão, the semi-arid region), extractivists (rubber and coconut extractivists, etc.), among others. These populations include around 5 million families (25 million people) throughout the country.

\(^5\) OPAS, 1997; Salud de los pueblos indígenas Washington DC.

\(^6\) Interview with Marcos Pellegrini, the then coordinator of the Ministry of Health’s HIV/AIDS program for indigenous populations.
organized by communities in conjunction with the macro-regional meetings attended by these groups made it possible for indigenous leaders to more actively demand their right to healthcare and, especially, to an indigenous healthcare subsystem inspired by the Yanomani Health District.

Among these events, it is worth mentioning the 1st Meeting of Indigenous Healthcare Agents and Microscopists in the Brazilian Amazon (AM) and the 1st Macro Regional Workshop on STD/AIDS Strategy, Prevention, and Control for Indigenous Populations in the South, Southeast and Mato Grosso do Sul Regions (PR) that took place in 1997. These events brought together healthcare agents and indigenous leaders from the state of Amazonas and other states to discuss the issue of healthcare and played an important role in helping to consolidate the indigenous health movement guaranteeing, in that same year, the presentation of Bill no. 63, which proposed the creation the Indigenous Healthcare Subsystem. The fight for an Indigenous Health Subsystem was sustained by the indigenous leaders, indigenist NGOs, and public health workers based on the need to improve the system’s operational capacity to reach isolated communities as well as on its responsiveness to and accountability for the specificities of indigenous tribal culture and on overcoming the racism of health and municipal authorities.

In the late 1990s, the infant mortality rate for the indigenous people was more than twice that of white Brazilians and rates of TB were more than six times higher than the figure for the population as a whole (Amarante, 2000). To deal with this situation, a unique structure was created in 1999 within the SUS: the Indigenous Health Subsystem, made up of 34 Indigenous Health Districts (DSEIs). These districts were designed to reflect the fact that indigenous territories crossed municipal and sometimes even state boundaries. Each DSEI is overseen by a Conselho (council), 50% of whose members are, by law, indigenous health service user representatives. The indigenous tribes who are the users of the subsystem now played an instrumental role in the organization of healthcare services and in social control, at least from a legal perspective.

In conclusion, the national anthropological community and the growing attention of multilateral organizations to the indigenous issue, causing them to work more actively with the indigenous populations in their struggle for self-determination, contributed to the emergence of indigenous leaders on the national scene as well as to their involvement in the constitutional process. Definition of a legal framework
ensuring the rights of indigenous tribes as well as the growing attention given to issues of equality and diversity contributed to fostering the creation of indigenist and indigenous organizations in the '90s that were geared towards indigenous health. From there, the process of mobilization for a subsystem was consolidated through participation of indigenous leaders in local, state, regional, and national Indigenous Health Conferences as well as through regional events promoted by the Ministry of Health to train these leaders in implementing health programs. Finally, in 1999 a subsystem whose territorial bases respected the distribution of indigenous tribes, which oftentimes do not fit into municipal or state borders, was created through legislative approval and implemented by the Ministry of Health.

**Development of a peripheral region**

In the Brazilian experience, the idea of sustainable territorial development began to take shape in the late 1990s. At that time, significant assessments of the Pronaf (National Program to Strengthen Family Farming) accompanied the end of the first cycle of implementation of the program. The Pronaf is still regarded today as one of the most successful federal government programs, having survived five different Executive administrations. Its creation is due to a combination of three inter-connected factors: a) the American and European experience which based its agricultural development structures mostly on family units; b) existence of a marked proportion of these kinds of establishments in Brazil’s agricultural development structure, even after the brutal modernization that took place starting in the 1970s and despite the predominance of *patronal agriculture*; and c) the existence of a strong social movement headed by the National Confederation of Agricultural workers (an umbrella group for 2000 rural worker unions whose main base is made up of family farmers) and the Central Única dos Trabalhadores (which, despite the heavy presence of urban segments with bankers and metal-workers has the largest numbers of unions affiliated with the rural sector), which made the fight for a specific family farming program its main issue in the early 1990s.

