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THE 57TH PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

by

Ashleigh Angell

Experiencing firsthand the Presidential Inauguration of Barack Obama on January 21, 2013 is something I will never forget. The sheer excitement of the day was amazing. Everyone I encountered in Washington DC was excited for the occasion and very much in the spirit of the day. My cousin and I left her apartment six hours before the ceremony to walk the two miles from her apartment to the National Mall. The Metro (subway) was so full of people that trains were being diverted past the National Mall station to prevent any accidents.

When we got to the Mall, the security lines were absolutely nuts! They were so long, yet surprisingly efficient. I would estimate that there were at least 300-500 people in front of us when we got in our security line and it only took a little over an hour to make our way through. Those of us who had tickets were divided into separate security lines based on the color of the ticket you had. Our tickets were in the gold section, which was the last section of tickets. Those without a ticket could enter the back half of the national mall and even though they were much further away security ended up closing off the mall about an hour before festivities started because capacity had been reached. There were over two million people there that day!

Things got underway when the dignitaries started making their way onto the capitol steps. I remember how excited the crowd got when former President Jimmy Carter, former President Bill Clinton, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and Vice President Joe Biden and his family were introduced. The mostly Democratic Party crowd was less welcoming of Speaker John Boehner and former Speaker Newt Gingrich. The Supreme Court justices likewise received rather tepid reception.
Senator Charles Schumer, chair of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, opened the ceremony. The Invocation was read by Myrlie Evers-Williams, who is a civil rights activist and the widow of Medgar Evers who was assassinated in 1963 for his efforts during the civil rights movement. There was also a performance by the Brooklyn Tabernacle Choir. Vice President Biden was sworn in by Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor and President Obama by Chief Justice John Roberts.

The President’s inaugural address touched on many issues including ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, pursuing economic recovery, and reforming the tax code so the burden of the national debt does not lay so heavily on the middle class, and reforming schools to ensure all Americans receive a decent education. I will never forget listening to the President’s speech in person: we were completely captivated by everything he said. The issues I found most significant were the President’s determination that the United
States must lead the way in finding sustainable energy resources, providing equal pay for women and upholding the rights for homosexual couples.

Following the address, Kelly Clarkson performed, and a poet, Richard Blanco, read a poem written for the occasion. The benediction was given by Rev. Louie Giglio. The events concluded after Beyonce sang the National Anthem.

Political Science is the study of government and politics, and there is a great deal that goes into understanding how our government operates. The Presidential Inauguration is an excellent example of American politics brought to life. It illustrates how both sides of the aisle can set aside their differences for one day and celebrate, not only the beginning of a new presidential term, but also a new chapter for our country. It is an unforgettable experience that every American should have at least once!

Below: Ashleigh’ at the inauguration
The lives and struggles of Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Salvador Allende Gossens reflect the historical struggles of Latin America itself. At the time of their birth (1908 and 1928), the region had been immersed in centuries-long conflicts which saw lower-class Latinos fighting for basic rights such as food, clothing, sanitary dwellings, fair labor and political opportunity from the Latin American elite and their modern-day imperial allies. Emancipation from these local and foreign powers was the central motivation for Guevara and Allende. Through the virtues of their birthright, studies and experiences, each man would come to develop and employ a particular philosophy to accomplish that freedom: Guevara promoted the method of armed revolutionary struggle and Salvador the path of reform via democratic participation and constitutional discipline. Their efforts were not welcomed by everyone (as the elite and imperial powers). Guevara and Allende rallied their own forces to oppose revolutionary movements. The upper-class never wanted to share their wealth, and they collaborated with various U.S. government agencies such as the State Department, C.I.A. as well as with American corporations stationed in Latin America to sabotage these uprisings. It is my intent to examine the similarities and differences in Guevara and Allende's approaches, the effects of their actions upon their supporters and opponents, and the potential options that may have allowed their endeavors to succeed in the manner that they had envisioned, and, many had hoped, would come to pass.

**The Early Years and Philosophical Developments**

All human beings can be best understood by examining their childhood. Both Guevara and Allende came from families which consisted of noble bloodlines and educated, liberal-minded professionals. While Allende was born into a family of diplomats and indoctrinated into a political and legal approach to life, Guevara was born into more open-minded parents who encouraged his adventurous spirit.

