

## **Philosophy and politics Liberalism and other ideas**

**Daria Makarova**  
*Kaunas University*

---

**Abstract:** In Western Europe, workers' movements will emerge, which makes conservative ideas counterattack and gain importance.

After the First World War, liberalism was weakened by the rise of fascisms such as the Italian or German National Socialism. In Spain and Portugal the dictatorships of Franco and Salazar.

On the other hand, the communist alternative of the USSR is proposed and liberalism still persists in France or England.

**Keywords:** World crisis, world ideas, thinkers and political structures

---

### **Introduction**

- Crisis of welfarestates
- Crisis of Marxism
- State intervention that guarantees that all citizens are equal.
- Equalopportunities (Rawls)
- No state intervention. This idea is fundamentally economic.

### **John Rawls**

Each person has a different socialization, therefore not everyone considers in the same way what is fair from what is not. This is a problem in the search for universal principles.

Possible answers are emotive, relativism or utilitarianism. Rawls thinks that what benefits the majority is not really fair, therefore utilitarianism does not serve as a way to determine what is or is not fair and neither is the emotive.

Rawls is, in this sense ambitious, seeks rational principles that are just and valid for all.

It starts from an original situation where the principles of justice will be defined. In this situation we would not have inertia and the best would be rationally sought.

In this sense it would be better not to know anything about which social group we belong to - age, sex, nation ... If you know something about these types of issues, your criteria can vary greatly. It is called the veil of ignorance.

The subjects in the original situation would have before them the so-called veil of ignorance.

In any case, it is not assumed that we are absolutely ignorant because if not, we could not judge therefore we assume that we are:

- Rational
- We seek our own well-being, our happiness.
- We are not envious (we prefer to be a little less happy than others than to be all unhappy.)
- Norarewealtruistic.

Rawls presupposes that rational individuals, in this uncertain situation, will tend to the maximization of the minimums.

Individuals prefer those institutions that maximize their minimum possible standards.

These individuals in the original situation and subjected to the veil of ignorance do not know their own history but they do know about the existence of policies, religions ... They do not know about its ideology, orientation, but they do know about its existence and know, for example, that issues such as religion have generated confrontations, etc ...

These people need to be happy therefore they need certain basic goods to access happiness.

People would therefore need issues such as:

- Right to life
- Physical and moral integrity

- Right to choose
- Freedom of conscience
- Freedom of expression
- Freedom of movement.

These would be a series of fundamental freedoms that all human beings must have and that must be compatible, at the same time, with the freedoms of others.

In terms of remuneration, Rawls would choose the Maximian point of view, greater utility and economic performance.

Capitalism and absolute private property are not part of fundamental freedoms. Yes, a personal private property which does not involve companies.

Social inequalities are just and maximize the well-being of the poorest.

## **Conservatism**

### **Principles:**

- It is rooted in concrete histories of specific and different countries.
- It arises rather as an answer and has no theoretical intention in its origin.
- There is a great variety within conservatism: history, different countries...

There are special differences between two branches: British conservatism and Eastern European conservatism.

- A principle of security versus resolution.
- Preserve tradition, permanence, stability.
- Loyalty and respect, of patriotic responsibility, of the upper classes.
- Importance of the traditional family model.
- They always seek stability, to maintain traditional values.
- Loyalty, security, patriotism, solidarity are his visions, although not so reproduced in reality.

Over time, without becoming the same, there will be a connection between nationalism and conservatism. Some authors:

- \_\_ J. de Maistrae (XVIII-XIX)
- \_\_ L. de bonald (XVIII-XIX)
- \_\_ E. Burke(XVIII)
- \_\_ J. Donoso Cortes (XIX) Spanish conservative very innovative.
- \_\_ M. Barres (XIX-XX)
- \_\_ Ch. Maurras (XIX-XX)
- \_\_ F. Megel (XVIII-XIX) at first has liberal ideas.
- \_\_ M. OakeSmott (XX)
- \_\_ C. Schmitt (XX) is authoritarian
- \_\_ F. Dostoyensky and J. Conrad are both conservative writers.

Conservatives are going to reject the idea that society is born of a contract. For conservatives, societies are fruit, rather their basis is in tradition and loyalty. Raising the idea of a contract, as the origin of society, would call into question the historical basis and that would lead to chaos.

Religion is linked to traditions. It affirms stability and is reluctant to change. It generates, likewise, a fear of the beyond, or what may come if you do not behave in a certain way, this is used to limit the freedom of action.

DONOSO CORTES states that if there is an ecclesiastical representation, repression from the state is not necessary (and vice versa), therefore, he believes that being religious makes you free (because the state is not going to restrict you). He says that a community of Christians is the perfect community.

A spiritual person, of faith, who assumes the religious precepts is not going to be repressed by the state since he first represses his own faith.

Donoso defends private property as one of the pillars of stability "there is private property because there is order and vice versa." It also fosters tradition, the passage of ideas from parents to children which generates responsibility, continuity.