In assessments on the Pronaf in the late ‘90s, the following can be seen: a) the program had been relatively successful in establishing itself as an important policy and the first whose target public was family-based agriculture; b) nevertheless, there was
still some difficulty penetrating the more fragile areas of this segment; and c) one of its components (the focus on strengthening infrastructure in small municipalities) presented greater problems in implementation, thus branching off from the other main components, such as lines of credit for farmers. This third element of the assessment was based on a series of changes introduced since then which led to adoption of the territorial approach in rural development policies in Brazil. At the outset, Pronaf’s infrastructure activities were regionalized in an effort to overcome the fragmentation which had been found up to that point. Next, this component of the program gave rise to a new program in conjunction with the Pronaf: the National Rural Territories Support Program. The initial expectation was, therefore, that the adoption of the territorial approach to rural development policies would overcome two problems: the excessively localized nature of investments, thus moving to an inter-municipal or regional scale, and the need to identify and foster new activities capable of challenging the generalized tendency to diminish the importance of agricultural activity in creating income and jobs (Graziano da Silva, 1999; Veiga ET AL. 2001; Abramovay, 2003).

Between the first attempts to adopt the territorial approach and its full institutionalization in 2003 (under the Lula Administration), a fundamental contradiction arose: although the essence of the idea of territorial development was diversification of the economies of rural regions, in Brazil this program ended up being managed by a sectorial and peripheral ministry: the Ministry of Agricultural Development. This can only be understood by considering that in Brazil's federal government structure there are two ministries responsible for actions concerning agricultural and rural development: the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Mapa) and the Ministry of Agricultural Development (MDA). The latter was created in the mid-1990s, following creation of the Pronaf; both were a response to demands from the rural workers' union movement. This initial contradiction of a transversal policy that was geared towards diversity, yet confined to the auspices of a peripheral and sectorial ministry, was added to another contradiction typical of Brazilian tradition: territorial development actions were adopted that gave exclusive privileges to the most fragile segments of the rural populations (family farmers, landless workers, what remained of Quilombola communities, and indigenous people), which were officially defined as the target public of the MDA rather than the whole of the economy of Brazil's rural regions.

How could this new institutional framework have repercussions on a localized
situation of applying the policy, such as the Vale do Ribeira in the state of São Paulo? This region, located in southern São Paulo with a population of approximately 350 thousand, is known for concentrating the largest remaining areas of Atlantic Forest in the country as well as for its low human development indicators, despite its privileged location between the metropolitan regions of São Paulo and Curitiba.

Popular organization gained strength in this region mostly starting in the '80s. From then until now, several organizations have been created and, in many cases, they began with the constitution of resident associations. These groups and organizations were created using influence from the Catholic left, whose presence came about through church-related agents (Comissão Pastoral da Terra). Some of them remained location-based resident associations and some moved towards attempting to represent more specific interests. This was the case, for example, with the association of the residents of Guapiruvu, which is today an important example of economic organization of traditional local populations. The same was true for the Quilombolas, who responded to the attempted construction of the Tijuco Alto Dam by creating the Movement of People Threatened by the Dam (MOAB), starting in 1989. Another aspect resulted in the creation of labor union organizations, such as the Family Farming Union of the Vale do Ribeira (Sintravale). Finally, local environmentalist organizations were also created, such as the Environmentalist Highlands Association (ASA) and the Institute for the Sustainable Development of and Citizenship in Vale do Ribeira (IDESC), to mention just a few examples.

It is in this context and mainly supported by the social movements and environmentalist NGOs in the region that the rhetoric of sustainable development comes about as an attempt to set out environmental conservation as well as expectations for a dynamic economy based on making use of the potential from energy and land resulting from it and, furthermore, including poor populations in the positive consequences and possibilities arising therefrom. It is also within this context that these mechanisms are created, by joining the need perceived, from the government creating spaces of political participation aimed at territorial development (which is in turn influenced by the struggle of the social movements to establish policies with this feature, as highlighted above) to local desires for methods of promoting sustainable development. The Consad (Food Security and Local Development Council), which was created at the start of the Lula Administration in several regions in Brazil, including the Vale do Ribeira
(Favareto & Schroder, 2008), is particularly noteworthy. This council absorbed other initiatives that were also created by the federal government, such as the Territorial Development Council (Ministry of Agricultural Development) and the Agenda 21 Forum (Ministry of the Environment). Up until that point, the Consad coordinated creation of a local development plan and defined public investments associated with it in a participative manner.

