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Introduction

After an intense cycle of social struggles in Latin America in the last decade, the outbreak of the international financial and economic crisis in 2008, and the rise to power of progressive governments in the region; some social movements, organizations, and academic groups have highlighted the necessity to articulate the various sectorial agendas in a more comprehensive vision in relation to economic, ecological, social, and gender justice.

The recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) that took place in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012 was a favorable location for this debate since the notion of “sustainable development” includes an economic, social, and environmental pillar. In this context, the “People’s Summit in Rio+20 for Social and Environmental Justice in Defense of the Commons, against the Commodification of Life” took place in parallel to the official conference. In this space, civil society organizations, movements, and transnational advocacy networks that work in the Latin America were mobilized to question the concept of sustainable development and “Green Economy”, which are fueled at official levels, and promoted instead alternative analytical frames.

This article attempts to provide insights to understand how social actors construct their collective action frames, what type of interrelations between conceptualizations and demands develop, and what the factors that have influence on the possibility for their alignment are. Specifically, the lens was focused on the links between the agendas surrounding gender, economic and ecological justice demands pushed by two networks—the Latin American Network of Women Transforming the Economy (Red Latinoamericana de Mujeres Transformando la Economía, or REMTE as per the acronym in Spanish) and the Group of Reflection and Support to the World Social Forum (Grupo de Reflexión y Apoyo al FSM, or GRAP as per the acronym in Spanish)—in a specific structure of political opportunities at an international level, as Rio+20 was. It is showed that while REMTE interlink gender, economic and ecological dimensions in their collective action frames, the economic and ecological dimensions seem to be mainstreamed into GRAP diagnostic and prognostic framings, while the gender dimension is integrated partially. Secondly, it is found that the negotiation of the rules of the participation process and the possibility to have key people in strategic and
leading positions are key factors that explain the possibility to promote interlinked collective action frames with different social actors.

On one hand, the Latin American Network of Women Transforming the Economy (REMTE) is a collective of women from six countries in the region that critiques the dominant economic model and its social and gender impact. This network was founded in 1997 and has combined training, advocacy, and mobilization actions with other actors from civil society organizations from the region. As a regional network, REMTE is a member of the Hemispheric Social Alliance, of the International Council of the World Social Forum, and the World March of Women (WMW). It has participated in campaigns against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), other Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), and external debt with the objective of advancing the agenda of gender justice in various debates about development. Members from Bolivia, Peru, and Brazil actively participated mainly in the People’s Summit organizing activities on care economy as an alternative to Green Economy as well as working with WMW, visibilizing the feminist agenda in different debates and mobilizations.

On the other hand, the Group of Reflection and Support to the World Social Forum (GRAP) is a collective initiated in 2009 by founding members of the World Social Forum mainly from Brazil. In 2010 they launched a mobilization process towards Rio+20 by creating an informal network of activists from different movements (feminist, human rights, colonial/modernity project, indigenous, civil society networks), mostly from Latin America and Europe. This working group organized a Thematic Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil in January 2012 and the debates and common positions were consolidated in a document submitted as input for the People’s Summit and governments in Rio +20.

**Theoretical Framework and Methodology**

In recent literature dedicated to the analysis of transnational processes, their multiple implications, and complex consequences (Smith, 1992; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Sikkink, 2003; Sikkink, 2005; McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly 2005), there is a progressive recognition of the links among theoretical fields of political science, international relations, and social movements. In this way, new channels have been opened to explore the formation, action, and construction of meanings in distinct organizational formats such as transnational networks, coalitions, and movements, as
well as to study the links among the various spatial scales of transnational collective action.

Taking the work of Keck and Sikkink (1998) as a point of reference, REMTE and GRAP can be considered transnational advocacy networks. Both cases are made up of members from different countries who are united by a set of common principles and discourses, as well as by dense exchanges of information that combine face-to-face and virtual meetings.

According to these authors, transnational advocacy networks can be understood as “political spaces, in which differently situated actors negotiate—formally or informally—the social, cultural, and political meanings of their joint enterprise” (Keck and Sikkink, 1998, p.3). In this sense, frame analysis as a research methodology (Snow and Benford, 1988; Hunt, Benford and Snow, 1994) is an appropriate tool to understand how discourse is produced, its internal logic, and its connection to other discursive positions in a political opportunity structure, such as Rio+20.