## **British Conservatism**

**Edmund Burke** (1729-1797)

### **Intrusion:**

The differences it maintains with continental conservatism and that Burke revealed; that he was a politician rather than a philosopher. It is also contradictory, on the one hand it will support the French Revolution and then I condemn it.

Works by Burke: "Reflections on the French Revolution" (1790)

His thought is unphilosophical and almost romantic. He also writes letters, speeches and pamphlets.

He has a significant contempt for French philosophers especially despises Rousseau.

He rejected reason and theory precisely because of his rejection of philosophers for using reason. All his work is a praise of prejudice.

"The logic of romantic feeling" It comes to be named for its formal structuring of its thought. He is a writer of legalism. I reject everything that has to do with the French Republic. Support for the English Republic.

He views political tradition as a sense of religious reverence. He also considers kings as if they were gods, so he is irritated that the French Republic put kings as simple men.

New constitution and new government: crazy and tragic ideas.

He does not deny that the system can be changed, but gradually. It is totally opposed to revolutionary change.

Society is an artifice that is based on prejudice, understanding this as love and loyalty. It is artifice because it is not natural. The group is a group organized by history. He does not agree with the social contract (he believes that at some point it could have existed naturally, but since he does not know when he dismisses it).

The basis of society and morality needs to be part of something beyond ephemeral existence. (This is much like religious thought)

Burke unites politics with religion:

- And sometimes he does not reject reason by linking him to chance.
- Differences between upper and lower classes. The upper classes should be the proud and the lower classes should not.
- Reverence for politics and institutions.

It proposes a parliamentary government led by a compacted minority, whose goal is the political good. It rejects a government of the people.

It defends the independence and judgment of action of parliamentarians. (The parliamentarian can do what he wants)

He says, regarding the French Revolution, that freedom must be virile, moral and orderly. It does not admit equality, it defends natural inequality.

Inequality goes with man, because of his abilities, inequality goes with man because of his abilities and this is essential for any political order.

He sees the French Republic as a punishment from God for the sins of men. (You wish to warn in your letters of the danger posed by the French Republic.

To recap: it is a romantic discourse, unrationalist (rejects reason), moderate with regard to social change (incremental form), opposed to social redistribution, traditional conception of society linked to Catholic values (justifies social inequality, hates popular sovereignty)

Most authors place the beginning of the conservative movement in the final periods of the French Republic.

It is based on their position to change, to progress. The current lifestyle (the status quo) is always defined, they only admit certain small changes gradually.

The conservative reactionary wants to regain his status, which he had before the revolutionary changes. In this way, conservatism can be understood as:

- As a reaction to revolutionary changes or movements of change.
- Like the social and political structure of the moment itself.

For conservatives, individual freedom is more important than the equality of society. There is a clear respect for tradition and heritage.

The church is one of the basic pillars of conservatism. There is also a distrust in reason, it is untainted with elitist thought, being the social order one of the most precious values. A vision of society in a hierarchical way. Conservatism is associated with:

- Pre-industrial economic interests

- Pre-democratic systems of authority.
- Societies organized around land, nobles and peasants.
- Kings, nobility, army...

The social structure is based on:

- Serfdom
- Rural society dominated by hereditary and privileged nobility.
- Landowning nobility ranks first in terms of economy, society or culture.

On the side of political society:

- Absolutist systems headed by authoritarian monarchies
- Monarchies that rule with the support of nobles and political organizations linked to the court.
- The church has a monopoly on rites, teaching, and social services.

### **Neoconservatism**

It is an elite movement, concentrated in a small group. It also has a strategy. They are a small group without electoral base, but with great capacity to manage public opinion due to their strategic position in universities or in the media.

In their origins they are linked to the Democratic Party and are of Jewish origin that are also related to Jewish intellectual environments.

Its objective is to respond to the problems of contemporary society. They also believe that their ideas are appropriate for a modern democracy. They also believe in an elite council and matter in scientific prestige.

His publications are a way to spread his ideas among American society. It is clear that in order to influence they must win the culture war, influence or manage public opinion. The role of the family is also very important, it is very common for several members of the same family to be linked to neoconservatism.

The origins of conservatism are located in the time of the great depression and has a marked nationalist cut.

The old conservatism fails with the bombing of Peral Harbor thus losing great power of influence. They are opposed to the politicians of the New Deal and the growth of the state bureaucracy.

After World War II it remained a movement of a few members and are anti-liberal, anti-Soviet, and anti-communist.

They abhor extremism, both left and right and the growth of the state with the invasion of private space. Having little luck in the elections, they take refuge in developing their economic theory.

In the 60s-70s Neoconservatism emerged. They are linked to the Democratic Party and form the coalition for Democratic Majority and begin to introduce changes such as the appearance of magazines or books such as James Coleman.

