

“ ” \*  
:

(가 )\*\*



I.

가  
가  
가  
가  
가  
가

---

\* 2002 ( 072-  
BM2085 “ ”)

\*\* Don-Moon Cho(Catholic University of Korea), “Neoliberal Economic Reform and Workers' Living Condition: Bankrupt Washington Consensus and the 'Transfer of Legitimacy' Effect”.



가 가, 가 , 가  
 가  
 가  
 , , -  
 ,  
 가  
 (purified) 가  
 1990 가  
 , 1995 가  
 가 . 1 30%, 2  
 53% ,  
 58% 71%, 81% .  
 1300

1994 1 54%  
, 1998 1 53%  
2

가 가 가

CUT(Central Única dos Traqbalhadores)

.2)

?

, 1994 1998 가 ,  
2002

가

가

?

가 가

“ ” “

”

.3)

2)

가

3)

2

1

(2003)

, 2

가 ,

1.

1964 (Sarney) 가 (+) (-) 100% 가 GDP 1980

1985

1986 (Cruzado) (heterodox) 가 (stagflation) 4)

1000% 1980 (Collor)- (Franco) 1993 2700% , < 1> 1988 , GDP 4.46%, 1990 1.31%

가

4) 1985 Paiva(1998), Baer(2001: 173-200)

Ribeiro (2003), Baer &

1987 1992 0.43%

< 1> , 1978-2002.

	GDP (%)	(%)	(%)	(1992 , 100)	(1990 , 100)
1978	4.80	38.90			
1979	7.20	55.80			
1980	9.20	110.00			91.3
1981	-4.50	95.00			
1982	0.50	100.00			
1983	-3.50	211.00			
1984	5.30	224.00			
1985	7.90	235.00			
1986	7.60	65.00			
1987	3.60	416.00			
1988	-0.10	1038.00			
1989	3.30	1783.00			
1990	-4.40	1476.71	4.3		100.0
1991	1.10	480.23	4.8		91.3
1992	-0.90	1157.84	5.8	116.1	85.2
1993	4.92	2708.17	5.4	127.3	83.3
1994	5.85	1093.89	4.96	147.0	91.5
1995	4.22	14.78	4.63	162.3	92.2
1996	2.66	9.34	5.46	163.5	95.7
1997	3.60	7.48	5.66	171.7	103.3
1998	-0.12	1.70	7.60	168.2	106.0
1999	0.80	19.98	7.56	152.9	106.1
2000	4.36	9.81	7.14	151.4	
2001	1.51	10.06	6.23		
2002			7.34		

\* : 2001 3 ; 2001 GDP

\* : Baer(2001: 462-471), Amann & Baer(2002: 955), FGV(2001: II), FUNDAP(2002: 54), Stallings & Peres(2000: 120-121).

가

가

가

가 가  
가 ,

GDP

(-)

(Cardoso)

(Plano Real)

가

2.

1993 5  
. 6 12

10

IMF  
Consensus)”

“ (Washington

, 가  
.5)

1990

5)

Ribeiro (2003), CUT(2000), DESEP/CUT(2000: 6-7; 2002a: 8-12), Baumann(2002), Amann & Baer(2002), Baer(2001: 199-299), Baer & Paiva(1998), Stallings & Peres(2000: 72-109, 153-201)

가 “ ”

80

1994 2

1 1 URV(unidade real de valor)

가 가 , URV

(cruzeiro)

가 URV , 1994 7 URV

(2750 가 )

2 1970

가

1988 57.5% 10

1998 15.6%

1980

가 1991

93 20 2000 1



117 . 856  
 , 1991 1995  
 27 (US dollar)  
 1996 .  
 , , , , ,  
 가 .  
 가 .  
 , , , , , , , ,  
 , 1995 1999 19.8%  
 , GDP 18.55% 13.18%  
 .  
 1.376% , 0.878%  
 가 . 15-20%

3.

