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## The Cold War in Latin America

- A Cold War between the U.S. and the Soviet Union quickly follows the end of World War II.
- The Cold War has a profound influence in Latin America:

1. The Cold War is superimposed over deep ongoing processes of political and economic transformation within the region (state consolidation, demographic change, industrialization, the arrival of mass politics, etc.).
2. Some of these processes are independent of the Cold War.
3. And yet, the Cold War "supercharges" them: the Cold War is a competition between two modernization projects fighting for their hegemony in emerging economics.
4. Cycle of political polarization, revolution, and authoritarian reaction. Democratic reformism becomes extremely difficult.
5. Latin America becomes the center of global history, even if briefly.

- These influences decisively shape economic policy and performance.

SOVIET SHIP POLTAVA ENROUTE TO CUBA


## The traditional historiographical view

- Big factor: the U.S.
- Expansionary ambitions since Monroe doctrine and Mexican War (1846-1848).
- War of 1898, Platt Amendment, and gunboat diplomacy.
- After 1945, on the one hand, the U.S. cares relatively little about the region: focus on Eurasia.
- On the other hand, the U.S. is worried about Soviet influence and supports authoritarian regimes (e.g., Pérez Jiménez in Venezuela) over reformist democratic governments.
- This leads to multiple U.S. interventions (Guatemala, Dominican Republic, ...), inconsistent changes in strategy (e.g., Alianza para el Progreso), and generally bad outcomes (e.g., Escuela de las Américas, coups, ...).





## A new historiographical view, I

- Latin American actors had agency:
- Local elites used the U.S. as much as the U.S. used them.
- Most of the coups in Latin America would have probably happened anyway without U.S. intervention. Local elites have agency and capability.
- Both the U.S. and Latin American countries were multi-agent actors. Different actors had diverse goals and strategies:
- FDR's Latin America policy was very different from Kennedy's, despite both being democrat presidents: no U.S. armed intervention in Latin America between 1933 and 1954.
- CIA passed $\$ 50,000$ to Castro's guerrillas and the New York Times coverage is key for Castro's victory.
- Most other U.S. media (e.g., CBS) also positively covered Castro's guerrillas.
- War on drugs.



## A new historiographical view, II

- The U.S. influence in the Caribbean and Central America was much stronger than in South America (and even Mexico). Think about the responses to different nationalizations.
- A more general point: different Latin American countries reacted to the same challenges created by the Cold War in very heterogeneous ways. There was no "typical" Latin American response.
- Influence also went in the opposite direction.
- A growing understanding of the role of Soviet Union intervention, the role of Cuba in Africa and the rest of Latin America, and Cuba's manipulation of the Soviet Union: fight about "focos" in 1967-68.
- Plenty of non-transitivities: Franco in Spain and Castro in Cuba keep a warm relationship.
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## A new historiographical view, III

- Other actors:
- France's influence in Argentina's military.
- Trujillo's terrorism in the Americas.
- Brazil and Cuba's intervention in Chile; Brazil's influence on Paraguay.
- German multinationals in Argentina and Brazil.
- China's influence.




## Structural changes, II

## An uncertain future

- As we saw in previous lectures, the 1914-1945 cycle of world wars and depressions unhinges the Latin American model of export-led growth.
- While Latin America did not see any combat operation during World War II (beyond some naval engagements close to the coast), the war economy disrupted traditional economic and social structures.
- Commodities, planning, the substitution of imports: short-run absence of conflict between export and ISI interests.
- Furthermore, the end of World War II leaves many open questions regarding the future of the international economic organization (despite Latin America's role in Bretton Woods).
- Also, the U.S. focuses its development aid in Eurasia: William Clayton at the Chapultepec Conference in 1945.
- Let us look at some figures.


FORGOTIEN FOUNDATIONS of


Table 4.2. Growth and structural characteristics of different phases of LDCs' economic development, 1870-1990 (annual average compound growth rates)

|  | 1870-1913 | 1913-50 | 1950-73 | 1973-90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | 2.1 | 2.6 | 5.2 | 3.9 |
| Latin America (unweighted) | 2.9 | 3.2 | 5.1 | 2.7 |
| Latin America (weighted) | n.a. | n.a. | $5 \cdot 3$ | 2.8 |
| GDP per capita | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 1.5 |
| Latin America (unweighted) | 1.1 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 0.6 |
| Latin America (weighted) | n.a. | n.a. | 2.6 | 0.5 |
| Africa | n.a. | 1.2 | 1.9 | -0.3 |
| China | 0.3 | -0.5 | 3.7 | 5.7 |
| NICs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | n.a. | 0. 1 | 5.7 | 6.3 |
| Rest of Asia | 0.4 | -0.3 | 1.6 | $3 \cdot 3$ |
| Volume of exports |  |  |  |  |
| Latin America | 4.6 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 5.9 |
| Productivity |  |  |  |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |
| Labour | n.a. | n.a. | 3.4 | 0.3 |
| Capital | n.a. | n.a. | -0.6 | -1.4 |
| Joint factor productivity | n.a. | n.a. | 1.3 | -1.1 |
| NICs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Labour | n.a. | n.a. | $4 \cdot 3$ | 5.1 |
| Capital | n.a. | n.a. | 2.2 | -1.0 |
| Joint factor productivity | n.a. | n.a. | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| Employment structure (\%) | 1950 | 1973 | 1980 | 1990 |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture | so | 32 | 29 | 24 |
| Industry | 24 | 30 | 26 | 28 |
| Services | 26 | 38 | 45 | 48 |

Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Refers to South Korea and Taiwan only