**Salvador Allende.** Salvador Allende was born in 1908 in the city of Valparaiso, Chile to an educated and prosperous middle-class family. His mother, Laura Gossens Uribe, was a devout Catholic and was a descendant of French immigrants who belonged to the professional class of citizenry. His father, Salvador Allende Castro, was a lawyer who worked as a public defender for ordinary Chileans. Cockcroft (2000) stated that the father introduced the ideas of social reform and the separation of the Church and the State to the young Salvador. He also had a
Salvador Allende, founder of Chile's Socialist Party
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grandfather who was famous for his contributions as a doctor and founding the first public school and maternity clinic in Chile.

Allende's first witnessed the violent treatment of lower-class citizens when he visited Santiago when he was 8 years old. The mayor of the town was his uncle, Ramon Allende Castro, who displayed his "outrage at government-ordered massacres of workers" to Salvador and his father. The mayor explained that government forces used "with bullets and bayonets...the workers aren't fed, nor are social problems resolved. Our stupid government can't comprehend this simple truth" (Cockcroft 2000, 4). The moral Christian values from his mother, the prestige of a grandfather in the medical field, and the legal and political influence of his father and family would all contribute to Salvador's belief in the democratic and diplomatic methods of revolution.

After Allende finished high school, he enrolled in the military to complete his required service. It is here that he befriended "progressive, socially conscious soldiers and officers" and Cockcroft that this experience "along with Chile's 160 consecutive years of governance with a parliament, may have influenced Allende's later faith in the institution of Chile's military, a military that ultimately destroyed him and parliament" (2000, 5). After high school he enrolled at the University of Chile to begin his medical studies. The practice of medicine and the implementation of health services would be a central theme in Allende's life. Much like his grandfather before him, he volunteered many hours to serve the community and sought far-reaching reforms in health care.
Allende also became deeply educated in Marxism during his college years. Like many of his middle-class, educated countrymen who identified with the plight of the peasantry, this philosophy became a lens through which the instigators of the oppressive conditions in Latin America could be identified, namely the elite and their foreign capitalist allies. Allende participated in, and helped found, leftist student movements. One of his friends from his military service, Marmaduke Grove, launched a coup on June 4, 1962 that overthrew the itinerant right-wing government. When Grove was overthrown himself by individuals within his own government 12 days later, Allende was arrested and imprisoned for speaking out against the dissident factionalists within Grove's regime. Amidst the turmoil, Allende's father was dying. The culmination of his life thus far into a role of activism for a just cause, and the passing of the father who was symbolic of that struggle for Allende, was most likely what caused him to make "the promise that I would dedicate my life to the social struggle and the freedom of Chile." (Cockcroft 2000, 6)

Ernesto "Che" Guevara. Che Guevara was born on May 14, 1928 in Rosario, Argentina but his birthday is generally dated June 14th. His mother explained "the deception had been necessary...because she was three months pregnant when she married Guevara's father" (Anderson 1997, 3) and wanted to protect the sanctity of her Catholic marriage and birth. His mother, Celia de la Serna, is a descendant of pure Spanish nobility which boasted of one ancestor who was the viceroy of Peru during the colonial era and another who was a renowned Argentine military general. Her grandfather was a wealthy landowner and her father a law professor, congressman and ambassador. She herself had graduated from a prestigious women's Catholic school and was entitled to an inheritance at the age of twenty-one. His father, Ernesto Guevara Lynch, was descended from Spanish and Irish nobility and whose great-grandfather had been one of the richest men in South America. He dropped out of college "to have his own adventures and make his own fortune" (Anderson 1997, 5) like his ancestors.
He and his wife bought a plantation to grow yerba mate deep in the jungles of southern Argentina, and it was here that Guevara spent his earliest years as a child. At age 4, due to his notorious bronchial afflictions, the family moved to Alta Gracia in the drier highland climates. Guevara was a voracious reader. His mother and father were independent-minded and of a liberal nature, thus allowing him to read whatever he liked. A childhood friend, Jose Aguilar, remarked that "my father, who was a doctor, was upset by the fact that Ernesto read the works of Freud at the age of fourteen and that his parents did not mind" (Alexandre 1968, 13). Guevara, having been tutored by his mother, learned French and poetry along with other Latin American writings. By the age of 18 he, like Allende, began to become a student of Marxism. He was known for his fearlessness as a young child and teenager, performing daredevil-like stunts and actively participating in rough sports with boys much older than him.

