



Organized crime and urban violence in Latin America: an interview with Eduardo Moncada

Felipe Ramos Garcia 

Doutorando em Sociologia pela Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Bolsista FAPESP

Email: frgarcia@usp.br

Apoena Mano 

Doutorando em Sociologia pela Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Bolsista de Doutorado FAPESP

Email: apoenamano@usp.br

Eduardo Moncada 

Doutor em Ciência Política, Professor do Departamento de Ciência Política do Barnard College, Universidade de Columbia.

Abstract

Latin America faces many challenges in relation to urban violence, which can be considered a thread of historical, political and social processes in the region. At the same time, a scenario of profound social and economic inequality has enabled the growth and consolidation of organized criminal groups, which exploit various illegal markets, especially drugs. Dominating the production and distribution of these substances, many of these groups use violence to compete for markets with rival groups and public authorities, generating fear and insecurity among the local population. It is in this context that Eduardo Moncada's work is inserted. Using qualitative tools and ethnographic and comparative methods, the author seeks to understand how ordinary people react to violence experienced in everyday life. In this interview, we look at the author's main works and contributions, offering reflections to think analytically about how we deal with urban violence and how it is reproduced on a daily basis.

Keywords: Latin America; urban violence; organized crime; comparative policies; urban studies



Introduction

How can we understand the political factors that shape the dynamics and consequences of urban violence, local democracy, and development? This is one of the main questions that guide the work of Eduardo Moncada. Since 2015, he has held the position of Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Barnard College, Columbia University. Previously, he gained professional experience at other prestigious institutions such as Princeton University, Rutgers University, New York University, and Yale University. His research agenda focuses broadly on crime, urban politics, and subnational comparative analysis. Throughout his career, Moncada has conducted most of his research in Latin America. Currently, he is increasingly interested in building new theoretical, conceptual, and empirical connections with similar political dynamics in other regions of the world.

The main focus of this interview is to delve into Eduardo Moncada's works and arguments, conveying the significance of his contributions to interdisciplinary fields of international relevance. This publication seeks to showcase his work to a diverse range of Brazilian scholars who may find his body of work relevant and engaging. In addition to numerous articles published in prestigious international journals (MONCADA, 2009, 2013, 2016a, 2017), the academic significance of the author is reflected in the substance of his books.

In his first book, "*Cities, Business and the Politics of Urban Violence in Latin America* (MONCADA, 2016b)", he explores how three Colombian cities - Bogotá, Medellín, and Cali - respond to the dynamics of urban violence. For that, Moncada analyzed how the relationships between city mayors, business interests, and criminal organizations shape how major developing world cities respond to the challenge of urban violence. After that, Eduardo co-edited, together with Agustina Giraudy and Richard Snyder, the book "*Inside Countries Subnational Research in Comparative Politics*" (GIRAUDY; MONCADA; SNYDER, 2019). Advancing the comprehension that comparative politics are not only related to research across countries, in this contribution, they show how subnational research provides useful insights about substantive themes in Political Science, from regimes and representation to states and security to social and economic development. Recently, Eduardo published the book "*Resisting Extortion: Victims, Criminals, and States in Latin America*" (MONCADA, 2022). In this work, he tackles the following question: "Why do victims resist similar forms of criminal victimization in contrasting ways?" For that, he analytically approaches the widespread but understudied phenomenon of criminal extortion in Latin America to introduce resistance to criminal victimization into the emerging research on the politics of crime.

We'd like to start by discussing the intersections between Political Science and Latin America. Could you explore your general perceptions about the most recent developments and tendencies in this field of study?

Thanks for the opportunity to discuss this with you. In thinking about this question, I think there are two aspects I would mention that are important. One is that from my perspective, being trained in Political Science in the United States, but being from Latin America and studying Latin American politics, it has always been interesting for me that in most parts of Latin America, political science tends to get situated within legal studies and the studies to become a lawyer or join the judicial system. But this has changed and now we see valuable political science research being conducted in Brazil, Colombia,

Chile, Mexico and other parts of Latin America. I think North American political science needs to engage more seriously with work produced in the region. For a while, I think there was this perception from academia in the United States that kind of viewed Political Science as something that was developed here to study Latin America and other parts of the world. I think that's changing and that's a good thing.