Table 3.4. Latin American economic indicators, 1945-55a

|  | GDP <br> in 1970 dollars ${ }^{6}$ | Commodity exports annual growth rates at constant prices \% |  | Annual growth of real GDP per capita |  | Industry as \% GDP |  |  | Cost of living$(1945=100)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1945-50 | 1950-5 | 1945-50 | 1950-5 | 1945 | 1950 | 1955 | 1950 | 1955 |
| Argentina | 14018 | 5.0 | $-8.8$ | 1.6 | 1.0 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 255 | 585 |
| Mexico | 12926 | 11.7 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 148 | 248 |
| Brazil | 12309 | 8.1 | $-3.3$ | $3 \cdot 3$ | 3.4 | 17 | 21 | 23 | 173 | 384 |
| Colombia | 4325 | 17.5 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 193 | 242 |
| Chile | 3499 | 2.2 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 252 | 1438 |
| Venezuela | 3360 | 23.1 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 122 | 130 |
| Peru | 2518 | 8.8 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 236 | 333 |
| Cuba | n.a. | 10.0 | -1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $26^{b}$ | $26^{b}$ | $30^{6}$ | 118 | 118 |
| Uruguay | 1867 | 10.7 | $-10.4$ | 4. I | 2.4 | 18 | 20 | 23 | 129 | 220 |
| Guatemala | 885 | 16.1 | 1.7 | $-0.9$ | -0.3 | 13 | 11 | I I | 156 | 166 |
| Ecuador | 796 | 17.0 | $4 \cdot 3$ | 6.9 | 2.3 | 18 | 16 | 15 | n.a. | n.a. |
| Bolivia | 698 | -1.2 | $-2.7$ | 0.0 | -0.8 | n.a. | 12 | 15 | 188 | 2,525 |
| Dominican Republic | 533 | n.a. | n.a. | 5.0 | 3.0 | n.a. | 12 | 12 | 116 | 125 |
| El Salvador | 512 | 21.7 | 4.1 | 6.7 | 2.0 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 130 | 167 |
| Paraguay | 410 | 3.1 | $-2.6$ | 0.0 | -0.9 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 229 | 2,057 |
| Honduras | 323 | 22.4 | $-5.4$ | 1.7 | -0.2 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 115 | 144 |
| Costa Rica | 298 | 30.1 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 133 | 125 |
| Nicaragua | 239 | 16.8 | 23.1 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 95 | 165 |
| Panama | 217 | 29.8 | 4.6 | -2.5 | 1.1 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 110 | 113 |

Notes:
${ }^{4}$ Ranked by size of 1950 GDP. Cuba ranked on basis of current price 1950 figures, since no estimate exists at 1970 prices.
${ }^{b}$ Non-sugar manufacturing as per cent of total material production, i.e. the total is less than GDP.

Table 4.3. Latin America: growth of gross domestic product (GDP), 1950-90 (annual average compound growth rates)

|  | 1950-60 | 1960-73 | 1973-81 | 1950-81 | 1981-90 | 1950-90 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 2.8 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 2.9 | -0.6 | 2.1 |
| Brazil | 6.8 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 5.8 |
| Chile | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 3.4 |
| Colombia | 4.6 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 4.8 |
| Mexico | 6.1 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 0.8 | 5.3 |
| Peru | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 4.8 | -1.7 | 3.3 |
| Venezuela | 7.6 | 4.7 | -0.1 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 3.5 |
| Small countries ${ }^{b}$ | 3.6 | 5.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 1.2 | 3.8 |
| LATIN AMERICA | 5.1 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 4.4 |
| Oil exporters | 6.1 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 0.4 | 4.6 |
| Oil importers | 4.2 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 4.3 |

Notes:
a Figures for the 1950s and 1960s are measured in US\$ 1970, and from 1970 to 1990 in US\$ 1980 .
${ }^{b}$ Includes twelve countries, ${ }^{c}$ Includes five countries.

Figure 4. I. Latin America: Shares of manufactures, exports and exports of primary commodities in GDP, 1950-90 (\%)


## A demographic revolution

## Demographics, I

- Fast population growth.
- Much heterogeneity.
- Birth rates usually fall later than death rates.
- Thus, very young population.
- Life expectancy and infant mortality improve but still lagged those in advanced economies.

Table I. I. Population of the world's main regions, 1930-90

|  | 1930 | $1990^{0}$ | $1990 / \mathrm{I930}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| World | 2,008 | 5,292 | 2.64 |
| Latin America ${ }^{b}$ | 110 | 448 | 4.07 |
| North America | 134 | 276 | 2.06 |
| Europe $^{6}$ | 540 | 813 | 1.51 |
| Africa | 155 | 642 | 4.14 |
| Asia | 1,069 | 3,113 | 2.91 |

Table 1.2. Latin America: total population and population growth rates by
country, 1930-90

|  | In thousands |  |  |  | Average annual growth rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1930 | 1950 | 1970 | $1990^{\circ}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1930- \\ 50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1950- \\ 70 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1970- \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 107,408 | 165,880 | 285,695 | 448,076 | 2.17 | 2.72 | 2.25 |
| Argentina | 11,896 | 17,150 | 23,962 | 32,322 | 1.83 | 1.67 | 1.50 |
| Bolivia | 2,153 | 2,766 | 4,325 | 7,314 | 1.25 | 2.24 | 2.63 |
| Brazil | 33,568 | 53,444 | 95,847 | 150,368 | 2.33 | 2.92 | 2.25 |
| Chile | 4,424 | 6,082 | 9,504 | 13,173 | 1. 59 | 2.23 | 1.63 |
| Colombia | 7,350 | 11,946 | 21,360 | 32,978 | 2.43 | 2.91 | 2.17 |
| Costa Rica | 499 | 862 | 1,731 | 3,015 | 2.73 | 3.49 | 2.77 |
| Cuba | 3,837 | 5,850 | 8,520 | 10,608 | 2.11 | 1.88 | 1.10 |
| Dominican Republic | 1,400 | 2,353 | 4,423 | 7,170 | 2.60 | 3.16 | 2.42 |
| Ecuador | 2,160 | 3,310 | 6,051 | 10,587 | 2. 13 | 3.02 | 2.80 |
| El Salvador | 1,443 | 1,940 | 3,588 | 5,252 | 1. 48 | 3.07 | 1.91 |
| Guatemala | 1,771 | 2,969 | 5,246 | 9,197 | 2.58 | 2.85 | 2.81 |
| Haiti | 2,422 | 3,261 | 4,535 | 6,513 | 1.49 | 1.65 | 1.81 |
| Honduras | 948 | 1,401 | 2,627 | 5,138 | 1.95 | 3.14 | 3.35 |
| Mexico | 16,589 | 28,012 | 52,771 | 88,598 | 2.62 | 3.17 | 2.59 |
| Nicaragua | 742 | 1,098 | 2,053 | 3,871 | 1.96 | 3.13 | 3.17 |
| Panama | 502 | 893 | 1,53I | 2,418 | 2.88 | 2.70 | 2.29 |
| Paraguay | 880 | 1,351 | 2,351 | 4,277 | 2.14 | 2.77 | 2.99 |
| Peru | 5,651 | 7,632 | 13,193 | 21,550 | 1.50 | 2.74 | 2.45 |
| Uruguay | 1,704 | 2,239 | 2,808 | 3,094 | 1.37 | 1.13 | 0.48 |
| Venezuela | 2,950 | 5,009 | 10,604 | 19,735 | 2.65 | 3.75 | 3.11 |
| Others ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 4,519 | 6,312 | 8,665 | 10,898 | 1.67 | 1. 58 | 1.15 |