Collective action frames are constructed through three core framing tasks: diagnostic framing, prognostic framing and motivational framing. The diagnostic framing identify events or situations as problematic and in need of change; they also signal certain agents as responsible. Therefore, an “other” is projected as being responsible for and/or antagonistic in the situation. The prognostic framing establishes a plan for the solution to the problem, identifying what should be done and who should do it. Lastly, for people to take action to overcome a collectively perceived problem or “injustice”, they must develop a set of compelling reasons for doing so (Hunt, Benford and Snow, 1994, pp. 228-229). In this way, motivational framing identify and work out the motivation that pushes actors to commit to participation in collective action and become protagonists (Ibid.).

Snow and Benford (cited in Laraña, 1999, p. 250) refer to master frames as those collective and shared definitions of problems that various movements promote that play a central role in the emergence of cycles of protest. These frames allow the mobilization of broad bases, especially when there exists great heterogeneity between the groups and specific interests of mobilization.

These frames are built according to the assessment of political opportunities and the prioritized advocacy strategy (“insider” or “outsider” in terms of Fox and Brown, 1998). In this sense, and as will be further discussed, while GRAP and allies developed an insider/outsider strategy for Rio+20, and therefore the frame attempted to influence
the official process, REMTE in alliance with the WMW and other social movements focused on prioritizing the People’s Summit space.

For this research, a review of secondary information obtained from various sources (documents and dissemination materials produced by the networks for Rio+20, review of the websites, etc.) was done. Also, semi-structured and in-depth interviews of key actors representing the selected collectives were conducted (two for each network). Participant observations in four significant spaces were made: during the Thematic Social Forum: Capitalist Crisis, Social and Environmental Justice from January 24 to January 29, 2012 in Porto Alegre, Brazil; the Rio+20 Conference and the People’s Summit from June 15 to June 23, 2012 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; and the World Social Forum from March 26 to March 30, 2013 in Tunis, Tunisia.

An intentional selection of cases was made; therefore, the representativeness of the sample is theoretical. In addition to the criterion of accessibility, the case selection was oriented by the criterion of diversity. One case is a women’s network that builds its collective action frames linking with women’s and mixed social movements. The other case is a mixed informal network with members from different regions and organizations, including feminist organizations from Latin America, promoted by a Brazilian group. Beyond the differences in terms of trajectory, scales of work methodology, in both cases their collective action frames for Rio+20 attempted to: i) articulate the ecological, economic, and gender dimension, ii) in a participatory way among different actors hence their relevance to this study.

The interpretation of an international political opportunity structure influences the mobilization strategy and the action frames promoted

Opportunities and threats are not objective categories, but rather they depend on the interpretation of the actors (McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly, 2001). In the case of the Rio+20 Conference, the analysis of political opportunity carried out by GRAP and its allies and REMTE took into consideration the correlation of forces among the actors that influenced the negotiation process.

One of the axes of Rio+20 refers to the “Green Economy”. This agenda was promoted by the European Union and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and was supported by some multinational corporations. It is built on the premise that the economic invisibility of the so-called “ecosystem services” has caused them to be underestimated and exploited incorrectly (including forests, lakes, river
basins, and so on). Therefore, it is necessary to “rebuild natural capital as a critical economic asset and as a source of public benefits. This is especially important for poor people whose livelihoods and security depend on nature” (UNEP, 2011, p.16).

In this context, both groups designed a specific advocacy strategy and developed a “counter-frame” that denounced the “corporate takeover” of the United Nations by the multinational corporations that promoted the Green Economy agenda. Therefore, they claimed that although channels for civil society participation existed, the interference of corporations, international financial institutions, and the weight of the European and United States governments eroded the real advocacy capacity of social organizations and civil society networks.