There's a lot of new developments in Political Science, particularly in Comparative Politics, which is my subfield. There is an effort among comparativists who study Latin America to engage with Latin American scholars who are Political Scientists who studied abroad or studied there in parts of Latin America, but who are advancing their own theories, their own methods and their own analyses. The effort is to have more conversations with each other as colleagues versus sort of northern academia dictating what needs to happen and how things should be studied.

I think you see that in a few different ways. For example, some networks are being formed between scholars and political scientists in the United States and Latin America. One that I work with and that does a lot of exciting work is the Red para el Estudio de la Economía Política de América Latina (REPAL)¹, where you have students and scholars of politics and Latin America coming together with students and scholars of Latin American politics that are based in the United States and Europe to engage with each other's work as equals. I think that's a positive development in how Political Science, as it is defined in the United States, is engaging with the regional study of Latin American politics and Latin American studies.

How did you become interested in working on topics such as crime, violence and politics in Latin America? How does your work fit and contribute to this field?

Probably the main reason why I ended up studying crime and violence in Latin America has to do with my own upbringing. My parents are from Ecuador and Colombia, and they migrated to the United States in the 1970s. Part of the reason why they migrated, in addition to the economic pressures that they were facing, was also fleeing violence. Especially my mother from Colombia, who was fleeing the dynamics of crime and violence - both the traditional political violence associated with the Civil War, and also the growing criminal violence in the cities where she lived after having grown up in the countryside. I remember when I was a kid in the United States, before we could go back and travel back to Latin America, that all the conversations my parents had on the phone with my relatives in Latin America included discussions about crime and violence. These were always issues that they were talking about, of how things were dangerous and insecure, and getting more dangerous and more insecure. I think, subconsciously, that may have put something in my mind and led me to get interested in understanding this "place" through the lens of crime and violence. I wanted to understand why crime, violence, and insecurity are such big issues in Latin American politics.

My work within Political Science in the United States is somewhat unique because the discipline came to the issue of crime really late, if compared to other disciplines like Criminology, Sociology, Anthropology, or Urban Studies. All of those fields have been studying crime and urban violence and other dynamics for a while. Traditional political science in the United States has just started looking at crime as an issue that is political in nature and also has political consequences. I tried to explore how traditional Political Science concerns around redistribution or electoral politics intersected with crime

¹ Cf. <https://redeconomiapoliticaamlat.com/>

and violence in the region. I've tried to do that throughout most of my work. My work is at an intersection between traditional Political Science and this newer topic of crime and violence.

I don't want to say I'm old, but I think I was part of what became a first wave of people that were starting to do this. Other scholars that are very well known and have made major contributions to this research include Enrique Desmond Arias², Angélica Durán-Martínez³, and others. It's exciting because now you go to Political Science conferences in the United States, and there are lots of panels on crime and violence in Latin America. That wasn't happening when I was a doctoral student. You had one or two of those, not a dozen of those or a section of the conference dedicated to that. I think the field is changing a lot in that respect.

How did you decide to specifically explore the Colombian cities of Bogota, Medellin, and Cali in your first book? Could you describe the innovative development of your analytic framework focusing on the interaction between urban political economies and patterns of paramilitary control? How does that relate to what you mentioned as a "reconciling of macro and micro level approaches?"

My first book, "Cities Business and the Politics of Urban Violence and Latin America", was based on my dissertation. This is related to the previous question about crime and violence being very new issues at that time in U.S. Political Science. My idea of focusing on that was both kind of exciting, but also unsettling because it was this topic that people hadn't started to think about and grapple with in Political Science. I wanted to do it for some of the personal reasons that I mentioned.