Table 1.3. Latin America: Crude birth (CB) and death (DR) rates for selected
five-year intervals, 1930-85

|  | (Births, deaths per 1000 population) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1930-5 |  | 1945-9 |  | 1960-5 |  | 1980-5 |  |
|  | BR | DR | BR | DR | BR | DR | BR | DR |
| Argentina | 28.9 | II. 6 | 25.2 | 9.6 | 23.2 | 8.8 | 23.0 | 8.7 |
| Bolivia | - | - | ${ }^{*} 47.1$ | 24.1 | 46.1 | 21.5 | 44.0 | 15.9 |
| Brazil | - | - | * 44.6 | 15.1 | 42.1 | 12.3 | 30.6 | 8.4 |
| Chile | 40.2 | 24.5 | 37.0 | 17.5 | 31.6 | 12.1 | 24.2 | 6.3 |
| Colombia | 43.3 | 22.5 | 43.4 | 20.8 | 41.6 | 11.5 | 29.2 | 6.3 |
| Costa Rica | 44.6 | 21.5 | 42.7 | 13.2 | 45.3 | 9.2 | 30.2 | 4. I |
| Cuba | 31.3 | 13.3 | 30.0 | 8.7 | 35.1 | 8.9 | 16.0 | 6.3 |
| Dominican Republic | - | - | *50.5 | 20.3 | 49.4 | 14.8 | 33.6 | 7.5 |
| Ecuador | 48.5 | 25.7 | 45.9 | 20.0 | 45.6 | 14.3 | 35.4 | 8.0 |
| El Salvador | 46.5 | 32.7 | 44.8 | 22.8 | 47.8 | 14.8 | 38.0 | III. 1 |
| Guatemala | 46.2 | 31.7 | 49.1 | 26.5 | 47.8 | 18.3 | 42.3 | 10.5 |
| Haiti |  | - | * 43.5 | 27.5 | 41.9 | 22.2 | 36.6 | 14.5 |
| Honduras | 42.0 | 21.7 | 44.5 | 10.0 | 51.2 | 18.1 | 42.3 | 9.0 |
| Mexico | 44. I | 26.7 | 44.5 | 17.8 | 45.5 | 11.3 | 31.7 | 6.3 |
| Nicaragua |  | - | *54. 1 | 22.7 | 50.3 | 17.1 | 44.2 | 9.7 |
| Panama | 37.4 | 15.1 | 38.3 | 10.8 | 40.8 | 9.6 | 28.0 | 5.4 |
| Paraguay | - | - | * 47.3 | 9.3 | 42.3 | 8.1 | 35.8 | 6.7 |
| Peru | - | - | * 47 . 1 | 21.6 | 46.3 | 17.6 | 34.2 | 10.5 |
| Uruguay | 22.3 | 11.6 | 19.7 | 9.1 | 21.9 | 9.6 | 18.3 | 10.0 |
| Venezuela | 39.9 | 21.9 | 43.6 | 16. 1 | 44.2 | 9.1 | 33.0 | 5.5 |

Table 1.6. Total fertility rates, $1950-5,1960-5$, and $1980-5$

|  | Births per woman 15-49 |  |  | Ratio of columns |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950-5 | 1960-5 | 1980-5 |  |  |
|  | (I) | (2) | (3) | (2)/(1) | (3)/(2) |
| Total | 5.8 | 6.0 | 3.9 | 1.03 | 0.65 |
| Argentina | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Bolivia | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 0.97 | 0.95 |
| Brazil | 6.2 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 1.00 | 0.61 |
| Chile | 5.1 | 5.3 | 2.8 | 1.04 | 0.53 |
| Colombia | 6.8 | 6.8 | 3.5 | 1.00 | 0.51 |
| Costa Rica | 6.7 | 7.1 | 3.5 | 1.06 | 0.49 |
| Cuba | 4. 1 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 1.15 | 0.40 |
| Dominican Republic | 7.4 | 7.3 | 4.2 | 0.99 | 0.58 |
| Ecuador | 6.9 | 6.9 | 4.8 | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| El Salvador | 6.5 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 1.06 | 0.75 |
| Guatemala | 7.1 | 7.0 | 6. 1 | 0.99 | 0.87 |
| Haiti | 6.3 | 6.3 | 5.2 | 1.00 | 0.83 |
| Honduras | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 1.04 | 0.84 |
| Mexico | 6.8 | 6.8 | 4.2 | 1.00 | 0.62 |
| Nicaragua | 7.3 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 1.00 | 0.81 |
| Panama | $5 \cdot 7$ | 5.9 | 3.5 | 1.04 | 0.59 |
| Paraguay | 6.8 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 1.00 | 0.71 |
| Peru | 6.9 | 6.9 | 4.7 | 1.00 | 0.68 |
| Uruguay | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 1.07 | 0.90 |
| Venezuela | 6.5 | 6.5 | 4. I | 1.00 | 0.63 |