Despite the existence of participative forums which came up with development plans and of the participation of social movements and organizations in these forums, the direction of regional development has changed little. In effect, in the Vale do Ribeira, the forums have been important spaces for making information democratic and for building alliances, yet little has been produced in terms of consensus and shared visions of the future. For example, the development plan created at one of the local forums (the Water Resources Management Committee) is differs substantially from a plan created within the Consad, which is the council that manages the Food Security, Nutrition, and Local Development Consortium. This is because groups with seats on one forum are different than groups with seats on the other. In the case of the Vale do Ribeira, formation of social organizations and groups came about in such a way that there are few cases or situations where the demands of social organizations and groups are aimed at combining private and social gains. Most of the time, arguments evoke social justice and reparations for historical privation (as is the case of the Quilombolas, for example,) on the one hand, or the de-idealization of problems, apartheid-ization of investments, and de-politicization of the conflict, in short, on the other hand (as is the case of the rural producer associations or corporate associations).

The structures of political opportunities can be seen as influencing this situation: the government, in order to maintain its bases of domination and support, assimilates analysis of the conflicts and challenges that it needs to regulate and translates them into new programs or policy directives, exemplified by the National Program for Strengthening Family Farming, the rhetoric of territorial development, and the recognition of the ancestral rights of communities of slave descendents. Influencing structures of social opportunities are: the fact that the union movement knew how to absorb the emergence of two categories, such as family farming and territorial development, to better position itself in putting forth demands to the government and constructing a field of alliances favorable to this end. Communities of slave descendents
began to define themselves as such when the institutional environment recognized rights that were only attributable to this social group. Influencing manners of interaction are: the fact that there is coherence between styles of activism and permeability of the institutional environment to certain demands from organized groups. Beyond this, there is coherence between the range of alliances constructed by these groups and their potential affinities with political projects (and those supporting them) geared more towards economic growth or more towards reducing poverty and inequality.

Both of the cases presented are a window onto the behavior of a set of empirical levels that are taken as explanatory variables in a good part of the literature on the topic. Here it can be seen that the institutional design matters when establishing routines that could lead to social learning and to defining rules and structures for fostering agents that operate in informal and formal spaces, from local and regional meetings to participative councils and forums. Yet, it can also be noted that, under the same set of rules and incentives, organizations work in a distinct manner. Distribution of power is important when allowing information and spaces where public resources are channeled, or where the legitimacy of public decisions is decided, to be accessed by social groups that are rarely given this kind of access, such as indigenous groups and family farmers living in impoverished regions. This brings about greater democratization. Yet this democratization has also been seen as restricted, since representation via social organizations makes it hard to pull together more isolated populations and their direct interests.

Going a bit further, it is possible to see how the three notions on which these observations are supported allow for a comprehensive analysis of the problems contained in attempts to deepen democracy and pursue the normative ideal of decreasing inequality. Structures of political opportunity, structures of social opportunity, and manners of interaction are in line with a situation that allows interdependencies to be glimpsed between interactions and structures; between the conditioning factors of social heritage, in their contradictions, and what they offer in terms of reproduction and triumphs of innovation, and spaces of freedom for collective action, where these contradictions take on shape and meaning.

In both cases we can observe a process wherein there is a gradual overlaying
between the processes of social mobilization and demands and federal initiatives (responsibility for indigenous health, as well as for promoting better living conditions for small family farmers). They show a notable permeability of government beaurocracies and of political actors to the demands of social groups which were mobilized in the processes of these interactions as well as in forging alliances with other social movements and professional sectors. New and old leaders of social movements, unions, and NGOs end up finding channels within the government bureaucracy to manifest and publicize their demands and interests, whether through the myriad of participatory spaces created in the last twenty years at the local, state, and federal levels, whether through contact with party leaders in tune with the political dividends of negotiating alliances with groups that were historically on the edges, but which are increasingly present at the political level, or even whether through the permeability of the public bureaucracy of the politically mobilized social actors.

IV. Resources, impacts, and risks

One important point to be noted in analyzing the processes of interaction between government and society is that these ‘new’ policies have contributed to channeling a significant amount of new resources to indigenous groups and regions included in the Citizenship Territory Program.