I ended up pursuing it and focusing on Colombia for two reasons. On the one hand, there's the personal connection. Which is something that at least in North American Political Science you don't often talk about - the personal as part of the justification for what you study. But I think it's important to acknowledge that. Colombia is part of my heritage. I have family in these cities. So I wanted to understand these places. That was part of the reason. More analytically, what I found interesting in the Colombian case was that, particularly at that time, everybody was talking about Colombia as this almost failed State. A place that was about to fall off the cliff and become a failed State - with civil war, drug violence, and corruption. But when you zoomed in and looked at cities within the country, you saw very different scenarios.

You saw for sure the cities of Medellin and Cali with long histories of violence, crime, and armed criminal groups. Then you saw Bogota, which also had its crime and violence issues, but had also these innovative politics that were happening focused on how to deal with crime and violence. Then you had some places like Medellin, for example, later on becoming a model of urban governance reproduced in some other places. The idea that one of the most violent cities in the world during the 1990s, just a few years later, could be the model of urban governance was very intriguing and puzzling to me. That is why I wanted to dig into that, and it seemed like one way to unpack that and try to explain it, or better understand it, was to compare the experiences across these cities. I was focused on the very different experiences they had with trying to grapple with crime and violence. This proposal led me to the idea of thinking about urban political economies and patterns of armed territorial control.

In my book the focus on Urban political economies is essentially about the relationship among business firms within a city, and between them and the local governments. This was something that I was borrowing from literature in Urban Studies that mainly focused on the United States and Europe.

² Cf. (ARIAS, 2009).

³ Cf. (DURÁN-MARTÍNEZ, 2017).

There's a long and large literature about urban political economies in the United States, England, France, and other Western European countries. But we have not talked a lot about that in the Latin American case. My effort here was to try and think: if the private sector is this big powerful actor that can influence public policy as this literature tells us, and these are cities where crime and violence are such big and politically salient issues, then the hypothesis is that we should see business intervening in the politics of security in these places. I found that they were intervening in very different ways. But all of them were concerned about it, impacted by it, and using what political leverage they had to try and influence the types of policies that they got.

What became most interesting to me is that the traditional or conventional hypothesis would be that businesses would want the rule of law. They would want order through the rule of law. But in places like Medellín, which had become one of these models of urban governance, they weren't pushing for the rule of law. They were pushing for a sort of co-existence with criminal groups involved in the drug trade, extortion and other forms of criminality. They were "okay" with having a setup where there were one or a handful of powerful criminal groups that could maintain order in the city, because that allowed businesses to flourish, profit, and operate. Versus settings like you had in Cali, when you had a multitude of criminal actors and no one was really in charge, what made it a lot harder to sort of implicitly or quietly allow for that to exist, because it still disrupted your business activities. This intersection was interesting to think about in terms of business power, criminal power, and how these two interact with each other in these places.

Part of that speaks to this issue of reconciling macro and micro levels of analysis. A macro-level analysis would think: I'm going to focus on the national level and talk about Colombia as a failed State. But as soon as you zoom in to the subnational level, you find a lot more variation. Thinking about those dynamics that would classify a country as a failed State is important, but we need to situate those within the territory, within the country, knowing that it can vary. And at the micro level I was trying to think about: okay, so there's a lot of literature that was just starting to emerge that looked at the micro-level dynamics of crime in particular neighborhoods. For example, in favelas in Rio de Janeiro – Enrique Desmond Arias' work was foundational during this period. My effort here was to think "How do I connect these two?". How do I think about very micro-level dynamics, almost a granular level within the city, and then connect that to these broader macro-level political and criminal dynamics, and dynamics of violence that are happening that characterize the country at an aggregate level as a whole? That was the focus. I don't know if I was successful, but that was the effort to try and bridge these two to move that discussion forward.

You are one of the organizers of the book "Inside Countries", which features empirical chapters from across the contemporary Global South - including India, Mexico, China, and Russia. The introduction of the book mentions that "subnational Research contributes to methodological innovation by providing fresh opportunities for deploying vanguard tools of social inquiry, including mixed-methods that combine quantitative and qualitative analysis, promising new techniques for spatial analysis and experiments". What is a Subnational Research? Could you explain more about this proposal?