Table 1.4. Population under age 15 and age-dependency ratio: 1960 and 1985

|  | Per cent of population under age 15 |  | Age-dependency <br> Ratio* (per cent) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1960 | 1985 | 1960 | 1985 |
| TOTAL | 42.5 | 37.6 | 85.3 | 72.7 |
| Argentina | 30.8 | 30.5 | 57.0 | 64.1 |
| Bolivia | 42.9 | 43.8 | 85.3 | 88.5 |
| Brazil | 43.6 | 36.4 | 86.9 | 68.7 |
| Chile | 39.4 | 31.5 | 79.0 | 59.5 |
| Colombia | 46.4 | 37.8 | 98.4 | 71.4 |
| Costa Rica | $47 \cdot 4$ | 36.8 | 102.4 | 68.7 |
| Cuba | 34.2 | 26.2 | 64.8 | 52.7 |
| Dominican Republic | 46.7 | 39.7 | 98.8 | 75.2 |
| Ecuador | 44.8 | 41.4 | 95.4 | 82.2 |
| El Salvador | 45.5 | 46.0 | 92.5 | 97.7 |
| Guatemala | 46.0 | 45.9 | 94.9 | 95.5 |
| Haiti | 39.4 | 40.5 | 80.0 | 80.9 |
| Honduras | 45.1 | 46.3 | 90.3 | 98.5 |
| Mexico | 45.4 | 40.9 | 94.8 | 80.2 |
| Nicaragua | 47.9 | 46.8 | 101.3 | 97.1 |
| Panama | 43.5 | 37.6 | 90.5 | 72.5 |
| Paraguay | 47.6 | 41.0 | 103.9 | 80.1 |
| Peru | 43.3 | 39.9 | 87.8 | 76.9 |
| Uruguay | 27.9 | 26.8 | 56.2 | 60.7 |
| Venezuela | 46. 1 | 39.5 | 94.4 | 75.1 |

Note: *Sum of the population under 15 and over 64 divided by the population

Table 1.5. Life expectancy and infant mortality, 1950-5 and 1980-5

|  | Life expectancy ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Infant mortality ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950-5 | 1980-5 | 1950-5 | 1980-5 |
| Total | 51.9 | 66.7 | 126 | 61 |
| Argentina | 62.5 | 69.7 | 64 | 32 |
| Bolivia | 40.4 | 53.1 | 176 | 110 |
| Brazil | 51.0 | 64.9 | 135 | 63 |
| Chile | 53.8 | 71.5 | 126 | 20 |
| Colombia | 50.7 | 68.3 | 123 | 40 |
| Costa Rica | 57.3 | 74.7 | 94 | 18 |
| Cuba | 59.4 | 75.2 | 82 | 15 |
| Dominican Republic | 46.0 | 65.8 | 149 | 65 |
| Ecuador | 48.4 | 65.4 | 150 | 63 |
| El Salvador | 45.3 | 62.2 | 175 | 64 |
| Guatemala | 42.1 | 62.0 | 141 | 59 |
| Haiti | 37.6 | 54.8 | 220 | 97 |
| Honduras | 42.3 | 63.9 | 169 | 69 |
| Mexico | 50.8 | 68.9 | 114 | 43 |
| Nicaragua | 42.3 | 63.3 | 167 | 62 |
| Panama | 55.3 | 72.0 | 93 | 23 |
| Paraguay | 62.7 | 66.9 | 106 | 42 |
| Peru | 43.9 | 61.4 | 159 | 88 |
| Uruguay | 66.1 | 72.0 | 57 | 24 |
| Venezuela | 55.2 | 69.6 | 106 | 36 |

## Demographics, II

- Fast urbanization: Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and Sao Paulo become large metropolia.
- Structural transformation.
- Changes in gender roles.
- Education.

Table 1.7. Urban population in Latin America, 1930-80

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1930^{0}$ | $1950^{\circ}$ | $1950^{6}$ | $1980^{6}$ | Urban growth <br> rate $1950-80$ |
| Total | 17 | 26 | 41 | 65 | 4.1 |
| Argentina | 38 | 50 | 65 | 83 | 2.5 |
| Bolivia | 14 | 19 | 38 | 44 | 2.9 |
| Brazil | 14 | 20 | 36 | 66 | 4.8 |
| Chile | 32 | 43 | 58 | 81 | 3.1 |
| Colombia | 10 | 23 | 37 | 64 | 4.5 |
| Costa Rica | 20 | 18 | 34 | 43 | 4.1 |
| Cuba | 26 | 36 | 49 | 68 | 2.7 |
| Dominican | 7 | 11 | 24 | 51 | 5.5 |
| $\quad$ Republic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ecuador | 14 | 18 | 28 | 47 | 4.7 |
| El Salvador | 7 | 13 | 37 | 42 | 3.3 |
| Guatemala | 11 | 11 | 30 | 37 | 3.6 |
| Haiti | 4 | 5 | 12 | 24 | 3.9 |
| Honduras | n.a. | 7 | 18 | 36 | 5.6 |
| Mexico | 14 | 24 | 43 | 66 | 4.5 |
| Nicaragua | 14 | 15 | 35 | 53 | 4.5 |
| Panama | 27 | 22 | 36 | 50 | 3.7 |
| Paraguay | 11 | 15 | 35 | 42 | 3.4 |
| Peru | 11 | 18 | 36 | 65 | 4.7 |
| Uruguay | 35 | 53 | 78 | 84 | 1.1 |
| Venezuela | 14 | 31 | 53 | 83 | 5.2 |