< 1> 1000%가 가 1995 15%,  
 1996 97 10% 1998 1.7%  
 .  
 가 가  
 가 가 , ,  
 , , .  
 ,  
 ,



가 . 1994 1997 436  
530 21.6% 가 , 332 614  
가 가 1994 104  
1995 1 가 1997  
가 84 .  
, . 1994  
GDP 0.5% 1995 4.8%  
, 1998 가 8.4% .  
가  
가  
. 1994 7.1%  
“ 1998 11 13.6% 가 ”  
, ,  
, .  
. 1997 8  
가  
415 1998 11 IMF, ,  
. 1998 1999  
20% .

.

가  
가

1.

1964

CGT  
(pelego)

. 1978

ABC

, 가 “ ”  
가

24.5%

ABC

(novo sindicalismo) .<sup>6)</sup>

가

(PT)

---

6)

(1993), Alves(1985), Barros(1999: 29-45), Rodrigues(1997, 1999)

. CGT가 CGT CUT  
 . CGT가 CUT  
 . CGT가 CUT  
 PT  
 가 . CGT  
 CUT  
 .  
 1981-83 CGT CUT . CGT  
 , ,  
 CUT  
 CGT가 . CUT  
 1985  
 , CUT  
 CGT 7).  
 CUT가 가 1978  
 12.8% 1980 25.8%, 1989 32.8% 가  
 (Krein, 2002: 53).

---

7) CUT 1993 8 , CGT(Central Geral dos  
 Trabalhadores) 1983 11 1986 3 1988 CGT  
 (Confederação Geral dos Trabalhadores) 1989 4 (Magri)가  
 (Joaquim)  
 9 CGT(Central) . CGT  
 CUT 가 , CGT(Confederação)  
 (Medeiros) 1991 3 FS(Força Sindical) CUT  
 CUT  
 ( , 1993; Barros, 1999: 29-45).

2.

CUT가 가

,

가

가

, 가 1988

.<sup>8)</sup>

1943 가  
do Trabalho)

가 (CLT Consolidação das Leis  
, )

가 1988

가

1988

가

1

가

가

3

---

8) Barros(1999: 17-27), O'Connell(1999), Lopes (2003), Menezes-Filho & others(2002), Gacek(1995)

, 가 60%, 15%,  
 5% 20% 가  
 . , 가  
 . , 1989  
 48 ( 72 )  
 ,  
 “ ” ,  
 “ (dissidio)” “ ”  
 “ ”  
 . 가가  
 ,

3.

1992 10 (Barelli)  
 DIEESE

, 1993

.9)

1993 9-12

CUT, CGT

. CUT

가

, CGT

9)

Barros(1999: 48-53) Manzano(2002: 24-26)

가 ,  
 FIESP 가  
 .  
 가  
 가  
 가 .  
 가 ,  
 가 ,  
 ,  
 .10)  
 , ILO 158  
 11), 가 2-5  
 (suspensão do contrato) .  
 2  
 , , ,  
 , , (cooperativas de  
 trabalho)  
 , 25

---

10) Krein  
 (2002: 10-26), CUT(2001), Freitas(2001: 3-9)  
 11) 가 ILO 158 가 , , (Mercosur)  
 가 가  
 (Freitas 2001: 13-14; CUT 2001).



“ (banco de horas)”

12)

1999 가 3.38%

2% 1 16.55%

1998 1200 1999 가 , ,

18% 44.6%

80 , 1990

12) Krein(2002: 18-26; 2003), CUT(2002: 37-38), CNM/CUT & DIEESE(2001), Manzano(2002: 49-50), Galvão (2003)

1. 가

(open unemployment) < 1> 90  
 - 5.05% 1  
 5.05%, 2 6.32% 가 7% .  
 “ (hidden unemployment)”  
 (total unemployment)  
 1994 14.3% 1999 19.3%  
 가 가 (CUT 2000: 6-8; CUT-EN  
 2002: 2-3; DESEP/CUT 2002b: 2-3). 1995 15.0%  
 2000 27.6% 가 , “ (discouraged unem-  
 ployment)”

가  
 .13) 가  
 , (RFFSA) 4 ,  
 1 1500  
 1/4 .  
 가 , ABC  
 1991 1997 47.1% 가  
 23.5% .  
 가

---

13) 가 CUT(2000: 6-13), SMABC/DIEESE  
 (2000: 2-9), Manzano(2002: 6-10), Amann & Baer(2002: 955-967)

2. 가

CUT 2002b) 가  
 2001 47.3% 가 , CUT(DESEP/  
 1993 44.4% ,  
 , .14) .  
 , ,  
 가

(Ramalho, 1999: 233-244).