Family and religion become the basis of the neoconservative movement and highlighted its Jewish background. It is in these years when they separate from the liberal movement that sympathizes with the counterculture movement.

In the 80s there is a turn when he is now interested in international relations and military affairs.

They interpret, for example, the hippie movement with an attack on the family and traditional American society. They disagree, in general, with counterculture ideas.

Scepticism about the role of the UN, EU, etc... of the general idea of creating world blocs.

To combat totalitarianism, they say, a nation that reflects the highest values of human civilization that would be the United States is needed. They see history as a goal that the U.S. has to lead the world to.

**Foreign policy:** follow the 5 theses of Leo Strauss and Donald Kajan: patriotism, world government is a terrible idea that can end in tyranny, statesmen must know how to distinguish between friends and enemies. For the United States, its national interest is not limited to its geographical borders. The United States has a moral obligation to defend a democratic country that suffers threats to its system.

There is a defense of capitalist democracy

-Moral obligation of intervention.

**Future of Neoconservatism:** Fukuyama argues that after the Cold War there is an idea that totalitarians are hollow. This idea is in neoconservatism. There may be an end to neoconservatism when its ideas and approaches fail, such as the invasion of Iraq. This is how maximalism is called into question (the idea of first acting, then asking for permission or international legitimation)

This crisis may generate a new cynical realism in the US by supporting dictatorships. This neoconservatism may resurface. "Neoconservatism was born to stay with us for a long time" Hugo Picada León (Salamanca, 17-3-06)  
\_ With Reagan's rise to power, the neoconservatives see a possibility to take part in this power.

They even allied themselves with the Clinton government because of its disagreement with the Bush Sr. administration. However, this is not going to last long and they strongly criticize it.

After September 11, Bush sees an alliance in the neo-liberal discourse with the idea that the US is the best nation in the world and has the inevitable task of leading the world to democracy.

They're going to join religious rights groups, although they're different things. It is a rather conjunctural alliance to achieve the re-election of Bush, feeling that his ideology is the closest to his interests. They believe in individualism, although never to the extreme since they will always move away from extremes. Ethical pluralism and separation of the world between good and bad.

**Domestic politics:** Neoconservative intellectuals are usually historians. It sells the idea of the need for economic growth. For American democracy to remain a global standard, it must maintain and foster its economic growth.

They prefer to look for alternatives to the welfare state, it must be the market that solves the needs. They see the state as a necessary evil.

### **Decisionism**

- Donoso Cortes.
- Carl Schmitt.

Decisionism places special emphasis on the decision, it is a current that sees the political decision in a certain way:

- Political decisions do not derive from an endless process of rational debate.
- Reason plays a limited role, while if personal and emotional inclinations, loyalties, taking sides are more important...
- Political decisions reflect a conception that goes beyond rational examination. (Not all decisions can be justified in a purely rational way.)

They strongly criticize liberalism (he was optimistic about parliament's decision-making power) saying that you can't always be caught up in pros and cons or rationalities.

There is no debate, we must choose. They go beyond the culture of conservative ideology.

Max Weber is, at heart, an advocate of decision-making.

A current example of decisionism: either you are with the state of Israel or you are against it.

What really matters is making the decision, the legitimacy itself derives from you making the decision.

The modern instrument of domination and control is then dictatorship.

The sovereign is not bound by the laws of nature, he can even perform miracles. It can even decide on the state of emergency where all legality can be abolished.

SCHMITT: born at the end of the nineteenth century in Germany. Its most flourishing period goes from World War I to the establishment of the National Socialist regime. He is a lawyer and theorist and an important theorist and his influence is also felt in the FRG. He is a decision-making and authoritarian thinker, his reputation is marked by the experience of the Third Reich and at times he comes to justify it so he is judged and prosecuted after World War II, not allowing him to return to teaching in his country.

His influence is also noticeable in Spain as he sympathizes with members of the Franco regime. He also knows Spanish history and culture very well.

Schmitt is sympathetic to the Zentrum but in its more conservative tendencies. Under the National Socialist regime, Schmitt defends executions such as "The Night of the Long Knives" (when Hitler murders those who would be his competitors), justifying this totalitarianism.

#### ○ **His conception of politics: questions liberal ideas that everyone**

Conflicts can be solved with reason. For him, politics is about making decisions. It clearly separates friends from enemies. It does not deny that it can exist or intermediate point, but the policy is to divide between black and white. Gray can exist in social life, but politics is deciding between one thing or another.

o The scenario of violence: it's a fate, we can't be scared  
ante el. La política es el destino. No hay consenso. Siempre van a existir amigos y enemigos. Disposición a matar y a morir.

\_cuando la guerra se excluye como posibilidad se criminaliza a uno de los implicados. Sin embargo, en la guerra no existirá criminalidad. Sino hay guerra se lleva mas a la población civil. Al no existir un declaración de guerra la criminalidad es pero. (Un ejemplo son las actuales guerras no declaradas). Un ejemplo de esto es que EEUU no ofrece ni la posibilidad de ser presos de guerra a los reclusos que tiene en Guantánamo.

