

The XXI century socialism in the context of the new Latin American left¹

El socialismo del siglo XXI en el contexto de la nueva izquierda latinoamericana

Recibido: 27 de junio de 2016 - Revisado: 10 de febrero de 2017 - Aceptado: 10 de marzo de 2017.

Julio Ramírez Montañez²

Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to present an analytical approach of the self-proclaimed “new socialism of the XXI Century” in the context of the transformations undertaken by the so-called “Bolivarian revolution”. The reforms undertaken by referring to the ideology of XXI century socialism in these countries were characterized by an intensification of the process of transformation of the state structure and the relations between the state and society, continuing with the nationalization of sectors of the economy, the centralizing of the political apparatus of State administration. However, in the last four years, in some countries where the socialism of the XXI Century has been implemented, the civilian population has been demonstrating against this type of regime.

Keywords

Socialism of the XXI century, the new Latin American left, Chavez’s regime.

Resumen

El objetivo principal de este trabajo es presentar un enfoque analítico del autoproclamado "nuevo socialismo del siglo XXI" en el contexto de las transformaciones emprendidas por la llamada "revolución bolivariana". Las reformas emprendidas al referirse a la ideología del socialismo del siglo XXI en estos países se caracterizó por una intensificación del proceso de transformación de la estructura estatal y las relaciones entre el Estado y la sociedad, continuando con la nacionalización de sectores de la economía, la centralización del aparato político de la administración del Estado. Sin embargo, en los últimos cuatro años, en algunos países donde se ha implementado el socialismo del siglo XXI, la población civil se ha estado manifestando en contra de este tipo de régimen.

Palabras clave

Socialismo del siglo XXI, la nueva izquierda latinoamericana, el régimen de Chávez.

¹ Artículo resultado del proyecto de investigación “El Socialismo del Siglo XXI en el Contexto de la Nueva Izquierda Latinoamericana”. Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana Seccional Bucaramanga.

² Profesional de las relaciones internacionales. Master en Relaciones Internacionales. De la Universidad del Flinders de Adelaida en Australia. Profesor de la Facultad de Administración de Negocios Internacionales. La Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, (Bucaramanga, Colombia) Director del Grupo de Investigación de la Facultad de Administración de Negocios Internacionales (GRICANI). Correo electrónico: julio.ramirez@upb.edu.co

Para citar este artículo use: Ramírez, J. (2017). The XXI century socialism in the context of the new Latin American left. *Civilizar Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, 17(33), 97-112. doi: 10.22518/16578953.902

Introduction

“Totalitarianism is the new word that we have adopted to describe the unexpected but inseparable manifestations of which in theory we call socialism”.

Friedrich Hayek.

The aim of this article is to present an analysis of the political ideology called socialism of the XXI century and its implementation in Venezuela, Argentina, Ecuador and Bolivia. In order to comply with the main purpose, the first part of the document provides an overview of some concepts developed by the theory of XXI century socialism and some factors that differentiate it from the socialism that was developed in Eastern Europe in the second half of the twentieth century.

In the second part, the article examines a perspective of the nonconformity of the so-called New Latin American left, we take into consideration the specific case of Venezuela during the presidential mandates of Hugo Chavez and Nicolas Maduro which were characterized by an authoritarian and populist regime; likewise in Argentina during the corrupt governments of Nestor Kirchner and Cristina Fernandez, in Ecuador under the populist regime of Rafael Correa where he has obtained some robust economic performance but has worn out in a constant dispute with the media and opponents, and in Bolivia under the command of Evo Morales waving flags of authoritarianism and the movement of Indigenism.

Finally, the article focuses its attention on reviewing the aspects where it is considered that this model has failed by using some analysis factors as reference such as corruption, the violation of the freedom of expression, the disrespect of private property and the disregard of the rights of political minorities.

Socialism of the XXI century

The initial part of this article aims to clarify the concept of socialism of the XXI century, its theoretical interpretation and its differentiation with the socialism developed in Eastern Europe in the second half of the twentieth century.

Hamburger (2014) argues that the term *socialism of the XXI century* has been used in relation to the process that took place in the last two decades in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and whose term was coined by Hugo Chavez Frias to differentiate it from the so-called “real socialism” of the twentieth century in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe. This author contends that the main lesson of the Chavista project was the need and importance of combined socialism with democracy, not a liberal democracy, but a participatory and direct democracy.

It is important to note that in its beginnings, the socialism of the XXI century counted as its main ideologist with Heinz Dieterich Steffan who has been considered by many authors as the “Power in the shade” during the first governments of Hugo Chavez. (Mujica & Rincón, 2008).

Dieterich served as advisor to the Presidency of Venezuela and his proposal was called “*The New Historical Project: Democracy of the twenty-first Century*” which revolved mainly around two fundamental axis: the economy of the equivalences and direct democracy (Mujica & Rincón, 2008).

In regard to the first axis of the economy of the equivalences, Mujica & Rincón (2008) indicate that Dieterich is based on the Marxist theory of the work value and the exchange of equivalents, from which new relations of production and of property are built with the means of production. This field seeks to gradually replace the regulating principle of the market

economy which is *the price*, by the regulating principle of the socialist economy represented in *the value*, understood as the inputs of time necessary for the generation of a product (Mujica & Rincón, 2008).

The second axis of the proposal of Dieterich is the direct democracy; this axis presents a criticism of capitalist society, affirming that the political rights of representative democracy -- are a bourgeois formality and that such representativeness is a myth; however, it would be necessary, but not sufficient, to the democratic society of the future (Mujica & Rincón, 2008).