Che Guevara’s parents allowed him to pursue his own individual beliefs. The Guevaras were said to adhere to few social customs, associating with upper and lower class peoples, and were referred to as "Bohemian" (Anderson 1997). Che himself was headstrong and resisted discipline, and his adventurous spirit would lead him to travel. He started medical school in 1945, but his lust for adventure led Guevara to travel across South America with his friend Alberto Granado in 1951. This trek solidified both Guevara’s identification with the people of Latin America, and his disgust for the elite and imperial forces that kept them impoverished.

During their trek through Chile, Guevara and Alberto came across an indigenous couple in the night. Guevara described the meeting in an emotional manner:

The couple, numb with cold, huddling against each other in the desert night, was a living representation of the proletariat in any part of the world. They had not a single miserable blanket to cover themselves with, so we gave them one of ours...It was one of the coldest times in my life, but also one which made me feel a little more brotherly toward this strange...human species (Guevara 2003, 77-78).

The two traveled further north, into Peru and the heart of the former Incan empire. Che was "appalled by the conditions of the Indians now totally degraded by hunger, exploitation and addiction to coca" (Alexendre 1968, 16). Shortly thereafter, Che would discuss his deep-seated belief that armed struggle was the only way to remedy the situation. While Alberto was musing aloud about fomenting a revolution by uniting the indigenous communities and peacefully winning over the government’s sympathy to accomplish a revolution, Guevara remarked; "Make the revolution without firing a shot? Are you crazy" (Alexendre 1968, 16)? The trip culminated with his visit to a leprosy colony in Venezuela, where Guevara befriended and cared for the
patients. Much later in life, Guevara's medical experience would meld with a guerilla spirit, creating his ideology of the "revolutionary doctor" where individuals of the medical field must meet their duties in health care and combat for the sake of their comrades.

A year after he had returned from his travels abroad, Guevara again left to visit his friend Alberto in Venezuela. However, Guevara ended up in Guatemala. He witnessed how the democratically-elected government of Jacobo Arbenz was overthrown by a C.I.A.-supported coup the purpose of which was to protect the profits of the American multinational corporation, The United Fruit Company. Guevara was aware of the duplicity of then Secretary of State Allen Dulles serving as a stockholder and attorney for the company as well. His first wife Hilda Gadea recalled, "It was Guatemala which finally convinced him of the necessity for armed struggle and for taking the initiative against imperialism. By the time he left (Guatemala), he was sure of this" (Alexendre 1968, 19). Guevara, now a self-proclaimed Communist, would join Fidel Castro's guerilla army and overthrow the Cuban dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista to help establish the first ever socialist, and eventually communist, government in the Western hemisphere.

Common Goals, Different Tactics

Socialism. Both Guevara and Allende believed that this political system would suit Latin America. Under socialism, individual citizens could determine their economic future as they could decide on how to use their land. This meant that no large, corporate institutions would be allowed to establish monopolies over their particular industry as they did over the previous century. Although their respective governments would act as an overseer of the process, Allende and Guevara enacted policies specifically geared towards providing the peasantry with an opportunity to create self-sufficiency.

Reform. The feeling of both men towards Latin American citizens can be summed up in a quote by Che Guevara: "No matter where I've been in Latin America, I never considered myself a foreigner. In Guatemala I thought of myself as a Guatemalan, in Mexico-a Mexican, in Peru-a Peruvian, and now in Cuba-a Cuban..." (Lavretsky 1976, 145). There was no higher purpose than to help facilitate decent living conditions for the peasants, which is why Allende and Guevara dedicated themselves to community service and political/public representation. Upon assuming office, both used this deep connection with Latin Americans as a motivation to bring systematic changes in agriculture, healthcare, and resource nationalization.

Agrarian Reform was at the top of the list for Allende and Guevara because it lay at the heart of economic stagnation for Latin America: the Latifundios. Since the colonial era, a small percentage of individuals held vast swathes of the land which was granted by the Spanish Crown. This was significant because the region's
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The economy was based on agriculture, cattle ranching and mining. Guevara and Allende believed these lands should be redistributed to the lower-class citizens so that they could create self-sustaining communities. Allende gave exceptional attention not just to the peasantry but to indigenous tribes within Chile’s borders. In his policies and speeches, he argued that "it is a national obligation...to not forget Chile's debt to the people of the Araucanian race, who are our ancestors" and that the government would "give them (Araaucanian and Mapuche tribes) their lands and dignify their existence..." (Cockcroft 2000, 71-72). By the end of Allende's first year in office, his government had appropriated 1,379 landed estates (Boorstein 1977) and returned them to the people. Guevara likewise announced and moved to implement agrarian reform within the Cuban government immediately after the rebel victory, explaining that "in Cuba two thousand owners...held 47% of the land" and that [speaking of his and Castro's new regime], "if the authorities did not affect an agrarian reform the peasants themselves would take the land which was rightfully theirs" (Lavretsky 1976, 146).