Notes: a Per cent in cities with 20,000 or more residents, 1930 and $50 . b$ Per cent in

Table 1.8. Sectoral distribution of labour force 1950-1980; secondary school enrolment rates, 1960-1981

|  | Percent of labour force by sector |  |  |  | Secondary school enrolment rate* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Agriculture | Industry | Agriculture | Industry | 1960 | 1981 |
| Total | 53.4 | 19.5 | 31.8 | 25.9 | n.a. | n.a. |
| Argentina | 25.2 | 31.8 | 13.1 | 33.8 | 23 | 59 |
| Bolivia | 61.4 | 20.0 | 46.5 | 19.7 | 12 | 34 |
| Brazil | 59.8 | 16.6 | 31.2 | 26.6 | 1 I | 32 |
| Chile | 34.3 | 30.2 | 16.5 | 25.2 | 24 | 57 |
| Colombia | 57.2 | 19.7 | 34.3 | 23.5 | 12 | 48 |
| Costa Rica | 57.6 | 16.7 | 30.8 | 23.2 | 21 | 48 |
| Cuba | 42.7 | 20.5 | 23.8 | 28.5 | 14 | 75 |
| Dominican Republic | 72.8 | 11.2 | 45.7 | 15.5 | 7 | 41 |
| Ecuador | 65.4 | 15.4 | 38.6 | 19.9 | 12 | 40 |
| El Salvador | 65.4 | 15.5 | 43.2 | 19.4 | 13 | 20 |
| Guatemala | 68.4 | 13.8 | 56.9 | 26. I | 7 | 16 |
| Haiti | 85.6 | 5.7 | 70.0 | 8.3 | 4 | 13 |
| Honduras | 72.3 | 8.9 | 60.5 | 16.2 | 8 | 30 |
| Mexico | 60.4 | 16.8 | 36.6 | 29.0 | 11 | 51 |
| Nicaragua | 67.9 | 15.2 | 46.6 | 15.8 | 7 | $4{ }^{1}$ |
| Panama | 56.4 | 13.6 | 31.8 | 18.2 | 29 | 65 |
| Paraguay | 56.0 | 20.0 | 48.6 | 20.6 | 11 | 26 |
| Peru | 57.7 | 18.3 | 40.1 | 18.3 | 15 | 57 |
| Uruguay | 24.4 | 28.0 | 15.8 | 29.2 | 37 | 70 |
| Venezuela | 42.9 | 21.4 | 16.1 | 28.4 | 21 | 40 |

Note: *Enrolment rate is population aged 12-17 divided by number enrolled; data for c .


Source: International Labour Office, Economically Active Population, 1950-2025 (Geneva,

Table 5.4. Educational levels of economically active population six Latin American countries, 1960, 1970, 1980 (\%)

| Country | Census year | Number of years of study |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None | I-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 10-12 | ${ }_{13}+$ | No info. |
| Argentina | $1960^{\circ}$ | 6.9 | 24.4 | 45.8 | 4.7 | 9.6 | 4.4 | 4.2 |
|  | $1970^{\text {b }}$ | 0.0 | 15.8 | 20.3 | 36.7 | 13.1 | 5.9 | 8.2 |
|  | $1980^{\circ}$ | - | $29.4{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $48.4{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 16.9 f | - | 5.38 | - |
| Brazil | $1960^{6}$ | 41.6 | 30.6 | 19.2 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 0.5 |
|  | 1970 | 36.0 | 27.6 | 22.9 | 6.1 | 4.9 | 2.3 | 0.1 |
|  | $1980^{6}$ | $27.2^{\text {i }}$ | 24.7 | 28.1 | 10.1 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 0.1 |
| Colombia | 1960 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | $1970^{\prime}$ | 21.6 | 3 I .1 | 27.8 | 10.0 | 5.6 | 2.8 | I. I |
|  | 1980 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 11.5 | $49.2{ }^{\text {d }}$ | - | $29.8{ }^{\text {m }}$ | - | $7.7{ }^{\text {b }}$ | I. 8 |
| Chile | 1960 ${ }^{\text {j }}$ | 14.1 | 21.3 | 35.2 | 12.3 | 10.0 | 2.3 | 4.8 |
|  | $1970^{\circ}$ | 8.2 | 15.4 | 31.6 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 4.0 | 14.3 |
|  | $1980^{\circ}$ | 4.9 | 11.3 | 25.9 | $14.9{ }^{6}$ | $33.3^{\text {a }}$ | 9.7 | - |
| Mexico | $1960^{\prime}$ | 35.4 | 32.0 | 24.3 | 4.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  | $1970^{\prime}$ | 27.1 | 30.3 | 29.7 | 5.9 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  | 1980\% | 16.2 | 22.1 | 34.7 | 16.2 | 4.6 | 6.2 | - |
| Peru | $1960{ }^{\prime}$ | 32.8 | -52.2- |  | - 11.6- |  | 2.5 | 0.9 |
|  | $1970^{\circ}$ | 19.3 | 27.3 | 28.1 | 7.9 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 3.2 |
|  | $1980^{\circ}$ | 12.4 | $24.2{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 18.4" | 13.10 | $13.8{ }^{\text {w }}$ | $12.1{ }^{\text {x }}$ | 6.0 |

## A new politics

## Deep change in politics

- Democratic spring:

1. Electoral victories of Teodoro Picado in Costa Rica (1944), Ramón Grau San Martín in Cuba (1944), José Luis Bustamante in Peru (1945), Mariano Ospina Pérez in Colombia (1946), Juan Perón (1946), and Gabriel González Videla in Chile (1946).
2. Democratic forces oust quasi-authoritarian regimes in Guatemala (1944), Ecuador (1944), Venezuela (1945), and Bolivia (1946).
3. End of Estado Novo in Brazil (1945).

- Fast reversion: Colombia, Peru, Cuba, and Guatemala between 1948 and 1954.
- Complex set of political movements:

1. More conventional welfare states: Uruguay and Costa Rica.
2. Popular Fronts: Chile (1937-1941; with a slightly different name until 1947) and Ecuador.
3. Populist movements.