In Sociology, the idea of subnational research is not uncommon – to think about levels of analysis and units of analysis below the national level, below the aggregate level. This has a long and rich history in Sociology and Anthropology. But in Comparative Politics, it was very new, at least until recently, to focus on units of analysis like a city, a neighborhood, or a region within a country. Instead, we were very much anchored in cross-national comparison. I think in part that was a product of how we thought about

politics as concentrated and controlled at the national level, and also about the data that we collected. A lot of our data collection efforts in comparative politics are historically focused at the national level, at that aggregate level. We didn't have a lot of data to be able to think about micro-level comparisons, like neighborhoods within a city or cross-city comparisons.

The project "Inside Countries" was an effort with my colleagues, Agustina Giraudy and Richard Snyder, who both have been doing a lot of work - even before I was around - conducting this kind of research. They were trying to think about conceptualizing and theorizing some of the core things that we are concerned about in comparative politics, but that we historically had thought about at the national level. That means, how do we think about political regimes, not just at the national level, but at the subnational level, like in a city, a county, a department, or a province? How do we think about development patterns? Not just at the national level, but within countries across territory?

What happens when you shift down from the national level? It has the benefit of generating lots of different cases for you to study now. You can compare lots of different cases within a country, holding constant national level dynamics, or you can compare subnational cases across countries that are very similar to each other, and maybe you wouldn't find counterparts inside of a single country. Maybe really violent cities across national borders from each other would be more comparable than trying to compare one violent city with another city in the same country. This opens up the door to thinking about different forms of comparison, which I think is exciting. It has also fueled and benefited from people experimenting a lot with different methods to try and study these cases, and you get a lot of these mixed-method projects that combine quantitative and qualitative analysis. Now we have a lot more data at the subnational level studying everything from democracy and authoritarianism to crime and social economic development. We have a lot more quantitative data we can use. It also invites those who want the opportunity to study politics at a very granular level.

If I am going to study crime and the impacts it has on politics, I can go to a subnational unit - a city, a neighborhood - and conduct interviews or focus groups that get at some of those dynamics and put those into conversation with some of the quantitative data that we have about things like crime, violence, and politics. We are seeing more and more people in comparative politics think about subnational research designs as a way to do this type of work. I think that it also helped us to converse a lot more with other disciplines. Like sociologists, anthropologists, and economists, for example. It's a great opportunity then to have those conversations that maybe we weren't having as much of when we focused at the national level.⁴

We would like to delve deeper into your approach to methodologies. Can you explore the multiple uses of qualitative approaches and ethnographic data in your work? How do you scale up the social theories and frameworks based on studying localized and situated experiences?

That's a great question. I think within Political Science in North America, ethnography is increasingly seen as a very powerful method. It's not the conventional method that defines the discipline. I think most of our analyses, when we look at comparative politics research, still show that it leans toward the quantitative side of things. Increasingly you see a sort of infrastructure within the discipline being built to support people carrying out qualitative research. Everything from sections of the American

⁴ In reference to this subject, we recommend the Special Edition 'Criminal Governance in Latin America in Comparative Perspective', published in a bilingual edition of *Dilemas*. organized by Benjamin Lessing (UChicago, USA), Joana Monteiro (FGV, Brazil) and Michel Misse (UFRJ, Brazil) Cf. (LESSING, 2022).

Political Science Association that are focused on qualitative methods and mixed-methods, to prizes for work that recognizes the use of ethnographic or interpretative research methodologies as well. There's a growing kind of interest in that. For many people who do that kind of work, including myself, part of what drives us to use this kind of tool in the context of Political Science is to understand how our concepts and arguments do or do not get reflected in the ways that people on the ground understand the reality around them - the environments around them.

