

Fernanda Di Flora*
Pedro Luiz Lima**

June 2013 elicited immediate reactions, both in the heat of the events and in the subsequent years, swinging between triumphalistic jubilation and catastrophic condemnation. In the broad field of interpretations of Brazil, as well as in a significant portion of specialized academic research on social movements, unilateral reactions prevailed. There seemed to be little room for nuanced readings, little room to emphasize ambivalences in that tumultuous sequence of historical events. June 2013 was either one thing or nothing at all.

Ten years later, with the national political landscape having experienced numerous setbacks and upheavals, it seems that we are on more solid ground to finally turn our gaze to June 2013 with greater historical rigor and acuity. Considering that major historical events tend to acquire new meanings over time, this dossier seeks to overcome immediate binary interpretations and participate in a collective effort to grasp the complexity of the protest cycle.

Facing this challenge, it seems interesting to reaffirm a basic premise of modern social sciences, often forgotten or underestimated: "The number and type of causes which have influenced any given event are always infinite and there is nothing in the things themselves to set some of them apart as alone meriting attention" (Weber, 1999, p. 94). Criteria belong, obviously, to those interpreting the event. Just like the perspectives and biases.

Assigning the sole responsibility for the subsequent democratic downturn entirely to the events of June 2013 is an oversimplified stance. At the same time, the perspective that sees it only as a diffuse foundation for democratic radicalization, perverted or sabotaged by various exogenous actors depending on each interpreter's preferences (sometimes the media, sometimes institutional left, sometimes the "political system," etc.), is also precarious. It is necessary, then, to avoid inscribing the historical event into a scheme with causal linearity. At the same time, one must guard against the excess of normativity from those who, to safeguard the supposed democratic essence of the phenomenon, isolate it from everything that came after.

The fallacies of arguments in terms of the "snake's egg" have long been criticized (Lima and Sawamura, 2016). Perhaps it is time, after ten years, to also question the foundations of interpretations of June as a "democratic shock" (Nobre, 2013; Arantes, 2014; Braga, 2015; Safatle, 2017). Beyond these two critical paths, which aim at the one-sidedness of interpretations widespread over the past ten years, there remains the task of exploring the potentials and limits of the strands that go in the opposite direction. Instead of closing the meaning of the events in a positive or negative key, these readings emphasize a certain indeterminacy, either through an affirmation of the "societal opening" as the precipitous effect of June (Pleyers and Bringel, 2015), or through the reconstruction of an almost infinite "mosaic" of actors and movements (Alonso, 2023).

* Professora Adjunta da Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná (UTFPR). Doutorado em Sociologia pela Universidade Estadual de Campinas. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4997-8651>. E-mail: ferdiflora@uol.com.br.

** Professor Adjunto da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Doutorado em Ciência Política pela Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7830-5136>. E-mail: pedrollima@gmail.com.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 International License, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt and create from this work, provided they cite its authors and the original source.

Expanding the range of our critical potential in the face of June 2013 and its consecrated interpretations – that is the purpose of this dossier. We understand that it is not the case to close the debate. On the contrary, it is about opening some exploratory paths to further deepen our understanding of the event in particular and, through it, the history of contemporary Brazil. In this regard, it seems to us that the dossier has been very successful.

It is our duty, finally, to briefly introduce the articles that make up this collective effort to reinterpret June 2013. Some of the articles presented here share a procedural approach to the protest cycle, placing it in a broader context of tensions and ambiguities latent in that historical moment and therefore rejecting the idea of a unique event with strictly defined agendas and actors.

The article "From the Offices to the Streets: The Political Antecedents of the Emergence of the June Confrontation Cycle, 2011-2013" by Rafael Souza explores the institutional and extra-institutional antecedents that led to the protest events of June 2013. While many analyses have focused on the urban dimension, Rafael argues that June should be framed in a broader context of the spread of various political dissensions that were already circulating in the streets and offices. He warns that by focusing exclusively on the urban or transportation issue, there is a risk of interpreting other emerging agendas as deviations, and other groups as strange or anomalous, not recognizing them as essential components of that moment. By addressing the origins of June, relating them to the weakening of the government coalition and pre-existing polarizations and conflicts, the author rejects the thesis that June was "hijacked," highlighting the diversity of performances, actors, and agendas that emerged later on the streets.