## LATIN AMERICA BETWEEN <br> THE SECOND <br> WORLD WAR AND <br> THE COLD WAR <br> 1944-1948 <br>  <br> EDITED BY LESLIE BETHELL <br> AND IAN ROXBOROUGH

## Populist politics, I

- Nationalism and revolutionary movements.
- Most famous examples: Lázaro Cárdenas (1895-1970), Raúl Haya de la Torre (1895-1979), José María Velasco Ibarra (1893-1979), and Jorge Eliécer Gaitán (1903-1948).
- Often called "populist."
- Tricky label; often "populist" means "I do not like this politician."
- Nonetheless, a useful term if used carefully.


## Populist politics, II

- Mechanism of political modernization from oligarchic regimes to modern mass democracies.
- Similarities and differences with European social democratic parties.
- Hard to classify along the left-right continuum of Western democracies.
- For example, Perón in Argentina is opposed both by the conservative and socialist parties, and there is a left- and a right-wing Peronism.


## Main features

1. Strong, charismatic leader that appeals to "people" bypassing the "oligarchy" and formal institutions.
2. Blame underdevelopment on corruption, oligarchy, multinationals, U.S.
3. Nationalists are adept at running modern electoral campaigns (newspapers, radio, later TV) and forge a coalition of working- and middle-class.
4. Urban electoral base. Rural voters often vote for more traditional parties.
5. Multi-class alliance (or at least pretense): "el pueblo," not the "clase obrera."
6. Creation of clientele networks based on loyalty to the movement.
7. Economic policy based on aggressive, short-run redistribution, not long-run reform.


## Argentina: Peronism

- Peronism is the most dynamic of populist movements: still in power in Argentina as of March 2023!
- Perón is a nationalist army officer. Influenced by Italian fascism (both in form and content).
- He is an expert in talking to each interlocutor in the language they want to hear.
- After a period as Minister of Labor (1943-1945), president from 1946-1955.
- Ousted by a coup.
- Exiled in Spain, he returned briefly in 1973 for a third presidential mandate.
- Much of Argentinian politics from 1955 to today is about how to accommodate/handle the consequences of 1955 .


## Juan Domingo Perón (1895-1974)



## LA INTERNACIONAL JUSTICIALISTA

AUGE Y OCASO DE LOS SUEÑOS
IMPERIALES DE PERÓN



## The economic policy of Peronism, I

- Perón believes World War III is most likely and wants to avoid globalization.
- Role of Miguel Miranda (1891-1953), first from the central bank and later from the national economic council.
- Labor market regulation and increase on real wages.
- Five-year plan of fast industrialization oriented toward the internal market. Related but different from Federico Pinedo (1895-1971)'s 1940 plan.
- http://cdi.mecon.gob.ar/greenstone/collect/planesde/index/assoc/HASH0143.dir/doc.pdf.


## Miguel Miranda (1891-1953)



## Real wages in Buenos Aires




## The economic policy of Peronism, II

- Nationalization of the central bank, railroads, utilities, airlines, telecommunications, harbor and navigation companies, and reinsurance.
- Break with the old export interests represented by the (old) National Autonomist Party (Partido Autonomista Nacional) and later the National Democratic Party (Partido Demócrata Nacional).
- Creation of the Instituto Argentino de Promoción del Intercambio and exchange controls.
- By 1949, there is a $87 \%$ difference between the official and black market exchange rate.
- Expansionary fiscal and monetary policy.
- Price controls (e.g., rent control, electricity, gasoline).
- Financial repression.



## The macroeconomics of populism

- Boom-and-bust cycle described by Dornbusch and Edwards (1992):

Phase I: Fast increases in public spending, real wages, and employment. Output grows, low inflation and imports provide slack at the cost of reducing reserves or higher debt. Mainstream economics is "proven wrong."

Phase II: Inflation starts to increase and output growth stops. Bottlenecks lead to price and exchange controls. Government deficit skyrockets.

Phase III: Inflation out of control (often hyperinflation), capital flight, and decline in tax revenue combined with high inflation results in large budget deficits (Tanzi effect). Stabilization attempts by reducing subsidies and devaluation lead to a drop in real wages.

Phase IV: A new government implements orthodox policies to stabilize the economy. The economy is stabilized, but the new government is highly unpopular as wages have fallen lower than before Phase I ("austerity is bad"). The government is kicked out (usually through elections), and we return to Phase I.


## Outcomes

- Perón's Argentina is the paradigmatic example of the macroeconomics of populism.
- After a few years of fast growth, the economy peaks in 1949 and reaches a balance of payments crisis.
- Also, inflation jumps in 1945 and becomes a chronic problem in Argentina.
- Alfredo Gómez Morales (1908-1990) replaces Miguel Miranda as the key economic policymaker.
- Even after the coup, economic policy keeps many of the Peronist ideas.
- The new military government asks Raúl Prebisch to prepare a study about the situation of the Argentinean economy.


## ARGENTINA,

from Peron to Macri
An Economic Chronicle


## Brazil: Getúlio Vargas

- Weaker movement.
- President 1930-1945 and 1951-1954.
- First period is close to fascism (Estado Novo), the second period is closer to "classical populism."
- Focus on nationalist economic policies.
- Creation of Petrobras.
- Followed by Juscelino Kubitschek (1902-1976): "fifty years' progress in five."
- By the 1970s, 28 of the largest 30 firms in Brazil are state-run.
- Fast economic growth combined with macroeconomic instability.


## Getúlio Vargas (1882-1954)



# Brazil's State-Owned Enterprises 

ACase Study of the State as Entrepreneur

Thomas J. Trebat


Edited by
Robert M. Levine and José Carlos Sebe Bom Meihy Translated by Nancy P. S. Naro and Cristina Mehrtens

# Revolution and reaction 

## A new cycle

- Despite the electoral success of populism, much of the next decades in Latin America will be shaped by a cycle of revolution and reaction.
- Consequence of many complex reasons, well beyond what we can consider here.
- Interestingly, the first act happens in a small, peripheral country: Guatemala.