Volviendo al conservadurismo de Schmitt, tras la II Guerra Mundial, a principios de los 60, dicto una conferencia donde lanzo el texto "teoría del Partisano" (miembro de una partida armada, la palabra en castellano es guerrillero). Ejemplos del nuevo partisanismo: Vietnam, Argelia, Cuba...

Este enfrentamiento entre dos grupos de hombres no es una cuestión de buenos y malos, todos somos potencialmente combatientes. La inmensa mayoría de la población es potencialmente combatiente, con lo cual el temor y la violencia se extienden al conjunto de la población.

Estos fenómenos del nuevo partisanismo suponen una nueva visión de enemistad. Una guerra total, enemistad total, un ejemplo es la lucha contra Napoleón en España, cuyo horror queda reflejado muy bien en los cuadros de Goya.

"With the appearance of the figure of the guerrilla, the war is returned to its seriousness and its drama"

**M. OAKESTLOTT:** *You have* a discourse about what it's like to be a conservative. It does not belong to the line of Donoso Cortes and Schmitt. He is neither a decision-maker nor a defender of authoritarianism. It has a lot to do with Burke, with political romanticism.

He defends tradition and criticizes nationalism, but unlike Schmitt or Cortes, his ideas are compatible with parliamentarism. For him, dialogue plays an important role.

It is an elitist, conservative dialogue... It moves away from the delusions of decisionism. In addition, their political and economic vision is much more akin to capitalism. He is an English conservative, therefore his political and economic experience is different.

Currently conservatives have assumed economic liberalism, defense of individual rights, limitation of the welfare state...

In terms of values, religion, issues such as sex and family, immigration and multiculturalism. Law and order. Emphasis is placed on condemning conduct that does not respect current legislation.

### **Traditionalists and Pro-Market**

Patriotism: speaks of loyalty and affection for one's own.

Nationalism: talks about an ideology of the nation and about the form of the nation. They usually claim that the detested boundaries are the boundaries of the nation.

Mauricio Violli: "for love of country"

### **Marxism. Emerging Factors The Elementary Principles of Marx Historical Development of Marxism**

The most potentially revolutionary fact lies in the oppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. The revolutionary fact is the conflicting and very different interests between the owners of the means of production and those who fight between them.

Marx's goal is to create a new society, eliminating the state, from the democratic republic, and thus creates a classless society.

Marx speaks of history in three states: *feudalism*, *capitalism* and *socialism*.

The manifesto is clearly a revolutionary text. The social key is the class struggle.

Dialectical or economic materialism is the theory of social development, which depends on the development of the forces of production.

Materialism = different religious scientist. Religious fiction is incompatible to explain the evolution of history. "Religion is the opium of the people."

It is just something that produces gratification or well-being, but this is fictitious.

Marx is proposing an economic determinism, since if the means of production do not change, he argues, if the economy in general does not change, the social situation in general does not change either. When the economy changes, everything else will change automatically.

**Summary of development theory:**

- Succession of stages (there is no turning back)
- Dialectical process
- Primary are production systems and secondary consequences of ideologies.
- Internal process since a transformation from the outside would not make sense.  
(imp.) When all domination ends, the state as a form of political power will end, which does not mean that it disappears from public powers.

**Marxismo\_\_Comunismo:**

**Context:** development of industry, of factories, development of the working class. Political systems of closed type, in political terms, where the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie exercise their power. Suffrage is census, only about 1% of the population has the right to vote. There is a repression of revolutionary and racial ideas. Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, Babeuf or Proudhon are precursors of communism. They propose cooperatives, planning, cooperation...

It is not really until Marx that a compound is made that lays the foundations of communist ideology. Marx was born in Prussia into a country where there was a monarchy, a strong army, a rural society with large landowners. He is influenced by the French world. His father was bourgeois and they are of Jewish origin. He studied philosophy in Germany and is under the power and influence of several authors:

- HEGEL: with dialectics, which sees history as a process of evaluation, transformation, dynamism and overcoming. Dynamism that arises from conflict, from confrontation, like the struggle of Marx's class.

Hegel's dialectic is of a spiritual plane. There are two principles of dialectics: the dynamic view of dialectics, and the conservative component.

Hegel posits that there is a culmination of history manifested in the Prussian state of his time.

Dialectics has its importance as a logical method for the philosophy of history.

Marx believes that the basis of social change is struggle, or he believes in a kind of peaceful understanding.

"The Manifesto of the Communist Party" written by Marx and Hegel is a program for action, it is a thought for revolution.

The course of history is seen as a succession of layers. For Marx a logical plan is followed, with an end.

Their dissatisfaction comes from the fact that the French Republic does not really change the economic order of society, it remains in the political base.

He believes that history is a class struggle or not a struggle of nations. He makes a critique of nationalism. Class is the really relevant social organization. Nor is it true that he is nationalistic.