In the case of the subsystem, the annual total invested in indigenous health grew five-fold over the last decade; in other words, because of the creation of the subsystem, the amount of US$ 450 per inhabitant which was reached represents five times the annual per capita expenditure by the SUS.

Something similar happened in the case of the Vale, where, for example, 45 projects involving 10 different ministries and negotiated at regional forums were implemented between 2007 and 2009. Already in 2009, the federal government had invested approximately US$ 100 million in the region through the Citizenship Territories Program.

How much can these new flows of resources be associated with the positive impacts on the living conditions of the populations and territories in question?
From the point of view of the subsystem, some important advances could be seen. One recurring topic in debates on the subsystem deals with its ability to establish intercultural relationships. For specialists in indigenous health, it is not just about ‘implementing programs,’ but rather about guaranteeing that they are effective. For example, in the case of the HIV-AIDS prevention program, it is necessary to recognize that the creation of the subsystem brought with it the totally new possibility for indigenous protagonism, insofar as it contributed to the development of a different approach that takes cultural specificities of the indigenous people into account. In this sense, there were several projects presented directly by indigenous and indigenist organizations to FUNASA (National Health Foundation) and the Ministry, with preliminary assessments arising from the activities of these organizations that allowed for greater knowledge of the communities and their demands, making it possible to create a set of specific instruments of control, assessment, and re-elaboration of actions (Coelho, Rosalen & Shankland 2010).

Another important aspect associated with implementation of the subsystem was improvement of some basic indicators. There was a substantial drop in infant mortality rates; yet, it is worth noting that it remains at 2.3 times higher than the rate for the population as a whole. Significant advances were also made in controlling tuberculosis. These trends are presented in tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1** – Infant Mortality Rates for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Populations
2000 – 2006 (per 1000 Live Births), Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DSEI/COMOA/DESAI (Health Information Spreadsheets, 2006).
Table 2 – Rate of Incidence of Tuberculosis for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Populations / 2000-2006 (per 100,000 inhab.), Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indigenous Population</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the case of the Vale, the assessment suggested gains for actors and organizations, but little effectiveness in making a coordinated territorial development project dynamic. In this sense, far from dealing with territorial projects (both in terms of scale and inter-sectoriality), it is about propositions for primary activities which also have a strong municipal bias. Even so, when looking at the progression of these investments over time in recent years, it can be seen that they are now closer to the interests of groups of farmers and geared less towards mere acquisition of machinery and vehicles for city halls. For example, substantial resources invested by the MDA during this more recent period were aimed at increasing feasibility of a Sales Center for family farming products. Another example: investments in technical aid geared specifically towards family farmers.

Finally, one point that has been widely discussed in academia and in the media regards the risks of ethnic and territory oriented policies in entrenching inequality. Using a concept proposed by Stewart 2003 to deal with “inequalities between culturally formed groups,” we will now use the term ‘horizontal inequalities’ to refer to the risk of increasing inequalities, whether between mobilized and non-mobilized indigenous groups or between rural populations that live in more or less isolated conditions, as is the case of the Vale. Another risk is the entrenchment of what we are calling 'the circuit of the poor policy;' this is the result of the fact that these initiatives are only supported on the organized actors connected to primary activities and which join ministerial efforts that were traditionally aimed at the social area of the government, leaving actions that could be more important to territorial development on the outs: those gathered
under the auspices of the ministries of science and technology, of industry and commerce, of tourism, and of planning. In other words, the idea is reproduced that, for rural regions and populations, the appropriate policies are agricultural policies and social policies, leaving investments in infrastructure, innovation, and strengthening market competition for the densely urbanized regions. In this circuit, groups with few resources that are exclusively associated with primary activities associate with public managers established in departments that deal with policies that are at the edge of the large public and private projects and end up achieving modest results in terms of the sustainable development sought.

That is, the two policies offer risks associated with crystallization of structures which may, in the near future, block the advancement of more dynamic policies aimed at those that have not been benefited by these arrangements.

Shankland (2009), in a wide-ranging study on the distribution of services offered by the subsystem to indigenous populations in Acre, pointed out that the gains made by the Indigenous Movement were distributed in a very unequal manner among the groups that took over as political protagonists and those that did not have an active role in these negotiations.