가

(CUT 2000: 11-13; Machado & Machado,  
 1998: 112-117). 1994 1996 1/4  
 2.1% 2.2% 가  
 . “ ”  
 22.02% 24.82% , 54.51%  
 56.99% 가 .  
 가 가

가

가

가

가

---

14) Portes & Hoffman(2003) , 가 (informal  
 “  
 proletariat” 가 가  
 가 90 가

3.

1988  
 , 48 44  
 44 1995 42.2  
 44 40%  
 , 1989 42.7%, 1999 42.4%  
 가  
 ,  
 ,  
 ,  
 SMABC 가 ABC CUT  
 32-38 , 44-45 40  
 , FS  
 Parana  
 ,  
 .  
 ,15) 가

---

15) DIEESE(2001a: 68), Manzano(2002: 27-69), Buechler(2001), CUT(2000: 6-8), OIT(1999: 250-251)

4.

1978  
 1990  
 1990 100 , 1993  
 1997-99 103-106  
 .16)  
 가 가  
 1991 1998  
 1 가 8.5%  
 가 .17)  
 , 1980  
 가 90 가  
 .18) DIEESE(2001a: 82-102) , 20%  
 1994 1999 3.3% 3.6% 가  
 10% 48.2% 46.8% 가 가  
 16) 1990 1998 가 135.3  
 106.1, 103.9, 99.1  
 가 (Stallings & Peres 2000: 116-149).  
 가  
 17) DIEESE(2001b: 86-90), Baer(2001: 212-214),  
 Stallings & Peres(2000: 121-131, 462-471), CUT(2000: 16-19)  
 18) Neri & Camargo(2002: 307-8) (Gini) (Theil) 1990 97  
 가 , CEPAL(Baumann, 2002: 25-26)  
 가 , Amann & Baer(2002: 950-955) 90  
 가 . Stallings &  
 Peres(2000: 129-131) 1990 0.01 가  
 0.02 가  
 90 가

가 가  
 가  
 . UNDP (human development index)  
 1990 59 1998 74  
 (Amann & Baer, 2002: 950-955)

1.

가  
 가  
 가

---

19) 2000 1 (DIEESE, 2001a: 88),  
 25% 1235 960 22.3%  
 350 312 10.9% 25%

가가

가

가

가

가

1998 11  
1998

IMF

1999

가

가

가  
 , 가 . ,  
 가 .  
 가 ,  
 .  
 , 가 .  
 가 ,  
 90  
 가 .  
 ,  
 . 1998  
 ,  
 ,  
 가 .  
 .  
 2. “ ” “ ”



“ ” .

가 “ ”

“ ”

가

“ ” “ ” 가

“ ”

가 ,

가

“ ” “ ”

Abstract

The dominant “Washington Consensus” capitalizing the positive effects of neoliberal economic policies comes under attack by a set of empirical studies, and the conventional theories highlighting the opposition of workers and the general public against the neoliberal economic policies.

To clear such theoretical confusions regarding neoliberal economic policies, this study aims to clarify the effects of neoliberal policies in terms of macro-economic indicators and change in living conditions, and then to identify major factors determining attitudes for or against the neoliberal policies.

While a series of preceding civilian governments failed in curbing run-away inflation, the Cardoso government succeeded in putting chronic inflation under control. Except for that, Cardoso's neoliberal economic policies ended up with great economic failure along with such macro-economic indicators as the low rate of economic growth, worsening trade deficit, expanding financial deficit among others. With regard to the living conditions, social failure was quite obvious given the hike in unemployment rate owing to the privatization of public enterprises and employment shrinkage in the manufacturing sector, the rising proportion of non-regular workers due to the relative expansion of service sector against manufacturing sector, the flexibilization of working hours and ever-worsening working conditions, stagnating or decreasing level of real income which fell short of catching up the increasing level of productivity, and the polarization of population with aggravating income inequality. After all, the Washington Consensus turned out to be nothing but an ideology aimed to propagate neoliberalism without empirical ground.