Nationalist = ideology = representation.

Marx never makes a theory of the state, visible political power is the state, but it is nothing more than the representation of a type of power, that of the bourgeoisie, it is a domain of a particular class.

**APPROACHES TO REVOLUTION:**

Class consciousness and the rise of the industrial working class must be created.

The only relationship workers have with their bosses is the economy. The only thing the worker has is his own labor power, it is the only thing he can sell.

For Marx there is no moral or ethical vision.

It will also influence Marx, Feuerbach, a deeply materialist philosopher. In it is the idea that our ideas, speculations... They settle in our mental reality.

Man created God in his image and likeness.

BRAUER: "We are waiting for a historic catastrophe that will be the most important that has ever been for humanity" He is a left-wing Hegelian liberal.

**Lenin and Leninism:**

Marx had a critical and skeptical view of the peasantry, yet Russian Marxists put an important spin on this. They see the possibility of linking peasant demands with a revolutionary process. This process ceases to be only industrial and becomes a great alliance between the peasantry and the working class, which makes it possible to link the demands of the peasantry with the project of socialist revolution, thus being able to unite socialist revolution and bourgeois democracy.

In Russia it is necessary to carry out a bourgeois-democratic revolution and link it with the project of socialist revolution.

Trotsky is the one who introduces the concept and idea of "Permanent Revolution" to designate this union or succession of bourgeois and proletarian democratic revolutions.

#### IMPACT OF WORLD WAR I ON THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST MOVEMENT:

Influence on the First International, here it is seen that in reality there is no international union. The socialist parties will support their governments during the WGI.

This will cause a bankruptcy in the attempt to follow the line set out in the First International.

There is a division in the position against the war, some, the most to the left, within the workers' groups, are going to oppose the IGM, they maintain, like Rosa Luxemburg, that this war is imperialist and call for an end.

Lenin, on the other hand, maintains that imperialist war must be transformed into civil war. It states that capitalism is war and destruction and to get out of this we must get out of capitalism.

This difference of ideas occurs within the Second International:

Rosa Luxemburg: "war on war"

Lenin: "transforming war into civil war"

With the Soviet Revolution of the 17th, it is shown that revolution is possible even under adverse conditions. It is observed that it is rather a question of will. This Bolshevik seizure of power is not done under Marxist or communist slogans, under the slogan bread, land and peace.

By making the world see that the revolution, even under adverse conditions, Bolshevik parties will be formed on a global level.

This process will give rise to the Third Communist International, which the Bolsheviks create by following their rules. There is a general policy for the world. A coordination between communist parties, decisions are taken jointly. The problem is that it will finally be the Bolsheviks who coordinate the situation.

In Hungary after the IGM a Soviet-type power is going to be built. In Britain, Rosa Luxemburg is going to lead the revolutions. In Germany the workers' council is created.

There is therefore a wave of revolutions and revolutionary attempts and what finally happens is that many failed and people like R. Luxemburg are killed.

Rosa Luxemburg is revolutionary, but opposed to the theory of democratic centrism. It is very radical and anti-imperialist but not Bolshevik. He founded the German Communist Party.

An example of the defeat of revolutionary movements is the establishment of fascism in Italy. There is a division between socialists and communists. The socialists reject the introduction into the Third International but with some exceptions.

#### **Cpsu Conflicts:**

At the death of Lenin will develop struggles for power mainly between: Trotsky and Stalin

Stalin sets the priority of defending socialism in the Soviet Union in order to strengthen the internal regime.

Trotsky believes that for revolution to succeed it must be carried out in capitalist Europe.

The majority position is that of socialism in Russia, that of Stalin.

#### **Collectivization:**

- Lenin establishes the new economic policy that gives more role to the market in the countryside and protects the priority rights of the peasants.
- What Trotsky proposes is a collectivization of the countryside, an end to private property and the joint exploitation of land.

Once Trotsky is defeated and Stalin asserts his power, he will likewise initiate collectivization, with which he previously disagreed.

Stalin consolidates his power in the 30s and murders all the old communists. In 1939 Trotsky created the Fourth International from Mexico, where he was assassinated.

#### **Marxism in Latin America:**

When we speak of the incursion of Marxism in Latin America, we must say that it occurs in a characteristic context and between the years 1810 and 1820. The context that must be highlighted is of a territory with strong economic problems, where there is a democratic deficit and corruption is the order of the day.

It should be noted that the vision we have of Latin America is like being on the shores of US capitalism. There has been a stagnation in development. There are also large differences between its population. In fact, Latin America is not the poorest region in the world, but it is the most unequal. It is closely linked to inequality, exclusion, violence...



The predominant themes in Latin America of Marxism or that will be extended are:

- The class struggle
- Anti-Americanism is going to become a discourse of Latin American communists.
- Land reforms are one of its basic proposals. It should be noted that inequality is very strong and land is in the hands of only a few.
- Nationalism and nation in its opposition to imperialism. A current example is the Bolivian case with Evo Morales for the nationalization of natural resources.