Verônica Tavares Freitas's article engages with Rafael Souza's procedural approach to June, addressing its consequences by analyzing the increase in calls for military intervention that followed in the years after the protest cycle. Focusing on a specific group – the interventionists – the author emphasizes the existence of numerous agendas and actors integrating the protests, refusing the perspective of the prominence of a specific group or agenda. Temporally delimited between 2011 and 2019, the research shows how the leaderships that claimed military intervention participated in the protests at various times and strengthened themselves in the context of the demonstrations that took to the streets, while others emerged in the immediate aftermath. Analyses claiming the existence of a "conservative appropriation" of the streets in general disregard the existence of groups that already had organizational structures before the 2013 protest cycle. In this sense, the author refutes the hypothesis of June 2013 as the "snake's egg," showing how, in reality, there was a conjunctural opening that allowed for the reordering of different groups, including the interventionists.

Guilherme Benzaquen and Simone Gomes' article investigates the dimensions of collective violence in Brazil after the June 2013 protests, highlighting lynchings, looting, and vandalism as part of a violent repertoire mobilized at different times. Adopting the concepts of "opening" and "societal overflow," the researchers propose an analysis that considers not only the events that preceded the protests but also the subsequent developments, often detached from the original causes. The violent repertoire, central to the analysis, reflects the rejection of the institutional and the search for demands through direct action, challenging the traditional role of organizations in collective mobilization. Among the three forms of this repertoire analyzed in the article, the vandalism articulated with the black bloc tactic was the most expressive, being mobilized on various occasions by different actors. For the authors, although June and collective violence are not equivalent, it can be said that they share intersections related to the historical context, highlighting the societal opening that brought conflict back to the streets.

In "The Images of June 2013: A Dispute for Brazil," Leandro Marinho addresses a central element of the protests: the imagetic question. Dealing with a phenomenon largely determined by new information technologies, Marinho investigates the distinctions in the treatment of images by traditional media and the then-emerging media activism circuit in the country. His article explores how, in the heat of the events, a symbolic struggle unfolded around the meanings of the protests. And how various political-media actors framed the same events differently according to their purposes of either conserving or radically transforming the status quo. Images stand out in Marinho's article, composing a rich and plural inventory of June 2013 as a terrain always in dispute.

The interpretative clashes over an event so radically polysemic and controversial are, obviously, contemplated in our dossier. And we can illustrate it through the distinction between Mayra Goulart and Allegra Levandosky's article, on the one hand, and Pedro Borba's text, on the other. While the authors emphasize that June 2013 leveraged anti-PT sentiment in various regions of the country, radicalizing it and, ultimately, tilting it towards its later Bolsonaroist drift, Pedro Borba, in turn, argues that it would be premature to close the meaning of the historical event at this or that point in its developments. For Goulart and Levandosky, the explosion of anti-PT sentiment already in the 2014 elections and the progressive radicalization of its presence in discourse and the national political imaginary, culminating in Bolsonaro's election in 2018, would be enough to inscribe June as a fundamental moment in a history of anti-PT sentiment. Averse to stricter circumscriptions, Borba understands that June 2013 was a moment of historical acceleration that would have transformed the traditional modes of action of both the left and the right – and, in this sense, we would still be living the shifting impact of that historical event. An event whose implications must be analytically grasped with relative prudence, as they continue to transform year after year in the turbulent national political life.

In this spirit of interpretative openness, we invite everyone to read the Dossier Rethinking June 2013. May it be an engaging read!

REFERENCES

- ALONSO, Angela. *Junho: a política de rua de Lula a Dilma*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2023.
- ARANTES, Paulo. *O novo tempo do mundo*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2014.
- BRAGA, Ruy. *A pulsão plebeia*. São Paulo: Alameda editorial, 2015.
- LIMA, Pedro; SAWAMURA, Mateus. O ovo da serpente? Fundamentos e variações da crítica ao componente conservador das “Jornadas de junho” de 2013. *Leviathan: Cadernos Pesquisa Política*, São Paulo, n. 13, p. 91-119, 2016.
- NOBRE, Marcos. *Choque de democracia: razões da revolta*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2013.
- PLEYERS, G.; BRINGEL, B. Junho de 2013... dois anos depois: polarização, impactos e reconfiguração do ativismo no Brasil. *Nova Sociedade*, v. 2015, n. 2, p. 4-17, 2015. Available at: <<http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/172074>>.
- SAFATLE, Vladimir. *Só mais um esforço*. São Paulo: Três Estrelas, 2017.
- WEBER, Max. A “objetividade” do conhecimento nas Ciências Sociais. In: WEBER, Max. *Max Weber – Sociologia*. Tradução de Gabriel Cohn. São Paulo: Ática, 1999.