GRAP considered Rio+20 an opportunity to advance the process of creating alternatives. Therefore, they engaged in the process forming a network of activists, academics, and representatives from social organizations with the ability to mobilize other actors in the process of Rio+20. With this end in mind, different activities were carried out, such as the creation of different thematic groups on a wide range of issues including human rights, territories, commons, extractivism, water, education, fair economy and finance, and ethics; the launch of a virtual debate; and the organization of the Thematic Social Forum: “Capitalist Crisis, Social and Environmental Justice” in January of 2012. It is important to notice that the women's rights agenda was not included as a specific thematic group but it was expected to be mainstreamed in each of them. A feminist activist from the Marcosur Feminist Articulation from Peru was the facilitator of the human rights thematic group that lately merged with the group on land and territories in order to promote a collective narrative around individual/collective rights.

The process resulted in the production of a framework document called “Another Future is Possible” which consolidates the proposals of the different thematic groups. This document was distributed in the People’s Summit as well as in the official conference of Rio+20.

Despite many members of GRAP and thematic groups being skeptical about the possible results of the official conference, they considered important to develop the insider/outsider strategy. Some of them followed the official negotiations pursuing a strategy of “damage control”, tracking issues such as the right to water, education, extractivism and geoengineering and trying to limit the Green Economy proposal.
Meanwhile, the members of REMTE allied with WMW mainly pursued an outsider strategy—the same one followed in other processes like FTAA or the World Trade Organization conferences (Cabezas, 2008). In this case, they directed their actions toward the People’s Summit, attempting to mainstream the feminist perspective into other movements; they denounced the corporate control of states by companies and the contradictions in government actions; they networked with social movements and linked with regional and global campaigns. In fact, REMTE’s focal point in Brazil, Sempreviva Organización Feminista or SOF, is also a representative of the WMW. As WMW representative took on a leading role in the Facilitating Committee of Brazilian Civil Society, and played an important part in political decisions and organization in the People’s Summit. SOF, together with the women of the “mixed” movements such as Via Campesina, the National Confederation of Agricultural Workers of Brazil (CONTAG, as per its acronym in Portuguese), the Andean Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations (CAOI, as per its acronym in Spanish), Unified Workers’ Central (CUT a pert its acronym in Spanish), and others, organized the first march of the Summit, which was called “Women against the commodification of nature, our territories, and our bodies” in which 10,000 women participated.

Therefore, in an adverse international conference context, both networks opted for a strategy of defensive transnationalization (Sikkink, 2005). According to Sikkink, this occurs when certain activists participate on an international level not to advance their agendas, but rather to defend and protect the achievements within their national political systems from the interference of international institutions.

These strategies influenced the diagnostic and prognostic framing of both networks, which are characterized by having considerable levels of abstraction, being oriented mainly toward motivation of civil society by rejecting “false solutions” proposed by governments and multilateral agencies and proposing “systemic alternatives”.

An approach to the economic, ecological, and gender interlinkages of the demands made by the members of REMTE

Through an analysis of statements, activity reports, and interviews, it can be stated that the members of REMTE who participated in the People’s Summit promoted frames that interlinked economics and gender through an analysis that originates from the “rupturist feminist economic perspective” (Perez Orozco, 2005, p. 53). This is
confirmed by the way in which their positions surpass orthodox notions of the economy in explaining the interconnection among production and reproduction processes and visibilize non-commercial economic processes. Capitalism is considered as an anthropocentric and androcentric system based on sexual, racial, and international division of work.

In order to analyze the link between woman and nature, proposals from ecofeminism and feminist economics are taken up, and it is asserted that the logic that overexploitation of nature as if it was an inexhaustible resource is the same as overexploitation of women’s bodies and work. Among the slogans promoted by the Brazilian members of REMTE in the People’s Summit were “Nature is not a commodity, and neither are women” and “Down with patriarchy and the Green Economy! Up with feminist and solidarity economics!” (Data collected through interviews and participant observation).

The link between commodification and control over territories, nature and women’s bodies can be seen in the action taken by the WMW and REMTE Brazilian focal point during the women’s protest in front of the headquarters of the National Bank of Economic and Social Development (BNDES, as per its acronym in Portuguese) in Rio de Janeiro. The bank was nicknamed the “National Bank of Sexual Exploitation” (since this acronym would be the same as the official acronym in Portuguese) and was denounced for financing development strategies that “dominate territories, exploit the work force, and increase prostitution” (SOF, 2012, 24).