The development until the Second World War passes through the appearance of a working class that will carry out the first strikes of workers, especially against American companies. Thus appears workers' consciousness and the first Marxist parties and workers' organizations with a broad trade union base. They were mass political parties. There are, for example, large campaigns of mobilization and training of people. It seeks to make people literate so that they can discover Marxist thought for themselves.

The issue of ethnicity is going to become the banner of Marxist denunciation.

HAYA DE LA TORRE: [translated] What you're going to do is mix with Marxist thought, scientific questions like the ones you take from Einstein.

The problem that communism is going to encounter in Latin America is the advance of reformist socialism. The latter will assume certain precepts like the Marxists, but propose a reform within capitalism itself and not its abolition as the communists propose.

It is necessary to emphasize the fundamental role played by Marxist parties that even go so far as to ally themselves with non-Marxist tendencies in order to carry out their reforms. The example of Costa Rica with a communist-church-state alliance.

### **During The Cold War**

The Cuban Revolution led by Fidel Castro triumphed as a Marxist and Leninist revolution.

The United States feels the threat of Marxism.

Fidel Castro will feel that he has sufficient support from the USSR, especially after the missile crisis in 1962. From here, Cuban foreign policy is based on spreading the different foci of communism that somehow distract the attention of the United States.

According to Castro the only way to reach communism is violent revolution and he will become an exporter of the revolution, however, there are other Marxist sectors that support another way of reaching communism through elections.

The United States is going to carry out a policy consisting of supporting a series of right-wing dictatorships throughout Latin America, which produces a flourishing of them.

As an example of sultanism are the *Gomosos* of Nicaragua who own almost the entire country. This will be opposed not only by the most disadvantaged classes, but also by part of the country's bourgeoisie.

It is the end of the cold war, when the revolution takes place in Nicaragua. It is when Somoza orders the assassination of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, director of the newspaper "La Prensa" and leader of an alliance opposed to the power of Anastasio Somoza Debayle. Here Somoza loses all support and his regime is abolished.

In Colombia, the *Farc* with Marxist and Leninist origins will appear, initiating guerrilla warfare and seeking the formation of a Marxist state, although with the passage of time they have become another preserve of power for world drug trafficking networks.

An example of the path of elections to achieve power is the triumph of Salvador Allende. In the fall of Allende has a fundamental importance the United States although it must also be said that it has to do with the divisions within Marxism since some supported a hardening of the system in the Cuban way of Fidel.

### **After The Cold War:**

Marxism will have two tendencies:

- On the one hand, the one led by Lula, fell element of union is that we must develop a social agenda but without compromising economic stability since this would be counterproductive.
- on the other hand is Fidel and Chavez. Each one comes to power in a different way but maintains many elements of union. Above all, it is united by the anti-imperialist discourse.

Between these two groups there is some distance, in terms of content and strategy.

On the other hand there is Evo Morales who is, above all, a social leader who embodies the interests of a working class.

As for the electoral future of the Latin American left:

- López Obrador, leader of the PRD in Mexico, does not have easy to come to power but he does have great popular support.
- Ollanta Humala does have great support in Peru and is a firm candidate for the presidency in 2006. His speech is Marxist and close to that of Castro or Chávez.

Strategies of the new left are neo-populism that is characterized by elaborating a critical discourse towards the established elites and the employment of a mediación between leader and masses generally through the mass media.

#### **On the ethnic issue:**

- The Peruvian way: the Peruvian indigenous has channeled his mechanism of protest through feeling proletarian. The feeling of proletarianism is greater than the ethnic question.
- The mas, Bolivian movement of the USA
- Zapatismo: rebellious and revolutionary civil and political movement with a popular and indigenous base.

It should be noted that the left in Latin America is articulating itself in three axes:

conservatism versus progressivism  
Neoliberalism versus statism  
Nationalism versus regionalism

#### **Populism in Latin America:**

The issue of populism is clearly in force in present-day Latin America. It is a concept in permanent construction and certainly ambiguous, although it should not be stopped using it since its debate, its practical use, is necessary in order to really build the concept of populism. One thing is clear, the concept of neo-populism has a negative charge.

#### **Conceptualization and Analysis of Populism in Latin America**

- **Gino Germani:** He sees populism as a product of the transition from agricultural to industrial economy. It arises in this transition towards a modern model where, according to Germani, there is a large mass of the population excluded from the system with which the movement of more to channeled through populist leaders arises.
- **Torcuato Di Tella:** makes an analysis of the managerial elites and establishes a typology. he will also assume part of Germani's ideas but complement them with issues such as typology. In this way, he classifies the types of populism in Latin America into:
- **Q. Interclassists of Integration:** which are parties that arise from a specific elite, that may belong to the middle and upper classes... This is the case of the PRI in Mexico and the PP in Brazil, which seek a mobilization of various social classes.
- **P. Apristas:** as are the Apro. Peruvian, the National Liberation Fr. or the Dominican PRD.
- **P. Naceristas or reformist military:** which are military groups that promote reformist development measures.
- **P. Social Revolutionaries:** here Di Tella develops this typology of revolutionary social parties from people like Fidel Castro.
- **P. Peronists:** They are tremendously influenced by Peronist ideology and it is reflected in practically all of Latin America.