I'll give you an example. When I started my last book project on extortion, I remember doing research on this in Medellin, Colombia. I had come into the project thinking about extortion in a sort of conventional way. An armed actor shows up, or a member of an armed group shows up, they charge you an amount of money and they leave. The politics of that is about the monetary exchange, the material loss that you incur. And it is. But I remember talking to people who were getting extorted by a gang in downtown Medellin, and I kept asking them questions about that material loss and they were okay with it at first. But then they got kind of frustrated because they were saying that the experience of extortion is a lot more than that. It's about me sitting here at my business, that I'm trying to use to survive, and having someone I don't know who's probably a lot younger than me as well show up and demand something from me, and take it from me. It has implications for my dignity, for my self-respect, and for how I see myself as a second-class citizen. For me, that was kind of like a light bulb, the "aha" moment, and I thought: if I am going to study this, I need to use some qualitative tools that can get to that interpretation of their reality. I cannot only rely on quantitative tools to understand how extortion and other forms of crime are political in their nature and how they impact politics the way that people see them.

It is important to discuss aspects of "scaling up". It's something that I have two different perspectives on. One is based on the traditional ethnographic work, which might argue that you don't necessarily want to scale up. Theorizing at that micro level is what the ethnographic method is best equipped to do. That's what you want to do. You want to keep your theory there, referring to that place, to that time, to that space, to those people, to that phenomenon. Sometimes I think to myself that's what I'm trying to do. But there's also the tension when you want to be able to say something bigger, you want to be able to say something that travels, that helps other people have a conversation with you about this phenomenon - that maybe they're seeing in very different places that you haven't studied. I think one way to do that using ethnographic tools is to carefully emphasize issues like concepts: how concepts that you can form inductively through ethnographic work can travel to other places. I think processes as well, like pathways that link different variables, can also be used and studied ethnographically and help us to better understand these things in other places and in other parts of the world too, and other parts of moments in time. I think there are ways to scale up maybe not an entire theoretical framework, but you would say pieces of it using the ethnographic method.

Now let's go through "Resisting Extortion". Could you make a parallel based on the methodology of the book and your main arguments and findings? How did the qualitative methodologies such as interviews, focus groups, and participatory drawing exercises offer possibilities for exploring the phenomenon of criminal extortions?

I think the method and the argument of the book are very much in conversation with each other. You perceive that throughout the elements of the theoretical framework that I developed for those cases that I am studying in "Resisting Extortion". On the one hand, I think the book, if we wanted to summarize the key argument from it, is that people who are victims of crime aren't just victims, but actually mobilize

to resist, to negotiate, to even stop their victimization. But they all can't do that. There are certain conditions that allow them to engage in different forms of resistance.

In the book, I argue that if we look at things like different types of business firms, and business sectors, and private sectors in the market, one of the key variables is their level of collective capacity. Can they come together and coordinate with each other to confront criminal actors, or if they don't have that power, what does that do for their ability to negotiate extortion? Where you have that collective capacity, you can use that to confront organized crime in very forceful ways. Some of the examples in the book are drawn from parts of Mexico, and parts of El Salvador, to a lesser degree where some elements of collective action are possible and that allow you to confront organized crime, and other places where you don't have that collective capacity and you're forced to or relegated to negotiating extortion. Making deals with criminal groups to lessen the amount that you're charged or to have them treat you with a bit more respect in the ways that they interact with you as well: which can be very important, but doesn't eliminate extortion or your victimization.

All of those elements were very much informed by intensive fieldwork. Almost 14 months of fieldwork across Colombia, El Salvador, and Mexico, over several years. I counted on a lot of really great research assistants who worked with me, who were also members of communities where I was studying, who participated in the process and that helped me better understand what was happening in these communities. They allowed me to access individuals that otherwise I wouldn't have been able to access as well. I think one of the key challenges for this type of research is gaining trust in these types of settings - and doing that as an outsider is very difficult. Having those local research assistants who were not only super helpful in carrying out parts of the research, but also in making connections for me and helping me connect with people locally, was hugely important as part of the qualitative aspect of the project.

I think that my use of different methods helped to understand extortion when I initially didn't realize how complex extortion the relationship between victims and criminal groups can be. As the project progressed I kind of added new methodologies because I kept thinking: "I'm not able to capture certain things just with an interview" or "I'm not able to capture things just with the focus groups". So I needed to add other methodologies and introduce them into the research design to capture those other things.