Similarly, Dieterich says that the division of powers is the basis of the State of bourgeois right and the only contribution of it to advance in the political coexistence. So it is assumed that the formal mechanisms - division of powers, constitution, electoral system, parliament, federative structure of the State, the media, access to private property, the rule of law, public-private dichotomy - have suffered a reversal or neutralization by the dominant elites that they converted into simple theorems (Mujica & Rincón, 2008).

This socialism of the XXI century according to Dieterich will be materialized in three stages:

Chart No 1. Stages of the socialism of the XXI century.

Stage	Phase
Stage 1	The overcoming of global capitalism
Stage 2	The intermediate phase of coexistence of the two means of production - the capitalism that has not died and socialism that is being born
Stage 3	The final stage is the society without market economy, without condition and without government

Source: Mujica & Rincón, 2008, p. 64

In the same way, another important author is Anthony Giddens (1999) in his article

entitled *Beyond the left and the right. The future of radical policies* in which he summarizes the main aspects of the twenty-first century socialism in six key points:

1. The twenty-first century socialism in theory should deliver the constituent power to its depository in a real and effective way, i.e. people become conscious and organized.

2. For the twenty-first century socialism the institutions have values. And within the institutions, those that allow free communication are of great importance (mainly, the alternative media and the deliberative forms of democracy).

3. The individual self-government is linked to the social self-determination. For the twenty-first century socialism, citizenship must be constantly activating its condition of 'constituent power'.

4. Must have open mechanisms of collective deliberation and decision, so that solving the problems is a matter of public opinion, it is more difficult for people to pursue their individual self-interest.

5. Equality must be regarded as a significant influence. Must provide the foundations of health, education, freedom and justice that allow citizenships to share responsibility for their decisions.

6. Recognizes individual rights such as habeas corpus, freedom of expression, residence, movement, inviolability of correspondence, of domicile (Giddens, 1999).

Conceptual differences between socialism and socialism of the XXI century.

It is important to distinguish the main conceptual contradictions between socialism

developed in the twentieth century in the political regimes of Eastern Europe and the one implemented in Latin America in the twenty-first century in Venezuela, Ecuador, Argentina and Bolivia.

Juan Carlos Monedero makes an important contribution in his article “Hacia una filosofía política del socialismo del siglo XXI. Notas desde el caso venezolano” to say that one of the main arguments of the governments of the socialism of the XXI century is that in the past, the socialists did not take into account the specificities of each country. Specifically, he highlighted the differences in regard to racial, ethnic, geographical, cultural traditions and historical practice, etc. that are now taken into ac-

count in the definition of socialism of the XXI century (Monedero, 2008).

Monedero argues in a similar way, that the socialism of the XX century, quite the contrary was deeply statist, it was capitalist in regard to the exploitation and alienation of workers and productivity, colonial, predator of nature, based on a simple idea of progress.

In this article, Monedero summarizes the important differences between the two types of socialism taking as reference some analysis factors such as: political rationality, homeland, citizens, honor, worker, community, individual, resources, production, ideology, status and cash management.

Chart No 2. Main differences between the socialism of the century XX and XXI.

Analysis factor	Socialism of the XX century	Socialism of the XXI century
Scientific rationality	Scientific socialism	Humanist Socialism
Homeland	Internationalism	Homeland identified with the majority and faced with the powers
Citizens	Citizenship as proletarians	Citizenship with natural rights and duties
Honor	Proletarian dignity	Social recognition
Worker	Worker as a hero	Worker freely associated as a creator of value in use.
Community	Party, union and family	Organized community in movements
Person	Collectivism	Crowd
Resources	Adequacy	Sustainability
Production	Productivism	Environmentalism
State	National state	State municipal, regional and central and supranational controlled popularly
Ideology	Statist and authoritarian	Authoritarian and personalistic
Management of Tables	Revolutionary	Rebel

Source: Monedero, 2008, p. 21

In the chart above, we can see notable differences between the two ideological visions. On the one hand, the socialism of the XX century based its scientific reality on scientific socialism developed by Marx and Engels, sought the internationalization of the labor movement, stressing the importance of the worker as a hero of the society, where the party, the union and the family are highlighted

in the social sphere and the national state in the political field.

On the other hand, the Latin American Socialism is based on a socialist state that in theory, is concerned with the social aspects of its population, is sustainable, respects the environment; the community is organized in social movements and the citizenship has natural

rights and duties. The clearest example can be found in the Venezuelan version of XXI century socialism which presents a strong blend of historic Bolivarian nationalism, Marxism of the twentieth century and Latin American populism.

The new Latin American left

The fall of the socialist regimes in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union raised an important effort to communities of academics, intellectuals, parties and progressive groups around the world to redefine the positions of the left, distinct from the undemocratic aspects which prevailed in the eastern regions of Europe during the second half of the twentieth century (Magallanes, 2008).

The increase in the number of governments that are assigned to the socialism of the XXI century was a result of the crisis and disappearance of neoliberal governments that dominated Latin America since the mid-1970s until the end of the decade of 1990. Its disappearance was accelerated by a series of popular uprisings that drove the rise of left-of-center governments with programs of rejection of the neoliberal socio-economic doctrines and the promise of fundamental changes in favor of the large majorities.

The “Left turn” of many of Latin American governments during the XXI century through the emergence of progressive policies in countries such as Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela left as a consequence that in 2008 eleven of the eighteen Latin American countries were governed by Presidents of center-left or left.

This socialism of the XXI century, overflowed the Venezuelan experience and became a trend that took greater force throughout Latin America, especially in *Ecuador* with its President Rafael Correa, in *Bolivia* implemen-

ted by its president Evo Morales and in *Argentina* initially with Néstor Kirchner and later with his wife Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner, as well as in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Uruguay. This ideological conception sought primarily to give responses to the serious problem of underdevelopment in which the region lives due to the social imbalances, injustice and inequality (Hamburger, 2014).