Brazilian workers resisted consistently neoliberal economic policies, but the general public sent wholehearted support to Cardoso's neoliberal policies. Workers' resistance was well grounded on the obvious principle and policy outcome of neoliberal policies, but public support for neoliberal policies was not founded on their experience and following evaluation of neoliberal policies but derived from their appreciation of Cardoso's economic stabilization policies which made a success in suppressing inflation. In other words, the legitimacy was transferred from

Cardoso's preceding economic stabilization policies to his subsequent neoliberal economic policies. That's why the public did not hesitate to withdraw the legitimacy once given to the neoliberal policies as they experienced the real effects of those policies and witnessed their failure which ended up with economic disaster.

Key Words: Brazil, Neoliberalism, Worker, Labor Condition, Washington Consensus / , , , , ,

: 2003. 10. 3

: 2003. 11. 14

- Alves, Maria Helena Moreira(1985), *State and Opposition in Military Brazil*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Amann, Edmund & Werner Baer(2002), “Neoliberalism and its consequences in Brazil”, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, No. 34, pp. 945-949.
- Baer, Werner(2001), *The Brazilian Economy: Growth and Development*, 5th ed., London: Praeger.
- Baer, Werner & Claudio Paiva(1998), “Brazil’s drifting economy: Stagnation and inflation during 1987-1996”, in Philip D. Oxhorn & Graciela Ducatenzeiler(eds.), *What Kind of Democracy? What Kind of Market?: Latin America in the Age of Neoliberalism*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 89-126.
- Barros, Maurício Rands(1999), *Labour Relations and the New Unionism in Contemporary Brazil*, NY: St. Martin’s.
- Baumann, Renato(2002), *Brazil in the 1990s: An Economy in Transition*, Oxford: Palgrave.
- Buechler, Simone(2001), “The people are left to watch the ships go in and out: five voices speaking out on the unemployment crisis and capital flows in São Paulo, Brazil”, 2001 Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Washington DC, September 6-8, 2001.
- CNM/CUT & DIEESE(2001), *Perfil das Plantas Automobilísticas, Trajetoria de 1995 a 2001. Projeto Construção de um Sistema Nacional de Negociações Coletivas do Setor Automobilístico do Brasil. Relatório da 2a etapa da pesquisa. CNM, DIEESE, AFL-CIO*, São Paulo: CNM/CUT & DIEESE, Novembro.
- CUT(2000), *The Economic and Social Reality of Brazilian Workers*, São

- Paulo: CUT, August.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2001), *Precarização e leis do trabalho nos anos FHC*, São Paulo: CUT, Janeiro.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2002), *Debate & Reflexões: As Transformações no Mundo do Trabalho e as Tendências das Negociações Coletivas*, No. 10, Dezembro, São Paulo: CUT, NPS, FES.
- CUT-EN[Executiva Nacional](2002), *Carta Aberta da CUT ao Congresso Nacional(versão para discussão)*, Executiva Nacional da CUT, 20 de fevereiro.
- DESEP/CUT(2000), *Política Econômica e Gastos Sociais, 1995-1999*, São Paulo: DESEP/CUT.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2002a), *A flexibilização trabalhista tende a aumentar o desemprego e a informalidade*, São Paulo: DESEP/CUT.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2002b), *Os Gastos Sociais no Governo FHC*, São Paulo: DESEP/CUT.
- DIEESE(2001a), *A Situação do Trabalho no Brasil*, São Paulo: DIEESE.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2001b), *As Negociações Coletivas no Brasil*, São Paulo: DIEESE.
- Dollar, David & Aart Kraay(2000), “Growth is good for the poor”, working paper, World Bank, pp. 1-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2001), “Trade, growth, and poverty”, working paper, World Bank, pp. 1-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_(2002), “Spreading the wealth”, *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb.
- FGV(Fundação Getulio Vargas)(2001), “Conjuntura Estatística”, *Conjuntura Econômica*, Vol. 55, No. 5.
- Freitas, Carlos Eduardo(2001), “Alterações na regulamentação das relações de trabalho no governo Fernando Henrique”, in CUT (2001), *Precarização e leis do trabalho nos anos FHC*, São Paulo: CUT, Janeiro.