The focus groups were an effort to capture the collective decision-making that happens around how people understand extortion, and how they understand what they can do or not do, vis-a-vis the extortion. I wasn't getting enough of that through just one-on-one interviews. I needed to put people in a collective setting and see how they talked about these things. But even within focus groups, you have people who are quieter than others or don't want to talk in front of others. I needed to make sure that those weren't going to bias my results.

Drawing exercises was a way to try to get those individuals, the quieter individuals, to share and speak up. It was always a lot of fun to have them make their drawing about what generated security or insecurity for them, and watch them present it to everybody and talk a lot more than they had during the two hours of the focus group. That was always useful. Trying to think about how these different methods could help each other and address each other's limitations was key to being able to develop the book and do this research.

Certainly scholars like yourselves and others in Brazil and others in Latin America who study these issues also know these are settings of insecurity. These are settings of lots of distrust with outsiders. It's work that's difficult to do and takes a long time to do it. I think using these different methods as part of that process helps to not only capture parts of the empirical world that we might not always see if we

only use quantitative data, but also allows us to build relationships with people in the field that help our research along as well.

Could you describe what you are currently developing in terms of your research?

I'm still working on crime and violence in Latin America. This new project that I have kind of builds on the development of the book "Resisting Extortion", where I had this kind of "aha" moment of thinking about victimization as a political experience and a political process. One of the things that I started to think about for this next project is "How does living with and interacting with criminal actors shape your political engagement and the degree to which you want to engage or participate in politics?" There's been some really interesting and very important research on that in Political Science particularly, that's looked at how crime, and violence, and victimization impact your probability of turning out to vote on Election Day, or your policy preferences about security issues that you want: Mano Dura hardline politics, for example. Or if you are more open to social investment, or redistribution. I think those are super important. What I want to try to do is to build on that and think about it.

Those are individual-level effects, and what about collective effects? How does exposure to these criminal dynamics shape your incentives and ability to engage in collective action around politics? For this project, I'm exploring exactly that by trying to think through how competition among criminal groups at the neighborhood level impacts collective political mobilization to demand public goods from the government. How does living in a neighborhood that's controlled by a criminal group or multiple criminal groups impact your ability to work with your neighbors to demand things like access to clean water or sewage infrastructure, housing, education, roads, or electricity? I'm empirically exploring that right now in parts of Mexico City where you have criminal actors at the neighborhood level that control local drug economies and where you have lots of variation in collective political engagement there.

Much like we were talking about on "Resisting Extortion", I've had to adapt as well. Because of where I am in my career, I can no longer go and spend six months somewhere, which is really sad for me to not be able to go and do six months straight up fieldwork, or a year of fieldwork. But it has forced me to think about new ways to do ethnographic work without being in the field for extended periods of time. For this project, for example, I've hired and trained research assistants who are graduate students in Mexico City, some in Sociology, some in Political Science, and then I pair them with research assistants from the communities themselves. Members of the communities get trained on how to do these interviews, how to maintain the anonymity of the data, and how to keep the data safe. They work together on this project by doing interviews, organizing meetings, writing-up sort of mini-studies or mini-case studies on their neighborhoods.

It's been really interesting for me to see how bringing together academic researchers and community members can also generate all sorts of new insights that you wouldn't get if you only limited it to academic researchers. You guys probably know better, but there's a long and very rich history of doing that in the Brazilian case of Sociology - of bringing community members into the research process of participatory action research. Again, I think Political Science is catching up. I'm trying to figure out ways of learning from that to incorporate that into a comparative framework in Political Science.

In "Resistance Extortion", you mention that "Latin America accounts for 8% of the world's population, but nearly one-third of the world's annual homicides". How do you see the Brazilian dynamics of urban violence in organizing crime inside this phenomenon?