For Ornelas & Aceves (2011) the rotation in the last two decades to the left in Latin America is the culmination of a long process, characterized by ruptures and continuities of the theory and practice of the democratic forces in Latin America. In fact, not all the endeavours today are new or are reprints of the past. This turn to the left while, to a large extent, has fed the theory and practice of socialism and communism, has done, without doubt, of the liberal and democratic struggles sustained against oligarchic domination, imperialism, the military dictatorships and, recently, the resistance against neoliberalism (Ornelas & Aceves, 2011).

The call for unity by the so-called socialism of the XXI century has contributed to significant achievements on an international level as it has been the foundation of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), the community of states of Latin America and the Caribbean (CELAC) and the entry of Venezuela into the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR). The Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), which includes Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Cuba, has played as a team and has drafted agendas and positions that influence the discussion on meetings of Latin American governments (Ellner, 2012).

Crisis in the new Latin American left.

The socialist governments in Latin America have recently suffered the most

uproarious defeats, since Chavez in 1999 to strengthen the emergence of the twenty-first century socialism. To the defeat of Correa in the local elections in Ecuador in 2014, we can add the fall of kirchnerismo in Argentina and the chavism in the past elections of Venezuelan legislative in 2015. The latest defeat, which was unthinkable until a few months ago, suffered by Evo Morales who had the purpose of extending its mandate, seems to confirm the theory of the beginning of the end of the twenty-first century socialism in Latin America, which had a very short period of time, 17 years approximately.

After several years in power, the agents belonging to the flow of the so-called 'socialism of the twenty-first century', started 2016 with a clear failure of their policies and the repudiation of their initiatives at an international level. There are common symptoms and particular features of the crisis of the political and economic system in some countries of the region that have been implementing the socialism of the XXI century. Among those are the inability to counter the power of the private monopolies of the media, even in countries that have adopted laws and concrete measures to break the backbone of the right in Latin America. In each of these countries, in each one of the crisis faced by those Governments, the leading role has been of the private media, acting so brutal and overwhelmingly against the governments which have benefited from its successes and with broad government popular support.

Below are the experiences of Venezuela, Argentina, Ecuador and Bolivia under socialist regimes in the past twenty years.

Venezuela: The Bolivarian Republic and its Oil Populism.

The rise of the Bolivarian forces to power led by Hugo Chavez Frias in 1999 constitutes one of the most emblematic cases of rotation to the left that has occurred in Latin America. The arrival of Chávez to power marked a break in

the style and way of conceiving actions of the political situation in Venezuela.

Policies implemented by the previous governments were abolished with a style of confrontation that sought to remove from the Venezuelan political spectrum the bipartisanship and any other political expression. This political regime turned around the central and emblematic figure of Hugo Chavez and public policies depended on the particular juncture by which crossed the country at a given time. With these reforms the Venezuelan State increased its presence in the economic process through the taking of enterprises; the occupation of companies and of arable land; the nationalization of businesses; and the conversion of corporations to "socially owned enterprises".

Misleading guidance from the government management of XXI century socialism are contained in the official document entitled *Líneas generales del plan de desarrollo económico y social de la nación 2007-2013* (República Bolivariana de Venezuela, 2007).

The socialist model proposed in this document these main guidelines:

- The creation of a new socialist ethic supported by humanist schools of thought of socialism and the nationalists of Simon Bolivar.
- The search of the supreme Social happiness from the construction of an inclusive society;
- The construction of a revolutionary and leading democracy, understood as the one that transforms the weakness of the individual in collective force.
- A Productive Socialist Model, understands why the elimination of the division and prioritizing social labor and the elimination of the criterion of the production of wealth are subordinated to the reproduction of the capital, to be

replaced by another that serves for the satisfaction of human needs (República Bolivariana de Venezuela, 2007).

Additionally, this document outlines a modification of the territorial partner structure to adjust to the new productive model, the use of oil for turning Venezuela into a global energy power and the promotion of a new international geopolitical direction to the pursuit of multipolarity as international order (República Bolivariana de Venezuela, 2007).

The reality of Venezuelan Socialism.

The reality experienced by the Venezuelans in recent years is far from the utopia raised by the idealists who forged this model at the beginning of the government of Hugo Chavez. In the economic sphere we can see that despite the fact that more than a trillion dollars coming into Venezuela, by concept of oil revenues, during the past 14 years, the failure of the Venezuelan economic system is reflected in the shortages of basic commodities, and in the inability of the population to meet their primary needs, the shortage of basic consumer goods such as the toilet paper is one of the most grotesque example. Statistics of 2015, state the highest inflation in the world, in the order of 121 % per annum and a negative growth of - 4 %. (Duzoglou, 2016)

For Duzoglou (2016), in Venezuela, all the ingredients of a recipe for failure that characterize the projects undertaken were used to give as a result, a regime away from democracy and its principles provide a Neo narcocorrupt Dictatorship being drugs the essential ingredient of this recipe that transformed the strongest democracy in Latin America into an "Association of posters" faced but affiliated for convenience, where government has taken over the oil resources to accumulate excessive fortunes to the detriment of the situation of the disadvantaged, by those who falsely claim to advocate. (Duzoglou, 2016).

The reality of Venezuelan society was characterized by a totalitarian regime that constantly disrespect the fundamental rights of citizens such as freedom of the press, disregard for the rights of minorities and disrespect to the private property among others.