Since 1965 this analysis of populism will change with characters like Ernesto Laclau who criticizes previous structural-functionalist interpretations. He posits populism as an ideological phenomenon.

It states that what is really important is ideology and not social movements, organizations such as parties, etc ...

He says that the fundamental questions of populism are an ideological construct that appeals to the people as a discourse. This appeal to the people is aimed at entering into open combat with the dominant ideology. Laclau further states that within the elites there are different currents and sub-elites. One measure of analysis that this author uses is discourse.

### **Criticism of Laclau:**

You can't sum up populism as an ideology. In addition, there have been populisms of the left and right, so it seems difficult to summarize it in an ideology. Rather, it asks whether populism will not be a way of using the media, of moving the masses.

Since 1980, events of vital importance have occurred that will condition populism itself and its analysis.

First, let's distinguish the three currents of populism:

- **PRE-populism:** which emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century with the appearance of charismatic leaders from the very oligarchy that previously dominated. It tries to get closer to the people and it is at this time that the first mass movements are formed with the expansion of suffrage.
- **Classic populism:** it extends chronologically from the depressor of 1929 to the 70s. It is characterized by broad social mobilization, clientelism (the practice of keeping an electorate accepted through favors) and caciquism.

Classical populism is characterized by the fact that the importance of the leader is even greater, leaving parties aside. The phenomenon of politics also appears as a spectacle where issues such as the image of the leader are important issues. Demagogy is also used as a political tool, the population's own feelings are used to mobilize it. It also resorts to including promises that can hardly be kept.

- **Neo-populism:** in this new populism, the media, especially television and the Internet, will have a fundamental importance.

There is a consolidation of the star politician. It is deeply personalistic, so much so that it surpasses the political party. This is the case of Fujimori.

Another characteristic of neo-populism is referendums or plebiscites to change the rules of the game.

### **Classic Populism in Latin America:**

- Lázaro Cárdenas and the PRI in Mexico. He was president of Mexico and even more so that his PRI successors are classified as populists.
- Perón and Peronism: is another example of classic Latin American populism.
- Getulio Vargas and the Estado Novo: aimed at strengthening the urban middle classes.

### **Latin American Neo-Populism:**

- Collor de Melo: he proposes himself as a candidate opposed to Lula. He is a leader sought after for his aesthetics, way of speaking...
- Fujimori: surprisingly ascends to the presidency of Peru beating Mario Vargas Llosa with 56% of the votes and spending 64 times less in his electoral campaign. As soon as he comes to power, he installs policies of adjustments that are even more violent than those proposed by Vargas Llosa. Finally Fujimori resigns, although he is currently trying to be a candidate for Peru again and the polls show that he would obtain strong support.
- Chavez: He is another example of a populist leader.

By way of conclusion we say that the institutional framework is important in the emergence of populism since it can provide or hinder its appearance.

Currently there are authors who argue that a neo-classical populism is appearing.

### **Anarchism**

There is a great variety of senses of what Anarchism is. It differentiates between theorists and activists.

It is a variant of radical and revolutionary thought. Its greatest strength is developed in the 2nd part of the twentieth century.

It is closely linked to socialism, for its attacks on private society and the State. Within Russian Anarchism we find authors such as:

- Bakunin
- Kropotkin
- Natchaien, who is a friend of Bakunin.
- Stimel.

In French Anarchism we can find Sorel. However, the cradle of anarchism is in Russia.

Bakunin's encounter with Marx awakens him to a world of revocations. In Russia Marxism ends up defeating anarchism. When this happens, the most relevant authors withdraw from public life, are arrested or go into exile.

Anarchism is mainly located in Russia but is also important in southern European countries such as France, Italy or Spain.

In Spain it has great success, especially politically.

### **Ideology of Anarchism:**

There is opposition to the state and authority. They don't want the state and they don't want authority.

In their opposition to the State, to the Government, they maintain that what they do is provoke accumulation of wealth. They consider that inequality in wealth is the worst of evils and the one who causes it is the State.

- The submission of citizens to the State provokes repression.

- The state leads to war and militarism.

- They argue that neither the State nor the government have a justified existence, therefore it must be abolished. (Thought linked to action)

### **Conclusions**

What they propose then is to replace the State with a form of small communities, forms of local governments, autonomous, spontaneous and self-regulated. Then they will form a Federation without dome or hierarchies.

- They are also against intermediary organizations, such as trade unions.

They don't want anything that causes a verticalization of power.

