

10

Populism

Joint

The Populism in Latin America appeared in a moment very sense of the salaried population's recoveries in front of the capitalist system that began to be implanted with force in some of our countries.

- The promoted industrialization begins to produce a phenomenon of increase of the salaried masses.
- The urbanization concentrates masses on the cities.
- A policy of substitution of imports is applied.
- There is a considerable entrance of foreigner capital and technology.

Concept

- . There is who affirms the populism like a movement (sometimes played ideologically) that makes reference to the people, considered this as a social homogeneous group..

- Others think that the populism is a movement without ideology that consists on a disordered mobilization of masses, without doctrinal compass. It is "an anarquist intervention of the emotional people and, liberated to the commander's powers to solve, to the turn of the corner, the necessities of the hopeful masses". (Rodrigo Borja)

- Others underline that the populism is "an obliging allotment of the wealth. An allotment without production. It works in paternalistic form while there are resources to distribute. If there is not allotment possibility, the populism collapses." (Ramon Escovar Salom)

Picking up several of the elements, we can define the populism like *a movement, sometimes ideological, of mobilization of urban masses that is characterized by a bound speech to the people and an obliging distribution of the wealth, without equivalent production of it.*

Characteristic

It is eminently a phenomenon:

- . worker and urban
- . transitory and not permanent
- . nationalist
- . manipulated from above
- . that maintains the capitalist pattern.

The peasant difficultly is framed by the populism. The salaried masses are the dynamic element of the society. It is assumed that the masses are not channeled for the traditional parties, but easy to be blurred by the power of the State, of where it derives the intent of a State syndicalism. In this populist game, the salaried masses finished allied with the government (Italy, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico), and in turn, the bourgeoisie (always climber) is able to subsist and to be invigorated without having the political power directly. This changes the traditional outline to be able to.

In Latin America it can be spoken of populist régimes in the governments of: Cárdenas (Mexico 1934-1940), Perón (Argentina 1946-1953), Vargas and Goulart (Brazil 1950-1954 and 1961-1964), Ibáñez (Chile 1952-1958), Velasco Ibarra (Ecuador 1933 / 1944 / 1952-1956 / 1960 / 1968). There were tendencies and some elements of populist court in the governments of Paz Entensoro (Bolivia), and perhaps Pérez Jiménez (Venezuela), Rojas Pinilla (Colombia) and Allende (Chile).

Decadence of the populism

There is a diabolical chain of causes that goes precipitating always the one it breaks of all populism, that is:

1. growing State interventionism ;
2. gigantism of the State;

3. large bureaucracy;
4. inefficacy of answer of the State;
5. general dissatisfaction and collapse.

When not achieving the populism to solve the real problems indeed, just as it was promised to the masses, it loses their support little by little and of the bourgeoisie (it only attempts to their interests). It falls by itself, and it leaves a hole of power that they enter from ordinary to fill immediately the military ones (Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador) or a modernist social democracy (Venezuela after Pérez Jiménez). No populist régime has changed the structures of a system. And all have been corrupt and corruptive; not productive and not trustworthy of promises.

Explanations

Given the complexity of the phenomenon that adopts forms and peculiarities characteristic of several cultures and geographical spaces, it is not easy to find an enough and convincing explanation that could be applied to all the cases of populism.

1) *The populism is an ideological movement of transition*

It is an aberrant phenomenon of "asynchronia" (that is to say, of the simultaneous coexistence) of the two poles, in the process of traffic of a traditional society toward an industrial society. It has, hence, a cabinet effect and an amalgam effect. This is the theory called 'functionalist', brilliantly worked and diffused by Argentinean authors as Germani (1973), Di Tella (1973), Ianni (1973, 1975).

However they can come up several objections to this hypothesis.

The populism is not the phenomenon from a transitional stage of underdevelopment to development. The real populisms, as much the Europeans as the Latin Americans have been given, rather, in the countries more developed relatively. For example, the 'poujandism' in France, the fascism in Italy, the

populism in Argentina, Uruguay, Chile. If the hypothesis were truth, we would have to think about three questions, to all which it would be necessary to respond with a NO.

That is:

- ¿To economic bigger development, does it correspond smaller populism then?
- ¿Are the industrial societies immune of incurring in populism?
- ¿Won't the late societies be able to pass to more modern forms of canalization of the popular protest, without making the itinerary of the populism?

2) *The populism is an ideological phenomenon*

It articulates the people to the political speech of the dominant class. This is another commendable hypothesis, sustained by French Ernest Laclau. It is a phenomenon whose political ideology ties the presence directly from the people to its speech.

"Our thesis is that the populism consists on the presentation of the popular-democratic interpretations as synthetic-antagonistic group regarding the dominant ideology [..]

The populism arises in an ideological specific field: the one constituted by the double articulation of the political speech".

This is the first movement in the dialectical one between "polis" and "classes":

- 1) the classes cannot affirm their hegemony without articulating the town to their speech; and
- 2) the specific form of this articulation (in the case of a class that should face the block of power in their group to affirm its hegemony) will be the populism.

Partial conclusion

The populism had a great role in the destruction of the democracies in countries like Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil and maybe also Chile. And without

arriving to so much, the populist virus (with its similar to the demagoguery and the 'clientelism') has shrunk the efficiency of democratic régimes in several countries. Well a great expert of the phenomenon wrote that "*the populism has constituted the political most serious illness in Latin America*". (Escovar Salom)