Favareto & Schroder (2008) and Favareto et al. (2010) show how policies for Brazil’s rural regions have managed to reach intermediary sectors within the impoverished segments, yet reaching the poorest within this segment is difficult. The same studies also show how incentives are used and investments are raised by more structured sectors. Finally, they present a series of challenges that may prevent these gains from being long-lasting, and from becoming other forms of economical and productive inclusion for these sectors that therefore, remain highly dependent on continued governmental investments or official programs such as government procurement.

In these two cases, new resources began to be directed towards traditionally marginalized groups and have contributed to promoting distributive gains which were mostly appropriated by groups that are more directly involved in negotiations. Nevertheless, in both cases there are signs of entrenchment of horizontal inequalities and crystallization of 'poor policy' circuits. In this context, it will be necessary to create and maintain instruments of assessment that allow for monitoring how much these
processes will contribute to promoting an increased supply of resources for these population as a whole or that, alternatively, will be responsible for creating new and persistent iniquities between the 'mobilized' and 'non-mobilized.'

Final Considerations

In this paper, we call attention to the fact that there is a progressive combination of universal social policies with focused policies taking place in Brazil. As specialists in social policy, such as Ricardo Paes de Barros and Marcelo Neri, have noted, the situation experienced in recent years holds a certain degree of novelty, because for the first time reducing poverty has been combined with reducing inequality and substantial economic growth. Going against common sense, this cannot merely be attributed to better more well-known programs, such as Bolsa Família. If that were the case the result would be only be felt at the time the program is introduced. To the contrary, everything indicates that the programs have an aggregate effect of transference, elevating the minimum wage, making credit more available, increasing formal jobs, and creating a range of programs aimed at specific publics, such as those analyzed in this paper, and moreover the food acquisition programs that prioritize purchases from poor and traditional communities of farmers, for example. In other words, there is a peculiar combination of universal policies with focused policies. The Brazil of the 21st century brings with it a new configuration of institutions and policies, whose true features are only beginning to take shape. The contribution of this article was showing how new distributive mechanisms are gaining ground, but in a multi-faceted manner.

This ‘mix’ has been established through iterative processes that have co-supported each other for over twenty years and while also being shaped by political and social opportunities. Therefore, in the case of the policies analyzed herein, processes of mobilization, passage of legislation, and governmental initiatives have contributed to defining a new constitution that guaranteed new rights and the growth of the participatory sphere. This structure has opened up opportunities for mobilized actors to interact at the local, state, and national levels. In addition, national social movements

---

7 For further information, see ‘Miséria, Desigualdade, and Estabilidade: o segundo Real’. Fundação Getúlio Vargas, available at www.fgv.br/cps/pesquisas
find spaces at the sub-national level in which to communicate and fight for their agendas. In this process, social and political actors have built up strong forms of networking and collective action. A constant migration between political parties, professionals and bureaucracy, indicates that mobilized actors are interacting with all three. Also, mobilized actors have in some situations occupied seats inside the government, playing bureaucratic roles.

What can we predict about the type of political coalition and distributive standard that is being promoted via these mechanisms of interaction between government and society? To assess the ultimate results of such processes it will be necessary to combine aggregate analysis with a larger set of policies, especially those based on transfer of income, which significantly increased in the first decade of the 21st century. Just focusing on the cases analyzed here, it is clear that there are still hurdles to overcome in reaching the poorest and most under-privileged; yet as ambivalent as the gains described herein may be, they are part of a process where distributive gains are combined with aspects of politic inclusion. This key could represent some important innovations whose results should be closely monitored.

All of this indicates that the process of extending democracy is far from resolving distributive conflicts, but rather always places them in successively differential levels; it solves certain issues and provides certain underprivileged groups with access to resources, but it also maintains the obstacles in reaching the poorest and most disorganized. Recalling once again Paes de Barros, that is why it is necessary to avoid the temptation to think that we should just do more of the same because of the successful results of the social policies of the last decade. To the contrary, it is necessary to see the innovation in public policies in the same way that processes of technological innovation are conceived. Either permanent updating is done or the benefits obtained will tend to quickly dissipate.
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