- *Freedom of the press*

The Venezuelan journalist Carlos Ball president of the Center for the dissemination of the Knowledge Economy for Freedom (Cedice Freedom) considers that in a democratic society the existence of private media, apart from political and economic power is essential. When the main mass media is at the service of the dominant political project and is related to a single guideline, plurality disappears as well as the possibilities of exercising critique, these are key components of all order based on respect for public and individual freedoms, the balance between society and the State and the cooperation between the Powers (Ball, 2007).

In Venezuela, unfortunately, people saw the first step of a plan to override the freedoms of thought and expression with the cancellation of the license to the TV channel Radio Caracas Television (RCTV) that during 53 years was on air because they declared opposition to the Chavista regime. Government also threatens the Red Globo Vision of being closed soon. For Ball, this issue had serious repercussions since

it led to the imposition of an ideology which means a single thought and set a serious precedent that acts as a factor of intimidation to the whole private media information of Venezuela and leads to a state of rigid journal control of the social communication, with the consequences that derive from such action (Ball, 2007, p 26).

Similarly, Anibal Romero, Professor of Political Science at the University of Simon Bolivar asks

do we have democracy in Venezuela? Yes. Do we have freedom? I do not think so. At least not a true freedom, but the one that comes from the whims of a regime that allows us to breathe because it is vital, but not because it is a government of laws (Ball, 2007, p. 27).

- *Judicial and legislative systems depend on the executive*

The legislative and judicial systems have also been founded under the power of the president of the Bolivarian Republic and the followers of his revolution. Historically, almost the entire Venezuelan legislative body (National Assembly) has been the president followers, with the exception of the current period where the opposition won the most recent legislative elections. In the past legislative elections, the resignation of many opposition candidates was presented on the grounds due to a lack of guarantees from the National Electoral Commission (CNE) charged in previous elections with electoral fraud in favor of Hugo Chavez.

Robert Bottome and Norka Parra, authors of the article “Venezuela: Totalitarismo del Siglo XXI” claim that “Chávez and Maduro have radicalized aggressively their Bolivarian Revolution. Now the called “socialism of the XXI century”, has a real purpose: to perpetuate itself in power. However, Chavez and Maduro, are not true socialists or communists, but despots that will not stop in their objective to subjugate the Venezuelan people through the eradication of the freedom of expression, free enterprise and the right to private property, and on the concentration of all the civil power and economic power in the hands of the President forever (he).” (Bottome & Parra, 2007, párr. 1).

Recent findings concern even more and “speculate” that Nicolas Maduro in the company of Diosdado Cabello are giving the rotation of restricted democracy toward a

totalitarianism, under an order coming from to the National Assembly that created a draft law called “enabling law” where you are granted full authority for a year to do what you want on economic and political themes. For Bottome and Parra (2007), these changes will be directed to a constitutional socialist reform, a project of popular education to impose the new socialist values, the creation of a ‘communal state’ and the shift again of the name of the country to Socialist Republic of Venezuela. Changes that indicate an increased radicalization of Nicolas Maduro’s term.

- *Disregard of the rights of minorities*

The Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States is investigating 780 cases of political discrimination in Venezuela. The Government has compiled a list of 12.4 million of opponents, known as the “Maisanta list”, which used to deny them government jobs, licenses or passports. Similarly, all workers of the state petroleum corporation (PDVSA) that were part of the oil strikes against Chavez were dismissed. In this way, there are no equal rights for the entire population to benefit only the adherents to the Chavista revolution. (Oppenheimer, 2012)

- *Disrespect to the private property:*

Another matter of concern to several international analysts was the nationalization of companies in the power, communications and energy sectors in particular the telephone company CANTV, steelmaker Siderurgica del Orinoco (SIDOR), electricity (Electrician of Caracas, electricity from Valencia and Seneca) causing immediately the departure of foreign investors from Venezuela and a sharp decline in the Venezuelan currency (Bolívar). It is expected the announcement of nationalization of more strategic enterprises in the handling of the Venezuelan economy, so that radicalization grows even more with the socialist economic model (Bottome & Parra, 2007).

Argentina Kirchnerista.

The regime of the couple of Néstor Kirchner (2003-2007) and his wife Cristina Fernandez (2007-2016) has been one of the most controversial of the political history of Argentina. This regime was characterized by a populism oriented to polarize politically the country by the concentration of public power in the hands of the presidential couple, by the constant attacks on the media opponents in the newspaper *El Clarin* especially because of the corruption in the highest spheres of government.

Populism on the family Kirchner.

The populism developed in Argentina in the last two decades bears the traits of the most "classic" Peronism: guidance to the immediate needs and demands of the popular classes above all and subordination of economic policy objectives to such demands even at the expense of the fiscal or the most basic monetary restrictions (Gerchunoff & Aguirre, 2004).

Similarly, Svampa (2016) notes that in Argentina during the mandate of the Kirchner government was embarked on a process of political polarization, although different from other Latin American countries by the three following reasons. The first, because beyond the progressivism, the Kirchnerist model was deeply peronist, capable of combining political courage and a traditional organizational legacy, which reveals a pragmatic conception of social change and the construction of hegemony, based on the classic model of social participation under state control and the figure of the leader.

The second, because the kirchnerism never intended to promote dynamics of democratization, in contrast to what it has happened with governments in Bolivia, Venezuela and Ecuador, which addressed constitutional processes of participatory character and led to extend the frontiers of rights (Svampa, 2016).

And the third, because unlike the governments of Venezuela and Bolivia, which can be considered as populist because beyond their limitations, pointed to the redistribution of social power and the empowerment of the subordinate sectors. In Argentina, the most outstanding example is the stellar vocation of the middle classes, their political empowerment in a context of widespread consolidation of the big economic players. However, this does not mean that the popular classes are absent, without forgetting their trade union traditions, opening new fronts of conflict and struggle, the subaltern classes may increasingly become the guests of stone (Svampa, 2016).