Physical health was just as important to these two leaders as was emancipation from the socioeconomic disparities in their countries. In a speech to the nation Allende stated, that "the formidable boom of...scientific progress, advances in hygiene and medicine...have all bypassed the great majority of Chileans...who, after all, are the ones who create public wealth" (Cockcroft 2000, 36). In his earlier years as Chile's Health Minister, Allende drafted legislation that, in 1952, would become Chile's National Health Service and provide health care to 3 million Chileans (Cockcroft 2000) and he would continue to push for preventive healthcare such as healthier meals for children to fight malnutrition. Guevara was likewise concerned, being famous for his voluntary work within the leprosy colonies dating back to 1951. He also provided long hours of medical and other community service to Cubans after the war was won. During the war Guevara also developed his role of the "revolutionary doctor," stressing the relation between health care and armed revolutionary struggle in his personal diary:

...the guerilla doctor must go everywhere with his comrades and fulfill all other duties of a guerrilla as well, including that of combat...the doctor has the most influence on the other men and their morale, because, to a man in pain, a simple aspirin takes on importance if it is administered by someone who identifies with his suffering (Alexandre 1968, 27).

Guevara also participated in establishing government standards that would provide free health care and education to Cuban citizens, a policy that has not been replicated even in the most industrially, medically and technologically "advanced" nations of our modern day.

Another concern was the nationalization of natural resources. From the copper mines in Chile, to the vast sugar cane plantations of Cuba, and every financial, industrial and private company that existed in between, Allende and Che confiscated
of all properties and businesses that belonged to foreign multinational corporations. Allende said that this policy "the power of national and foreign monopolistic capitalism and of the big landowners" (MacEoin 1974, 70), while Guevara opined that "Agrarian reform meant the destruction of monopolies which prevented the peasantry from working the land" (Alexendre1968, 31). In Chile, U.S. companies like Kennecott, Anaconda and ITT dominated the profits of its natural resources. In Cuba, the U.S. Department of Commerce report in 1956 stated that U.S. companies controlled "90% of telephone and electric services, about 50% in public service railways, and 40% of raw sugar production" with one quarter of all bank deposits in the country going to Cuban banks that served as branches for U.S. financial institutions (Johnson, 1965). Nationalization of these company's assets was specifically aimed at ending foreign control and weakened local political elites who also profited.

**Armed Struggle or Constitutional Revolution.** While Guevara and Allende espoused the same ideology and proposed similar reforms, they differed on how to achieve change in Latin America.

The first difference was guns versus ballots. For Guevara, there was no question that revolution required armed resistance. His studies, travels and experience before and during the Cuban revolution showed him how deeply U.S. companies were so financially vested in Latin America, that they were willing to support the overthrow of anti-imperial governments and the deaths of tens of thousands of their supporters to protect those profits. He consistently believed that "armed struggle is the only solution for the peoples who fight to free themselves" (Anderson 1997, 599). In his journals, he writes that: (1) the people's forces can win a war against the regular army; (2) it is not necessary to wait until all conditions are favorable to start a revolution because the insurrection itself can bring about these conditions; and (3) in the underdeveloped nations of America, the basic field of action for armed struggle must be the countryside (Alexendre 1968, 31). These tenets would be the basis of Che Guevara’s internationally known book Guerilla Warfare where he systematically explained how the process of guerilla warfare can be developed and executed to maintain the regime of a newly-installed revolutionary government.