This is a great way to bring things full circle. I always wanted to study Brazil, but I don't have the language skills to do it, which is unfortunate. Although, I guess I could someday work with translators and other interpreters to try and do that kind of work. If we think about the study of crime and violence in Brazil. If I think about it from the North American Political Science perspective, it's been foundational to this movement towards studying crime and violence and Political Science. Enrique Desmond Arias and Janice Perlman's⁵ works, among others for example, introduced crime and violence in the developing world into North American Academia through the Brazilian experience and the Brazilian case.

There's a big imprint of Brazil and the dynamics of crime and violence in urban settings in a lot of what we do today in terms of studying these subjects in Latin America. It becomes interesting that now we have a lot of research that focuses on different parts of Brazil, beyond Rio de Janeiro. We know great works that focus on the dynamics of favelas and the very powerful drug gangs that control that engagement in territorial control. But you have helped me to understand better this. As thought about it and started to read other works from different regions of Brazil, I perceived that these are not the norm everywhere in the Brazilian landscape.

From my perspective, what's interesting is that much of our research has been influenced by the study of Brazil on crime and violence. But there's a lot more, for us working from North American academia, that we can learn from Brazilian scholars who are working on this and being cognizant of important differences across space and time. We need to be able to better understand the Brazilian case, and also to be better in our own theories about how these dynamics vary in important ways. If we've been building everything around that concentrated focus on Rio and favela dynamics, then maybe we're missing certain things that aren't captured in those dynamics. That could help us to understand better crime and violence not only in other parts of Brazil, but other parts of Latin America and other parts of the world where there are parallels between what's happening there.

To give a concrete example, one of the things I think there's a lot of interest in doing but there hasn't been a lot from North American Academia is studies of militias. That seems to be a big gap in our understanding of this in the English language academic work. We have a lot of rich material on drug gangs, we have a lot of rich material on police violence. Militias are always there, but we don't quite have the same level of in-depth study of that. You guys probably know better than I do, maybe why that is at least in the English language academic work. It seems to me that those are a coercive actor who works in tandem with the State, but who are also involved in criminal activities. That actor is something you see in many different parts of Latin America. Studying it in the Brazilian case can only help us to understand better that in other parts of Latin America and build comparative studies of that across regions that include militia more seriously as a critical actor.

I think there's a lot to learn. Who knows, hopefully someday I can go and learn more from people who are studying this in Brazil and will be able to think through these things together with folks there, too.

⁵ Cf. (PERLMAN, 1979).

References

ARIAS, E. D. *Drugs and democracy in Rio de Janeiro: Trafficking, social networks, and public security*. University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

DURÁN-MARTÍNEZ, A. *The politics of drug violence: Criminals, cops, and politicians in Colombia and Mexico*. Oxford University Press, 2017.

GIRAUDY, A.; MONCADA, E.; SNYDER, R. *Inside countries: Subnational research in comparative politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.

LESSING, B. Governança criminal na América Latina em perspectiva comparada: Apresentação à edição especial. *Dilemas: Revista de Estudos de Conflito e Controle Social*. Apresentação à edição especial. *Dilemas: Revista De Estudos De Conflito E Controle Social*, 15(spe4), 1-10, 2022.

MONCADA, E. Toward democratic policing in Colombia? Institutional accountability through lateral reform. *Comparative Politics*, v. 41, n. 4, p. 431-449, 2009.

MONCADA, E. The politics of urban violence: challenges for development in the Global South. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, v. 48, n. 3, p. 217-239, 2013.

MONCADA, E. Urban violence, political economy, and territorial control: Insights from Medellín. *Latin American Research Review*, p. 225-248, 2016a.

MONCADA, E. *Cities, business, and the politics of urban violence in Latin America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016b.

MONCADA, E. Varieties of vigilantism: conceptual discord, meaning and strategies. *Global Crime*, v. 18, n. 4, p. 403-423, 2 out. 2017.

MONCADA, E. *Resisting Extortion*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.

PERLMAN, J. E. *The myth of marginality: Urban poverty and politics in Rio de Janeiro*. CA: University of California Press, 1979.