This initiative shows a strong inter-linkage among different dimensions. The feminist anti-capitalist agenda promoted by the group links infrastructure projects with women’s realities and applies the notion of workforce exploitation, for the issue of prostitution; -a question that generates tensions with other feminisms and queer theories².

The combination of the analyses of feminist economics of care, the notion of “Buen Vivir” (Living Well)³ and sustainability allows questioning of dominant production, consumption, reproduction, and redistribution patterns and promotes the development of alternatives that have as a goal the sustainability of the planet and
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² For more information about this tension, see Preciado, 2007.

livelihoods. This implies recognition of the reproductive and productive sphere, but not equally since the reproductive sphere must be hierarchized above “productive” and “financial” economy. It implies going beyond valuing unpaid work or nature in monetary terms as a way to differentiate this proposal from the Green Economy (data collected through interviews and statements). The political discourse of REMTE links proposals that range from social and solidarity economy and agroecology to the defense of the commons with a feminist economics perspective.

The face-to-face discussion among REMTE members from different countries in the activities carried out in the People’s Summit allowed bridging between frames that came from different origins, as the “depatriarcalization” notion developed in Bolivia with the feminist critique of the maternalistic vision of social policies implemented in Latin America. The Bolivian members stated that the transformation of colonial structures of society must include the questioning of patriarchal structures and relations. Therefore, “decolonization” must be accompanied by a process of “depatriarchization” of the state and society. The notion of depatriarchization of the state was incorporated into the discourse of REMTE Brazilian focal point when it comes to assess gender aspects of public policies in Latin America. This concept allows them to elaborate a deeper critique. According to the document of SOF, it is necessary to question the recasting and reinforcing of women as mothers, which was developed under neoliberalism, but still present in the so called “post neoliberal” governments. They argued that even if there is a recovery of the state’s role in economic policies and also an expansion of social programs, policies centered on women as mothers still persist (SOF, 2012, p.14).

**An approach to the economic, ecological, and gender interlinkages of the demands made by the members of GRAP and the Thematic Groups**

In the document produced for Rio+20 “Another World is Possible” by GRAP and the thematic Groups, the economic and ecological dimensions seem to be mainstreamed into their diagnostic and prognostic framings, while the gender dimension is integrated partially.

In relation to the gender dimension, three types of references were identified: i) “the body as territory” notion, ii) the need to overcome dualistic thinking, and iii) the “ethics of care”.

The “the body as territory” notion is promoted by the feminists who participated in GRAP and the thematic groups. They attempted to link the discourse of collective rights to land and territory with women’s right to control over their own bodies. The proposal focuses on recognizing the body as a bearer of rights, for instance, to the right to non-discrimination, to enjoy a free and diverse sexuality while confronting heteronormativity (Thematic Group on rights, land and territories, 2012, 3).

Although this concept was not fully developed in “Another world is possible”, it was discussed within the rights thematic group at the Thematic Social Forum and then at the World Social Forum in 2013 when feminist members of GRAP organized one of the four core GRAP activities called “Political bodies: production, reproduction and sexuality”. This idea challenges some trends of ecofeminism that associate the reproductive ability of the bio women (Preciado, 2008) with the social construction of maternity and heterosexuality. Moreover, the mention of heteronormativity questions the alignment among sex, gender, and sexuality, as well as the assumption of “complementarity” between “opposites” in a context where the idea of the indigenous complementarity man/woman or “Chacha warmi” is accepted at times without much problematization under the debates around “Buen Vivir”. Nevertheless, these considerations do not seem to have been fully understood and assimilated by the other actors and/or persons responsible for the writing of collective position papers, given their superficial inclusion in the most important documents and the paucity of references to them by male members at Rio+20.

Furthermore, the document “Another World is possible” recognizes the need to “overcome the limitations of simple dualisms, which never answer to or reflect the complexities of life: public or private, government or business, nature or culture, object/body or subject, man or woman” (GRAP, 2012, 27). The aspirational tone of the document implies that as is another topics, there is no clear reference about specific strategies to overcome the dualistic thinking.

Thirdly, prognostic elements of GRAP proposal include advancing toward a biocivilization inspired by the principles of “ethics of care”, “el Buen Vivir” (Living Well), commons, human rights, the rights of nature, socio-environmental justice, and equality in diversity. Despite that sexual division of labour is identified in the document and the “ethics of care” is included as an alternative, key elements of the feminist
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4 For more information related to the notion of Chacha-warmi in Bolivia, see Conexión Fondo de Emancipación (2012).
agenda like social redistribution of care, power relations, and the role of men and the state are not mentioned.