Concentration of K power.

The letter K in Argentina has been used by the media to identify the regime of the married couple Kirchner. For Muñoz & Retamozo (2008), the presidencies of Nestor Kirchner and Cristina Fernandez were characterized by a significant concentration of executive power in what is known as Power K. These authors argue that the spouses Kirchner ruled in the margins of the Congress and other institutions of horizontal accountability.

For example, in just 6 months, at the beginning of his mandate, Nestor Kirchner enacted 232 supreme decrees, a rate corresponding to 38 decrees per month. Similarly, Kirchner retained the emergency powers delegated to the Executive by the Congress during the crisis of 2001, and in 2006 the Congress granted a wide discretionary power to modify the budget after its legislative approval. Although the reform of Kirchner to the Supreme Court was applauded in a generalized manner, other actions of the Executive invaded the independence of judges, especially the successful promotion of a law that increased the control of the Executive over the Council (Muñoz & Retamozo, 2008).

Similarly, the Kirchner concentrated Executive Power with regard to the provinces. This

was done through the development of new sources of income, particularly tariffs on exports and charges for public services unlike existing taxes were not shared between the federal and provincial governments. As a result, the participation of the provinces within the total income declined to just half of what had been a decade ago. This issue increased the dependence of the provincial governments on fiscal transfers from the federal government (Muñoz & Retamozo, 2008).

Continued confrontation of the Kirchner with the Clarín newspaper.

The Clarín newspaper was created in 1945 by the rancher founder of Socialism Independent Roberto Noble. It is a tabloid that, despite characterized by prudence with military governments as democratic, has had a strong influence on the decisions of the powers throughout the time. It is the main Argentine newspaper with the largest circulation in the Spanish-speaking world (Aruguete, 8 de febrero de 2016). With an average of 262.852 copies from Monday to Saturday and Sunday with 5.769.396 copies. The official accounts for the 31 % of the circulation of newspapers around the country and integrates the main multimedia tools of Argentina. In addition, it has a significant influence on other media graphics, even in the largest circulation, as “La Nación” newspaper.

The dominant position of the group, was broadly made possible by the good relationship between the holding company and the government of the day. It actually had a break point in the year 2008. In the midst of conflict between the main agricultural corporations of the country and the government of president Cristina Fernández de Kirchner a process of cross-charges began. In this context “charge force, a strong and public confrontation between the Government and Clarín. That is when President Fernández de Kirchner launched the proposal to amend the Broadcasting Law

22.285/80 in force from the dictatorship” (Aruguete, 2013).

This initiative was endorsed by the National Congress on 10 October 2009 with the enactment of Law No. 26,522 of Audiovisual Media Services. The new standard, among other things, obliges the Clarín Group to get rid of licenses and media in order to deconcentrate the audiovisual market. Although article 161 provided for a term of one year to the adequacy of the multimedia that exceeds the limits imposed by the new regulation, a wave of legal resources has allowed the Group not to divest until the time comes (Aruguete, 2013).

In addition, Sel (2009) argues that in the case of Argentina, although coverage is not complete, the SCA Law was established to achieve this objective. According to this author, only 35 % of the population had access to some over-the-air television channel in the analog era. The digitalisation process being undertaken by the Government, led to an increase in the coverage of 85 %. With regard to the election and with the emergence of the TDA, the supply of public channels increased with guidelines and thematic profiles that offer complementary contents such as tourism, cinema or science, among others. The digitalization is founded on the idea of the universality of service, a basic principle of the human right to information that had never been implemented in this way (Sel, 2009). In the same vein, the SCA law awards are established under the title of authorizations to public, provincial, municipal and university media. The feedback is understood as the intervention of the public in the broadcasting of television programmes through questions, criticism or opinions. That is to say, interaction of the public according to the rules of the programs or television channels. In this sense, this is the interactivity as a kind of feedback (Sel, 2009).

According to Repoll (2010) during the governments of Nestor Kirchner and Cristina Fernandez an open confrontation with the mul-

timedia group Clarin existed, due to the constant Government opposition to this medium of communication. Kirchnerist Governments harassed this daily newspaper in all the unimaginable ways; among the most noteworthy were the supply rationing for newsprint, inspections of finance and the constitution of the Bicameral Commission of the congress whose action ended by expropriating the newspaper, surrendering it to the General Confederation of Labor (Repoll, 2010).

Corruption K.

According to the daily newspaper *La Nación* in news submitted on 8 February 2016 the Federal Chamber of the City of Buenos Aires reported that between 2003 and 2015, some of the most notorious figures of kirchnerismo received a total of 2160 claims based on the district reports for possible acts of corruption. It was the former president Cristina Kirchner who, out of that total, received the largest amount, 419 claims, followed by her husband, Néstor Kirchner, with 193. Former Minister of Federal Planning Julio Vido also received 117, as well as the former Chief of Staff Aníbal Fernández, with 108. The information of the Federal Chamber does not specify how many of those complaints became formal judicial inquiries but prosecutors made the corresponding requirements. Due to the limitations of the computer system, it is difficult to know how many were dismissed either. The only two officials of the previous government who are convicted are former Transportation secretary Ricardo Jaime and the former Minister of Economy Felisa Micheli (Aruguete, 8 de febrero de 2016).

Ecuador: Economic development.