## Guatemala

- The Jorge Ubico (1878-1946) regime is thrown away on July 1944. Followed by Federico Ponce Vaides (1889-1956).
- October Revolution (1944) led Jacobo Árbenz (1913-1971) and Francisco Javier Arana (1905-1949).
- Presidency of Juan José Arévalo (1904-1990): "spiritual socialism."
- Deep unhappiness with the position of the United Fruit Company in Guatemala, vagrancy laws, and repression:

1. Labor reform (Código del Trabajo).
2. Creation of the Guatemalan Institute of Social Security (Instituto Guatemalteco de la Seguridad Social).
3. Creation of the National Indigenist Institute (Instituto Indigenista Nacional).

## Jacobo Árbenz Guzmán (1913-1971)



## Árbenz's presidency

- Jacobo Árbenz wins the presidential election in 1950 with a large majority.
- Strong nationalist rhetoric.
- Three pillars for the development of a modern economy:

1. Land reform (Decree 900). The land is given to farmers in usufruct (different from previous agrarian reforms in Mexico and Bolivia) and payment to landowners in interest-bearing bonds. Similar to reform in Taiwan.
2. Public-owned utility based on the hydroelectric Jurún Marinalá.
3. Transportation (new road and port Santo Tomás de Castilla in the Atlantic).

## The 1954 coup

- Coup of 1954. Role of the Dulles brothers.
- Followed by harsh repression.
- Impact all across Latin America: Cuba no es Guatemala.
- A three-part documentary (a bit biased and uncritical):

1. https://youtu.be/kIaIe8NbOSo.
2. https://youtu.be/gNGPj1tyrzQ.
3. https://youtu.be/nYJL9eHFuYw.

- Interesting comparison with Costa Rica and the role of José María Figueres Ferrer (1906-1990).


## A great novel




## The Cuban Revolution, I

- January 1, 1959: Fidel Castro's troops from the 26th of July Movement enter Havana.
- "Triumph of the Revolution": barely two years after landing on December 2, 1956.
- Paradox: revolution triumphs in one of the richest countries of Latin America:

1. Roughly comparable to Italy or Spain.
2. More unequal, though, especially along the urban/rural and white/black axes.

- Also, highly dependent on sugar and tourism (Mafia in Havana).


CUBA IN PERSPECTIVE FOR 1955 AND 1925
$($ U.S. $=100$ )

|  | PPP Adjusted |  |  | 1925 Extrapolations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Income per Capita | Output per Worker | Consumption Capita | Income per Capita | Output per Worker |
| Belgium | 53 | 56 | 52 | 68 | 67 |
| Denmark | 51 | 45 | 54 | 52 | 48 |
| France | 49 | 46 | 51 | 57 | 41 |
| Germany FR | 51 | 46 | 48 | 54 | 41 |
| Italy | 29 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 27 |
| Netherlands | 47 | 51 | 43 | 56 | 55 |
| Norway | 55 | 56 | 54 | 43 | 41 |
| United Kingdom | 57 | 52 | 59 | 65 | 56 |
| Argentina | 31 | 32 | 35 | 40 | 40 |
| Bolivia | 7 | 7 | 8 | - | - |
| Brazil | 9 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Chile | 23 | 27 | 28 | 32 | 35 |
| Colombia | 12 | 15 | 14 | 11 | 8 |
| Costa Rica | 16 | 21 | 18 | 19 | 21 |
| Cuba | 27 | 33 | 35 | 45 | 54 |
| Dominican Republic | 9 | 11 | 8 | - | - |
| Ecuador | 11 | 13 | 11 | - | - |
| El Salvador | 10 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| Guatemala | 10 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Haiti | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | - |
| Honduras | 7 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 14 |
| Mexico | 17 | 23 | 23 | 20 | 24 |
| Nicaragua | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| Panama | 15 | 19 | 18 | - | - |
| Paraguay | 9 | 11 | 11 | - | - |
| Peru | 12 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| Uruguay | 34 | 35 | 41 | 36 | 33 |
| Venezuela | 28 | 36 | 22 | 11 | 14 |

## INCOME PER CAPITA AND SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS

|  |  | Latin <br> America | United <br> States | Cuba |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Income per capita relative to United States, 1955 | 49 | 15 | 100 | 27 |
| Passenger cars per 1,000 persons, circa 1955 | 44 | 8 | 314 | 20 |
| TVs per 1,000 persons, 1960 | 81 | 11 | 308 | 73 |
| Radios per 1,000 persons, 1960 | 269 | 96 | 941 | 152 |
| Infant mortality rate, circa 1955 | 32 | 105 | 26 | 33 |
| Life expectancy at birth, circa 1955 | 71 | 50 | 69 | 64 |
| Doctors per 10,000 persons, circa 1955 | 11 | 4 | 13 | 10 |
| Literacy rate, circa 1955 | 98 | 58 | 99 | 79 |



Figure 3
INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION AND OVERALL OUTPUT


Figure 4
INCOME PER CAPITA, 1902-1958


Figure 6
THE EXTERNAL TERMS OF TRADE OF CUBA, 1902-1953
$(1953=100)$


## The Cuban Revolution, II

- Initially, a multi-class movement with the support of a large segment of society.
- The 26th of July Movement is one among several opposition groups.
- Revolution declared openly socialist in 1961.
- Fidel Castro later claimed that he made the decision in 1958, before victory, but was cautious.


## The international impact of the Cuban Revolution

- The revolution creates enormous fascination worldwide (even in the U.S.!).
- For those in favor of revolution:

1. Guerrillas can win against a formal army.
2. One does not need to wait until conditions are ripe for revolution. The insurrection can create them.
3. Revolution comes from the countryside.