Finally, it can be stated that GRAP documents underline a systemic view of both the problems and the alternatives. For instance, there are some references to the link between patriarchy and colonialism and the urgency of “building a system capable of transitioning from a patriarchal order” (GRAP, 2012, 29). This can be seen as a major achievement and a result of a sustainable strategy of feminist organizations, particularly the AFM of mainstreaming the feminist agenda with core World Social Forum’s debates and actors. Interviewees referenced to different initiatives that were steps on this process such as the “People’s Dialogues”, “Posneoliberal agenda”, “Inter-movement dialogues”, “Popular University of Social Movements”, among others.

According to interviews and participant observation, while there seem to have a general and explicit recognition of the feminist contributions to the frames promoted by the GRAP and Thematic groups facilitators, not all the actors incorporate it in the same way. When one of the facilitators and main drafters of “Another World is Possible” is asked about the role of the feminist agenda in the construction of alternatives, the structural analysis is reduced to a matter of feminism as a movement that might or might not have anti-systemic potential. The interviewee states:

“I do not know the place will have the feminist agenda or the gay and lesbian, black agenda, or even the workers or indigenous movement’s agenda [in the alternatives]. It is an open question. For me there are two elements that are central: anti-capitalism and the environmental issues. I think they are structural. Then, there is a multiplicity of actors.”

This testimony shows that besides the incorporation of the feminist agenda in general terms and its recognition as a social actor, resistances and lack of understanding of the feminist contribution to the structural analysis of the so called “civilizational crisis” remain in key actors.

**Factors for frame alignment**

Besides analyzing frames, it is interesting to understand what factors could explain the possibility of creating collective and interlinked action master frames. Through literature review (McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly, 2005; Silva, 2009) three brokerage mechanisms are analyzed: i) the organization of meetings and processes of participation for building coalitions and cooperation among actors, ii) overlapping
membership, and iii) the open, general, assembly-style deliberation for decision-making for the creation and alignment of frames in REMTE and GRAP.

The main finding in this area is that the negotiation of the rules of the game that shapes the processes of participation and debate to build a common position is a fundamental element to understand what the possibilities of frame alignment are, who the actors and prioritized spaces are, and how balance of power and possible tensions are managed. This dimension, which on occasions is considered by the involved agents a technical and unimportant aspect, points us toward the relational nature of power and its management by the collectives studied.

As Della Porta and Diani assert, “the identification of social problems and those responsible for them is, inevitably, highly selective” (2006, 76). Emphasizing a particular problem leads to neglecting others. Therefore, tension lies in how to negotiate what the prevailing agenda will be or which type of formulation has the ability to include other frames cohesively.

In this regard, it was identified that the presentation of new concepts in different transnational spaces or “counter-spaces” (World Social Forums, People’s Summits, etc.) over time contributes to the exchange of ideas and the elaboration of shared frames for the members of the various networks that have face-to-face contact. A “common language”, which is accepted, interpreted, and disseminated by different transnational actors, is articulated. Furthermore, it was found that one strategy designed to overcome resistance to the inclusion of the feminist agenda in the mixed spaces of both REMTE and the feminist organizations that are part of the GRAP and thematic groups network is to be present and manage to be engaged in leadership positions in mixed spaces, so to be able to influence the methodology, the selection of speakers and activities, and the drafting of common positions and statements.

For example, due to the strategic position of the REMTE Brazilian focal point as part of the organization of the People Summit, they were able to shape the methodology of the summit. As a result of this, they secured the participation of feminist women as speakers in the main plenaries, incorporated key proposals related to the care economy on the plenary synthesis and final statement as well as organized the women’s march and placed it as a central activity in the People’s Summit program.

In the case of GRAP, having an AFM representative as facilitator of the thematic groups helped to position their feminist analysis around “body as territory” as part of
the debates on Human Rights, collective rights and territories, include feminist speakers in different GRAP events and propose specific language for collective documents.