The political process initiated in Ecuador in 2007 deserves special attention due to the combination of multiple elements, sometimes of truly revolutionary nature, other hint of regressive, but always risky and contradictory. (Ramirez, 2015) For this reason, it is interesting

to analyze the dynamics of political, economic and social policies that are presented in Ecuador since the possession of Rafael Correa and their relationship with the capitalist world crisis and one of the recent demonstrations it is the financial crisis of 2008.

Within the salient aspects of Correa's government is the Plan of good life 2009-2013, where it was stipulated as an objective of the administration overcoming to dependence on primary exporter to consolidate a model of socialism of the XXI century focusing on the exploitation of biodiversity, the knowledge and the biotourism, focused on the Transformation of Ecuador into an "eco-tourism biopolis", which would overcome the dependence on exports of raw materials (Ospina 2012, p. 129).

Correa: Authoritarian Government.

For Basabe & Martinez (2014) in 2013 Rafael Correa clinched the bases of the authoritarian model-competitive started in 2007. Beyond the infrastructure and public investment –that any government with economic resources could also perform–, the administration of Correa is characterized this year –as in the previous but now more intensely– by the persecution of anyone who raises an opinion contrary to its management.

To run the policy of political persecution and intimidation, the government has resorted to both the use of state resources and the criminal prosecution of those who the president considers their "enemies". The absence of controls from the institutions of political representation and the situation of dependence and submission of the Judiciary system enable this form of policy-making in the country (Basabe & Martinez, 2014).

In the described context, the last barrier that should overcome president Correa to sustain power is the political constitution (designed by himself) which is not currently including reelection. However, the overwhelming

legislative majority of Alliance Country (AP) will expedite the constitutional reform as soon as the president tells them to do so. In this way, he will have paved the way for his renewed candidature and will extend his government at least until 2021 (Basabe & Martínez, 2014).

Correa and its constant confrontation with the Media:

Media in Ecuador live a constant confrontation with the government of Rafael Correa, which has led especially to large employers of the communication to form a complex opposition group. According to Punín (2011), the government of Ecuador has approximately 16 media outlets under the figure of public media, i.e. it represents the strongest media monopoly, which to date has not been able to compete with the commercial media. Troubling statistics in relation to violence toward journalists, a communication law stagnant, five influential journalists off the air, these are some of the evidences that this relationship could worsen with a sad result for democracy in Ecuador (Punín, 2011).

The Ecuadorian State during the two periods of Correa Delgado's Government has managed to accumulate and become a strange figure under the letterhead of public media, with three newspapers, seven radio stations, four thematic magazines and six television channels, each of these three correspond to the media that seized the group of bankers Isaiah we have been talking about: TC Television, Cable News, Gamavisión. It has also created others such as Ecuador TV, newspaper *El Ciudadano*, and an advertising agency Andes. In total, the Government would have 16 media outlets in their portfolio (Punín, 2011).

Bolivia: between authoritarianism and Indigenism.

In 2006, Bolivia began a new stage in its history. For the first time, a leader from Aymara origin, Evo Morales Ayma, assumed

constitutionally the presidency of the country. During this year, the President issued policies aimed at reforming the state and recovering the state control of natural resources. The process of change of the Political Constitution in Bolivia was opened with the appeal to the Constituent Assembly and with the referendum on autonomy, parallel processes that are up to date redefining the new political-administrative configuration of the country (Daheza, 2007).

Bolivia is currently a plurinational state in conflict by the tension between the two conceptions of development: the president Evo Morales –based on the hybridization between ancestral thinking and socialism– and the opposition, led by the regional government of Santa Cruz de la Sierra, founded in the transnational capitalist conception of the traditional elites of the country (Amaya & Pino, 2015).

In the midst of growing difficulties, the government of Evo Morales led a process of change characterized by the political strength of his party and the lack of definition of its draft state reform, which is a mixture of nationalism and Indigenism. Combining a radical rhetoric with moderate decisions, the Movement toward Socialism decreed the nationalization of the hydrocarbons, but did not establish a total break with foreign companies (Mayorga, 2006).

For Laserna (2007) in the government of Evo Morales three trends exist: indigenism, statism and populism, articulated by nationalism as a common reference and by the unifying leadership of the president. The article argues that, ultimately, the populist orientation prevails over the others. As this is a trend politically unclear, that is defined more by its method than by its objectives, has not allowed the government to consolidate a definite course. Today, Evo Morales is subject to the conflicting pressures of sectors and social groups increasingly fragmented and dispersed, and runs the risk of seeking refuge by affirming his leadership, which would create a fragile and undemocratic governance.

However, according to the newspaper *El País* the most striking case of the crisis of the new Latin American left is the government of Evo Morales, the Bolivian president, who was re-elected with 70 % favorability and which today faces a general discontent, to the point that in the latest surveys known, he is hardly supported by 30 % of citizenship. Morales has failed on all fronts, he has not been able to unit the country and has maintained a pugnacious confrontation with the political opposition, he has slowed the foreign investment in Bolivia, has not been able to reduce poverty or improved the living conditions of the Bolivian people, he has not been able to handle the mining and hydrocarbon wealth of the country, he has not been able to face with old allies such as Brazil and Argentina, and even he has managed to turn everybody against it, as it happened with a recent general rise of fuels, which should lay hastily backwards, before the citizen reaction.

Evo Morales an authoritarian leader.

According to Garcia (2016) with the circumstances in the country, the Bolivian society genuinely do not live under the rule of law, with full independence of powers and the ability of the institutions to be placed under the law to all persons, regardless of their jobs, political affiliation or economic power. At the end of 2015, the most important opposition leaders were facing trial, many of them politically motivated; several hundred (those involved were more than 700) Bolivians live in Brazil and other countries under the figures of political refugees or asylum seekers, an entirely new setting for the Bolivian democracy; the independent media are harassed by the State; judicial decisions in favor of opposition leaders are blocked by the Executive; indigenous leaders who are opposed to the ideas of government are refugees in their remote communities for fear of being caught; and opposition leaders are arrested, without trial, in public prisons, for much longer than that allowed by the law.