- Deep impact on a new generation of left-wing leaders: Venezuela, Argentina, ...
- On the other hand, the U.S. becomes obsessed with the possibility of a "second Cuba."
- Also, it makes much of the Latin American middle class willing to support authoritarian regimes.


The New York Intellectuals and the Cuban Revolution
rafael rojas




A TALE OF TWO


HONG KONG, CUBA AND THE TWO MEN WHO SHAPED THEM

NEIL MONNERY

## THE ECONOMY OF SOCIALIST CUBA

A Two-Decade Appraisal

Carmelo Mesa-Lago


## The economic policy of the revolution

- Widespread consensus in Cuba about five goals:

1. Fast economic growth.
2. Reduce dependency on sugar through rapid industrialization and diversification of agriculture.
3. Reduce dependency on the U.S.
4. Achieve full employment.
5. Redistribute income more equally.

## Two opposing views

- Key role of Ernesto Guevara (1928-1967) during the first years of the revolution:

1. "Build the new man and woman" with an ascetic edge.
2. "Maoist" view where consciousness and commitment can overcome material constraints.
3. Budgetary financing system (Sistema presupuestario de financiamiento).

- Opposed by Carlos Rafael Rodríguez (1913-1997), who headed the National Institute for Agrarian Reform (Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria, INRA):

1. He did have an education in economics.
2. More conventional, soviet-style planning.

- Failure of Guevaristas policies will lead to the final victory of Rodríguez' approach.




## 1959-1971: Period of reversals, I

- Incoherent economic policy, with much ad hoc experimentation, but always a clear idea of moving fast to a socialist economy.
- Transformation from an economy heavily linked to the U.S. to an economy heavily linked with the Soviet Union.
- Large migration of human capital: 1.3 million, many highly skilled, including the first revolutionary prime minister (José Miró Cardona, 1902-1974).
- Outcome is disappointing, with declining productivity.


## 1959-1971: Period of reversals, II

- 1959: First agrarian reform (farms $>400$ hectares) and nationalization of rental housing.
- 1960: Large nationalizations and a central planning board (JUCEPLAN) is set up.
- 1961: Cuba is declared to be "socialist."
- 1963: Second agrarian reform (farms $>67$ hectares).
- 1968: Revolutionary offensive. 55,636 small businesses nationalized.
- 1969: Year of the decisive effort.
- A ten-million-ton sugar harvest, planned for January 1969 to July 1970: goal to be transformative. Enormous effort, labor recruited. Fails short (8.5), low sugar price.


## Collectivization percentage

| Year | 1961 | 1963 | 1968 | 1977 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture | 37 | 70 | 70 | 79 |
| Industry | 85 | 95 | 100 | 100 |
| Construction | 80 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Transportation | 92 | 95 | 98 | 98 |
| Retail trade | 52 | 75 | 100 | 100 |
| Wholesome and foreign trade | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Banking | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Education | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |



## 1971-1990: "belated honeymoon" with the Soviet Union

- Soviet Union was a key supporter of Cuba since 1960. Vital to get around the U.S. economic sanctions.
- However, the initial decade of relations is complicated.
- Yuri Palov: "belated honeymoon" after 1968.
- Cuba breaks with China in June 1969.
- Introduction of Soviet-style central planning.
- 1972: Cuba joins COMECON.
- Opening of farmers' markets after the mass exodus from the Port of Mariel in the spring of 1980.


## 1990-2023: A never-ending "Special Period"

- 1990: Collapse of the Soviet Union: $85 \%$ of Cuban exports go to the Soviet Union and Eastern block at subsidized prices. Imports: $100 \%$ of oil, machinery, fertilizers, irons, foodstuff...
- Output probably drops by $35 \%$..
- New sources of revenue: tourism, remittances from Cuban diaspora, small businesses, and self-employment.
- Saved by Hugo Chavez's election: new oil subsidies in exchange for doctors and security services.
- Raul Castro's new reforms.
- Extremely difficult to assess economic performance: no good data.
- Charles E. Lindblom: "strong thumbs, no fingers."


## A Chilean alternative?

- Salvador Allende becomes president of Chile on November 1970 after a contested three-way election against Radomiro Tomic and Jorge Alessandri. Role of Christian Democrats.
- Previous experience of Eduardo Frei (President, 1964-1970).
- "La vía chilena al socialismo" ("The Chilean Way to Socialism"): agrarian reform, nationalization of industries, ...
- Traditional boom-and-bust cycle: expansionary fiscal and monetary policies lead, first, to fast output growth but soon after that to high inflation.
- Made worse by fluctuations in the price of copper and political tensions.
- A few crazy ideas: Project Cybersyn, inspired by Stafford Beer.


Eduardo Frei Montalva: un gobierno reformista A 50 años de la "Revolución en Libertad"

CARLOS HUNEEUS, JAVIER COUSO (Editores)


## Reaction

- Military coups:
- Brazil, 1964.
- Chile, 1973.
- Argentina, 1976.
- New generation of military dictators: neither old-fashion caudillos (except residuals of the past such as Alfredo Stroessner, 1912-2006) nor juntas fixing political impasses, but bent on a radical and thorough re-ordering of society even if by violent means (e.g., "Proceso de Reorganización Nacional" in Argentina).
- Guillermo O'Donnell: "bureaucratic-authoritarian" regimes.
- Because the states have become so essential, the fight for their control becomes fierce.



## Political economy of the dictatorships

- Large heterogeneity.
- Juan Velasco (1910-1977) in Peru: land reform, expropriation of foreign oil and mining companies, purchase of weapons from the Soviet Union, and support of the Communist party.
- Brazil: developmental state, nationalist support of industries.
- Chile: aggressive market reforms (but cooper industry never privatized).
- Military rule is not better on average than democratic rule regarding economic performance.



# Guardians OF THE NATION? 

Economists, Generals, and
Economic Reform in Latin America


Glen Biglaiser