However, even if being present in strategic positions and core debates in order to mainstream feminist analyses is important, the lack or reduced participation of members of mixed groups and other non-feminist women’s groups in feminist activities limits the actual capacity of feminist organization to influence the wider collective (information collected through interviews and participant observations in Rio+20 and WSF 2013).

As far as the mechanism of overlapping membership goes, the fact that there are few actors with overlapping memberships facilitates the understanding and appropriation of topics, language, and demands due to their recurring contact with them. For instance, this is the case for REMTE who benefited from the overlapping membership of their Brazilian members, who are also part of the WMW and represented them in the organizing committee of the People’s Summit.

In any case, it was identified that this factor has negative effects in terms of concentration of power and information. Through literature review (von Bülow, 2010) and conducting interviews, it was identified that in this process there existed a concentration of strong ties among a small number of actors. A criticism of “leadership logic” was also raised. Both elements difficult the connection among activists who work locally and the activists and leaders who participate in transnational spaces like the Thematic Social Forum and the People’s Summit.

It can be asserted that in both cases analyzed a democratic culture of reaching consensus through political argumentation against the different positions and strategies is promoted. Additionally the collective construction of documents and positions is a good indication of this fact. Nevertheless, this aspect must be nuanced in the face of the two points previously mentioned concerning rules of the game and overlapping membership.

**Conclusions**

Beyond the emphasis on each network, there exist important convergences in the attribution of meaning in diagnostic, prognostic, and motivation collective action frames promoted in Rio+20. This finding is consistent with findings in previous studies, especially with recent research at a regional level (Cabezas, 2008; Preciado and Uc, 2010; Svampa, 2011; Martínez, Casado and Ibarra, 2012).
The critique of neoliberal globalization and its institutions, as studied by Cabezas, 2008, Silva, 2009, and von Bülow, 2010 in different regional actors, is transitioning toward a diagnostic master frame of “civilization crisis” and prognostic master frame that reclaims a central category in feminist economics linked with critical ecology such as is the “sustainability of life”. According to interviews, given the scope of the “civilization crisis” frame, feminist group where able to incorporate feminist dimensions and categories that at the same time were easier to understand by other actors.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out a certain imbalance between the level of detail and elaboration in the diagnostic frames as opposed to the prognostic frames in both of the cases studied. In this sense, the level of generality seems to be a key element in incorporating different agendas (some of which are in tension) within a common frame.

Moreover, the diversity of interpretations stands out, as well as the flexibility with which notions are handled, in some cases with little connection with the theoretical references or social practice that gave rise or currently shape the concepts. For example, members of both networks recognize the potential of “Living Well” as a frame to mobilize different actors. Nevertheless, they also warn of its limitations in terms of understanding and support in non-Andean contexts by wider constituencies as well as the current dispute of meanings within their groups and among other social actors. According to the interviews, as for the GRAP, they had extensively discussed in their meetings and use it in their documents in Rio+20 as a narrative that connects the Andean cosmovision about the ‘Mother earth’ with the western framework of “rights” claiming for the recognition of the rights of nature, but also strategically due to the necessity to build a narrative that overcomes consumer society. In the case of REMTE, the members from Andean countries have linked “Living Well” with feminist economics and it is utilized in their contexts, recognizing in any case how governments are also using it politically. The members of REMTE in Brazil prefer to use the notion of sustainability of life since it is understood outside of Andean contexts.

Moreover, while the inclusion of parallelism between women and nature both being exploited by capitalism is more easily assumed by the feminist and mixed networks, the critique of heteronormativity and the inclusion of body as a scale for analysis and terrain for struggle seems to generate greater resistance. It would seem that
the feminist arguments most linked to the traditional Marxist economic framework are largely assumed while questions linked to “postmaterial” values are less easily accepted.

Lastly, the alignment processes of interlinked collective action frames would seem to be influenced by the type of official narrative (Green Economy), the political will of the actors involved in key positions, their negotiation ability and skills with respect to their specific agendas, and the negotiations of the rules of the game that shapes the participation and debate process. In this sense, it can be stated that the establishment of continuous debate processes among diverse actors who expand “the limits of thought” and at the same time allow the creation of a common language broad and complex enough to articulate mainstreamed demands is a key element to advance interlinked collective action frames in the long term.
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