Conclusions

The reforms undertaken by referring especially to the ideology of XXI century socialism in Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia and Argentina were characterized by an intensification of the process of transformation of the state structure and the relations between the state and society, continuing with the nationalization of sectors of the economy, the centralization of the political apparatus of State administration and the sustained loss of autonomy of public powers in favor of the government of the day.

However, in the last four years, in some countries where it has been implemented the socialism of the XXI century, the civilian population has been demonstrating against this type of regime due to the corruption, the implementation of public policies and because of the constant violations of fundamental rights, in aspects such as freedom of expression, the disrespect of private property and the disregard of the rights of political minorities, which has been shown in the most recent election results in these countries.

The Latin American Socialism is based on a Socialist State that in theory is concerned with the social aspects of its population, is sustainable, respects the environment; the community is organized in social movements and citizenship with rights and duties. The clearest example of this can be found in the Venezuelan version of socialism of the XXI century where there is a strong mixture of Bolivarian historical nationalism, Marxism of the XX century and Latin American populism.

“The Chavismo” in Venezuela has been characterized by an opposition to U.S. foreign policy, looking to build cooperation trades between countries of Latin America, as well as military and commercial agreements opposed to American interests (China, Libya, Russia, etc.). With regard to the internal economic policy, it has promoted the formation of public enterpri-

ses as well as the re-nationalisation of certain strategic sectors of the economy. The Chavista governments sought policies that promote economic equality, goals they scored in a degree of agreement with the economic statistics of the ECLAC, the UN agency. The Venezuelan reality was characterized by a totalitarian regime that constantly disrespects the citizens' fundamental rights such as freedom of the press, respect for the rights of minorities and disrespect to private property, among others.

In Argentina, the political regime of the couple of Nestor Kirchner and his wife Cristina Fernández was characterized by a populism oriented to polarize the country in a political way, by the concentration of public power in the hands of the presidential couple, by the constant attacks on the media opponents especially the daily newspaper "El Clarín" and by corruption at the highest levels of government. The main features of the Kirchnerista ideology can be summarized in the following points:

Peronism combative: Both Néstor Kirchner and his wife Cristina Fernández started in politics in the 1970s, militant in the university in the so-called "peronism combative", integrating the Peronist Youth.

Rejection of neoliberalism: The Kirchnerism has stated its opposition to the neo-liberal policies, as well as a rejection of the setting.

Rejection of the free trade agreements: the Kirchnerism has been frankly contrary to the free trade agreements, multilateral and bilateral alliances promoted by the United States. The highest point of this policy was the Kirchner's confrontation with the former president of the United States, George W. Bush, at the Summit of the Americas in Mar del Plata in 2005, which was crucial to avoid the signing of the FTAA (Free Trade Agreement of the Americas).

Regional Alignment: Internationally, the Kirchnerism has shown itself willing to

strengthen relationships with the countries of Latin America, particularly Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela, establishing a South American axle with Brazil, starting from the basis of Mercosur. The Kirchnerism has shown a strong defense of Mercosur.

On the other hand, Ecuador under the strongman regime of Rafael Correa has achieved robust economic performance but has worn in a constant dispute with the media opponents. The government of Rafael Correa has been called "Citizens Revolution", for the comprehensive political, economic, social, educational reforms which have been implemented since the beginning of the term in 2007 and for the implementation of a form of socialism of the 21st century in Ecuador, in accordance with the foreign policy of Bolivarianism.

The administration of Rafael Correa was launched on 15 January 2007 with the convening of a popular consultation for the public to decide if they wanted a National Constituent Assembly being approved and promulgated the current constitution in 2008, which bears the name Sumakawsay. During his government, there has been a great public investment for infrastructure, roads, security and social development. Large political and structural changes in the country were produced, through the adoption of new laws such as the International Monetary and Financial Code, which have given greater prominence and control of the State in the economy. They also promoted the modernisation and re-structuring of the judicial function.

Correa has been re-elected twice, in 2009 and 2013, being the first president in the history of Ecuador to achieve this feat, aside from being the first president to rule continuously for 9 years, a feat only taken into account for the history of instability and ungovernability that characterizes Ecuador. From 2013, the country's Alliance Movement won an absolute majority in the National Assembly, being able to carry out major political and economic

changes following their political line through the adoption of laws and constitutional changes. His Government has caused controversy for its relationship with the private media, who Belt considers their opponents. He was also accused by the opposition political parties and the media as an authoritarian ruler.

In Bolivia under the command of a Evo Morales waving the flags of the authoritarianism and Indigenism. On his side, the government of Evo Morales has several trends: indigenism, statism, populism and nationalism as they are articulated by the common reference and unifying for the leadership of the president. Since the beginning of Morales' government, he has supported the policies of the Latin American presidents like Fidel Castro, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, Néstor Kirchner, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner and Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez. Morales, being elected president, but before assuming as the first Bolivian president, made a tour of different countries that garnered great media attention. Morales vehemently criticized the free trade agreement signed by the governments of Peru and Colombia with the United States, and supported the government of Venezuela in its departure from the Andean Community.