- FUNDAP(Fundação do Desenvolvimento Administrativo)(2002), *Indicadores DIESP*, Vol. 11, No. 92.
- Gacek, Stanley A.(1995), "Brazil's labor movement", in Kevin Danaher & Michael Shellenberger(eds.)(1995), *Fighting for the Soul of Brazil*, NY: Monthly Review, pp. 39-46.
- Galbraith, James K.(2002), "Is inequality decreasing?: By the numbers", *Foreign Affairs*, Jul/Aug.
- Galvão de França, Caio (2003), CUT organization , 2003-2-03/2-04.
- Krein, José Dari(2002), "Análise do impacto e da efetividade das principais alterações legais no padrão de relações de trabalho no setor metalúrgico, entre 1996-2000", *Seminário regional sudeste, DIEESE/CESIT/CNPq*, São Paulo, 13-14 de março de 2002, pp. 1-111.
- Krein, José Dari (2003), Universidade de Campinas , 2003-1-17.
- Lopes, Fernando (2003), CNM/CUT , 2003-1-17/2-05/2-06.
- Machado, Ana Flávia & Danielle Carusi Machado(1998), "Análise de dois setores no mercado de trabalho: efeitos do Plano Real", *Revista de Economia Política*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 111-121.
- Manzano, Sofia Padua(2002), "As modificações na dinâmica das negociações coletivas do subsetor automotivo na década de 1990", *Seminário Regional Sudeste, DIEESE/CESIT/CNPq*, São Paulo, 13-14 de março.
- Menezes-Filho, Naercio, Helio Zylberstajin, Jose Paulo Chahad & Elaine Pazello(2002), "Unions and the economic performance of Brazilian establishments", Inter-American Development Bank, Working Paper, No. 464.
- Neri, Marcelo & José Márcio Camargo(2002), "Distributive effects of Brazilian structural reforms", in Renato Baumann(ed.), *Brazil in*

- the 1990s: An Economy in Transition*, Oxford: Palgrave.
- O'Connell, Lesley(1999), *Collective Bargaining Systems in 6 Latin American Countries: Degrees of Autonomy and Decentralization-Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru & Uruguay*, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.
- OIT(Organização Internacional do Trabalho)(1999), *Brasil: Abertura e ajuste do mercado de trabalho no Brasil-Políticas para conciliar os desafios de emprego e competitividade*, Brasília: Ministério do Trabalho e Emprego.
- Portes, Alejandro & Kelly Hoffman(2003), "Latin American class structures: Their composition and change during the neoliberal era", *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 41-82.
- Ramalho, José Ricardo(1999), "Trade unions in Brazil in a context of economic adjustment", in Martin Upchurch(ed.), *The State and 'Globalization': Comparative Studies of Labour and Capital in National Economies*, London: Mansell, pp. 230-247.
- Ribeiro, Fernando (2003), CUT-DESEP, 2003-1-31/2-03.
- Robinson, Ian(2002), "Book reviews: Polarizing Mexico; Growth, Employment and Equity", *Relations Industrielles*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 579-582.
- Rodrigues, Iram Jácome(1997), *Sindicalismo e Política: A Trajetória da CUT*, São Paulo: Edições Sociais.
- Rodrigues, Iram Jácome(ed.)(1999), *O Novo Sindicalismo: Vinte Anos Depois*, São Paulo: Editora Vozes.
- SMABC/DIEESE(2000), *Indicadores da Indústria Automobilística Brasileira*, São Paulo: SMABC, Março.
- Stallings, Barbara & Wilson Peres(2000), *Growth, Employment and Equity: The impact of the economic reforms in Latin America and the Caribbean*, UN, ECLAC.