- The only super structure would be the Federation but without a dome.

Five are the principles shared by anarchist thinkers:

- Man is good by nature: the State is a form of source of corruption, what corrupts man are institutions and customs (education, religion, politics and economy ...)
- Man is a social animal: for this reason he seeks life in community by instinct, we will have to cooperate voluntarily by an instinct of survival.
- Institutions: and above all the State are artificial, society is natural. What institutions do is brutalize the human being, they annul all the virtues that he has by nature.
- Change is spontaneous, direct and mass-based: it is not led by any charismatic leader. The action of the masses would be direct action, what happens is that this was interpreted as revolutionary and often violent action. They propose that the revolutions promoted by the political parties, induced from above are worthless, they will change the color but follow the same rules of the game.
- Industrial society is useless: it debases the human being. The machine dominates, brutalizes man, reduces his personality, reduces his creative and imaginative capacity.

### **Bibliography**

- [1]. Armstrong, J. A. (1988). Toward a framework for considering nationalism in East Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 2(2), 280-305.
- [2]. Andor, L. (2015). Fair mobility in Europe. *Social Europe Occasional Paper*.
- [3]. Bergson, A. (1991). The USSR before the fall: how poor and why. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(4), 29-44.
- [4]. Daviddi, R., & Ilzkovitz, F. (1997). The Eastern enlargement of the European Union: Major challenges for macro-economic policies and institutions of Central and East European countries. *European Economic Review*, 41(3-5), 671-680.
- [5]. Delsoldato, G. (2002). Eastward enlargement by the European Union and transnational parties. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 269-289.
- [6]. Draxler, J., & Van Vliet, O. (2010). European social model: No convergence from the East. *European Integration*, 32(1), 115-135.
- [7]. Dreger, C., Kholodilin, K., Lommatzsch, K., Slačálek, J., & Wozniak, P. (2008). Price convergence in an enlarged internal market. *Eastern European Economics*, 46(5), 57-68.
- [8]. Dunay, P. (1994). NATO and the East: A Sea of Mysteries. *World Policy Journal*, 11(3), 123-127.

- [9]. Gorodetsky, G. (1990). The impact of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the course of Soviet foreign policy. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 27-41.
- [10]. Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht Treaty, Economic and Monetary Union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International Studies*, 21(1), 21-40.
- [11]. Guiraudon, V. (2001). Weak weapons of the weak? Transnational mobilization around migration in the European Union. *Contentious European*, 163-86.
- [12]. Healey, D., & Healey, D. (2002). Homosexual existence and existing socialism: New light on the repression of male homosexuality in Stalin's Russia. *GLQ: A journal of lesbian and gay studies*, 8(3), 349-378.
- [13]. Hillion, C. (2014). The Copenhagen criteria and their progeny. *EU enlargement (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2004)*.
- [14]. Kandogan, Y. (2000). Political economy of eastern enlargement of the European Union: Budgetary costs and reforms in voting rules. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 16(4), 685-705.
- [15]. Kojevnikov, A. (2002). The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the invention of big science. *Science in Context*, 15(2), 239-275.
- [16]. Levesque, J. (1974). Modèles de conflits entre l'URSS et les autres états socialistes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 7(1), 135-142.
- [17]. Pejovich, S. (2006). 3. The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.
- [18]. Peterson, J. (2017). Juncker's political European Commission and an EU in crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(2), 349-367.
- [19]. Price, J., Sloman, L., Gardner, R., Gilbert, P., & Rohde, P. (1994). The social competition hypothesis of depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(3), 309-315.
- [20]. Sapir, A. (2006). Globalization and the reform of European social models. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(2), 369-390.
- [21]. Scherpereel, J. A. (2010). EU cohesion policy and the Europeanization of Central and East European regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(1), 45-62.
- [22]. Stephanson, A. (2002). Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 74-97). Routledge.
- [23]. Threlfall, M. (2003). European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(2), 121-139.
- [24]. Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, (34), 1-14.
- [25]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). The European Union Facing the 21st Century: The Digital Revolution. *TalTech Journal of European Studies*, 12(1), 60-78.
- [26]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). La estrategia de las instituciones de la Unión Europea ante el reto de digitalización. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 17-40.
- [27]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). El futuro digital de la política europea.
- [28]. Waaldijk, K. (1994). Standard sequences in the legal recognition of homosexuality-Europe's past, present and future. *Australasian Gay & Lesbian LJ*, 4, 50.
- [29]. Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(1), 4-29.
- [30]. Whitman, R. G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour?. *Contemporary security policy*, 25(3), 430-451.
- [31]. Wivel, A. (2005). The security challenge of small EU member states: interests, identity and the development of the EU as a security actor. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 393-412.
- [32]. Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of language and politics*, 14(1), 87-109.
- [33]. Young, J. W. (1994). Cold War Europe, 1945-1989: A Political History. *The English Historical Review*, 109(433), 1039-1040.