References

- Amaya, J. & Pino, J. (2015). Modelo de desarrollo y élites económicas en Bolivia: análisis de la concepción de desarrollo ancestral del Presidente Evo Morales. *Hallazgos*, 12(24), 241-255
- Áruguete, N. (8 de febrero de 2016). El kirchnerismo y sus 2160 denuncias por corrupción. *Diario La Nación*.
- Ball, C. (2007). Socialismo del siglo XXI. *Cato Institute*. Recuperado de <https://www.elcato.org/socialismo-del-siglo-xxi>
- Basabe, S., & Martínez, J. (2014). Ecuador: cada vez menos democracia, cada vez más autoritarismo con elecciones. *Revista de Ciencia y Política*, 34(1), 145 - 170.
- Bottome, R., & Parra, N. (2007). Venezuela: Totalitarismo del Siglo XXI. *Cato Institute*. Recuperado de <https://www.elcato.org/venezuela-totalitarismo-del-siglo-xxi>
- Contreras, M. A. (2007). Socialismo del Siglo XXI. Al debate. *Revista Venezolana de Economía y Ciencias Sociales*, 13(2), 53-57.
- Deheza, G. (2008). Bolivia: ¿Es posible la construcción de un nuevo Estado? La Asamblea Constituyente y las Autonomías Departamentales. *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 28(1), 61-79. doi: 10.4067/S0718-090X2008000100004
- Duzoglou, D. (2016). *El contundente fracaso de la izquierda latinoamericana*. Bogota: La Patilla.
- Ellner, S. (2013). Las complejidades de la izquierda radical latinoamericana en el poder: experiencias y desafíos en el siglo XXI. *Cuadernos del CENDES*, 30(84), 1-28.
- García, F. M. (2006). El gobierno de Evo Morales: entre el nacionalismo y el indigenismo. *Nueva Sociedad*, 206, 4-13.
- Gerchunoff, P., & Aguirre, H. (2004). La política económica de Kirchner en la Argentina: varios estilos, una sola agenda. *Elcano*, 48, 1-27. Recuperado de <http://biblioteca.ribei.org/680/1/DT-035-2004-E.pdf>
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Beyond the left and the right. The future of radical policies* (2a ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hayek, F. A. (1985). *Derecho, legislación y libertad*. Madrid: Unión.
- Hamburger, A. A. (2014). El socialismo del siglo XXI en América Latina: características,

- desarrollos y desafíos. *Revista de relaciones internacionales, estrategia y seguridad*, 9(1), 131-154.
- Hill, C. (2002). *National Differences in economic policy. "Democracy and totalitarianism"*. Washington: Mc Graw Hill.
- Lalander, R. (2012). Venezuela 2010-2011: Polarización y radicalización del proyecto socialista. *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 32(1), 293-313. doi: 10.4067/S0718-090X2012000100015
- Laserna, R. (2007). El caudillismo fragmentado. *Nueva Sociedad*, 209, 100-117.
- Magallanes, R. (2008). Del socialismo del siglo xix a la propuesta de un socialismo para el siglo XXI. *Revista venezolana de Economía y Ciencias Sociales*, 14(3), 33-48.
- Mayorga, F. (2006). Entre el nacionalismo y el indigenismo. *Revista Nueva Sociedad*, 206, 4-13.
- Monedero, J. C. (2008). Hacia una filosofía política del socialismo del siglo XXI. Notas desde el caso venezolano. *Cuadernos del Cendes*, 25(68), 73-108.
- Mujica, N., & Rincón, S. (2008). Quinto momento de la Quinta República: El socialismo del siglo XXI. *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia*, 13(42), 244-272.
- Muñoz, M. A., & Retamozo, M. (2008). Hegemonía y discurso en la Argentina contemporánea: efectos políticos de los usos del "pueblo" en la retórica de Néstor Kirchner. *Perfiles Latinoamericanos*, 16(31), 121-149.
- Ornelas, J., & Aceves, L. (2011). La izquierda latinoamericana en el siglo xx y la utopía recuperada. *Bajo el Volcan*, 11(17), 273-295.
- Ospina, P. (Comp.). (2012). Promesas temporales. Cambio del RÉGIMEN de acumulación: en ecuador, propuestas y realizaciones de la revolución ciudadana. En *¿Otros mundos posibles?: crisis, gobiernos progresistas, alternativas de sociedad* (pp. 113-130). Medellín: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Punín, M. I. (2011). Rafael Correa y la prensa ecuatoriana. una relación de intrigas y odios. *Razón y Palabra*, 16(75). Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=199518706070>
- Ramirez, D. (2015). La crisis capitalista mundial, América Latina y Ecuador: ¿socialismo del siglo XXI o neoextractivismo progresista?. *Sociedad y Economía*, 28, 51-74.
- República Bolivariana de Venezuela. (2007). *Líneas generales del plan de desarrollo económico y social de la nación 2007-2013*. Caracas: Autor. Recuperado de <http://www.mppp.gob.ve/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Plan-de-la-Nación-2007-2013.pdf>
- Reyes, O. (2006). Sobre el socialismo del siglo XXI en Venezuela. *Stockholm Review of Latin American Studies*, 1, 84-104.
- Repoll, J. (2010). Política y medios de comunicación en Argentina. Kirchner, Clarín y la Ley. *Andamio*, 7(14), 35-67.
- Romero, A. (2009). Venezuela y la soberanía popular. *Cato Institute*. Recuperado de <https://www.elcato.org/venezuela-y-la-soberania-popular>
- Sel, S. (2009). *La comunicacion mediatizada, hegemonias, alternativas, soberanías*. Buenos Aires: Clacso.
- Svampa, M. (2016). La década kirchnerista: Populismo, clases medias y revolución pasiva. *Lasaforum*, 44(4), 14-16. Recuperado de <http://www.maristellasvampa.net/archivos/ensayo061.pdf>