Allende, in contrast, had a constitutional approach. He would be defeated twice in two presidential elections, including in 1964 when the C.I.A. funneled $2.4 million into the campaign of his opponent Eduardo Frei (Boorstein 1977). Yet Allende remained content to wait until he could win the presidency in a democratic fashion, because he believed that the best way for the people to demonstrate the desire for change by a unified act of free will: casting a vote. Allende's approach "worked to prevent the conspirators from obtaining the moral and constitutional justification" (Boorstein 1977, 65) they would claim in protection against armed rebellions such as those led by Guevara and Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Allende and Guevara also differed on their views about aligning with the USSR. Allende did not attempt to befriend the Soviet Union at any time during his presidency. He openly criticized the Soviet Union during its occupation of
Czechoslovakia in the 1960's and did not at any juncture seek their protection. Guevara and Castro had openly stated that the Socialist revolution in Latin America would have been impossible without the support and protection of the Soviet Union. The economic and political agreements immediately signed between the two countries after the war was of less significance than the military support that was given to Cuba to defend against U.S.-backed insurrections such as that of the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961. Che had happily noted in a speech given on June 10, 1960:

Let these creatures of the Pentagon and the American monopolies, who have carried out their criminal activities with impunity on Latin American soil now beware...Cuba is no longer a remote and isolated island in the ocean defended only by the bare hands of its sons and the noble endeavors of the oppressed throughout the world. The Cuba of today is a glorious island in the middle of the Caribbean Sea under the protection of the rockets of the mightiest power in history (Lavretsky 1976, 168)!

Guevara and Allende also differed on how they treated their respective military forces. In all of Latin America, the military posed the greatest threat to government regimes. Guevara and Castro moved immediately replaced the heads of the local police and army with trusted revolutionary comrades to prevent any possibility of a U.S.-supported coup. Men who were known to be loyal to the former dictator Fulgencio Batista were weeded out, tried, and executed within weeks of the rebel victory. In Chile, the military was allowed to stay intact after Allende won the presidency. According to Boorstein (1977, 65), "Allende appealed to the constitutionalism and patriotism of the armed forces" preferring to speak with the heads of the military to prevent hostility. Allende was asked many times by supporters within his Popular Unity party to either replace the heads of the military, arm the people, or create a joint civilian-military faction. During a visit by Fidel Castro, Allende warned of the dangers that lurked within the Chilean military, yet Allende steadfastly maintained that the armed forces would remain within the boundaries of the constitution (Cockcroft 2000). Although the initial leaders in the barracks did allow Allende and his Socialist government to try ruling, his unwillingness to control the military allowed anti-socialist elements within to gain some power which would eventually, lead to the downfall of his presidency.

**The Fall of the Revolution’s Leaders**

The philosophies and policies of both men created an anticipated backlash from wealthy elites in Latin America. As noted earlier, this class of Latin Americans controlled the region’s wealth and thus stood to lose the most along with their U.S. corporate allies. Through the collaborative efforts of wealthy Latinos and U.S. military agencies, most notably the C.I.A., Che and Allende would be cornered and executed for their part in the revolutionary process.
**Salvador Allende.** Prior to his endorsement during the months of July to September 1970, 5,300 U.S. citizens entered the country, (Boorstein 1977) most of whom, if not all, were assumed to be C.I.A. affiliates. The United States had tried to create dissent amongst Chileans toward Allende through economic sabotage and by fomenting social chaos during these months. Richard Nixon had famously stated his desire to "make (Chile's) economy scream" by cutting off all international financing received from institutions such as the World Bank and the I.M.F. in the hopes that the scarcities that would be created on the community level would create mass frustration and be turned toward Allende. The presidential election of 1970 had to be formally inaugurated by the Chilean government since Allende did not win the majority of the votes. After signing an agreement that guaranteed his government would not become authoritarian, Allende's opponents prepared to approve his presidency. For his Latin America and U.S. enemies, these concessions neutralized "the last thin hope of a coup with constitutional cover...Now the chances of blocking Allende depended on a straight military coup" (Boorstein 1977, 68).

Rene Schneider, who was head of the armed forces at the time, was an obstacle to a planned coup, because he was loyal to the constitution. Under direction from President Richard Nixon and Secretary of the State Henry Kissinger, the C.I.A. assassinated Schneider on October 22, 1970 (Cockcroft 2000). This provoked such outrage that Chileans immediately approved Allende's presidency. The U.S. then temporarily moved into the background.

Over the next two years, however, the U.S. government would rapidly reinvigorate its efforts as Allende’s reforms proved detrimental to multinational corporations and their Latin American military allies. U.S. financial institutions and C.I.A. affiliates sabotaged the Chilean economy, physical property and infrastructure. Covert "labor" and "community" organizations and media outlets like the C.I.A. sponsored *El Murcurio* newspaper, Chilean politicians, and radio and television stations followed up by blaming the chaos on Allende's government. This helped to create an atmosphere of dissent toward Allende. The US once again focused on influencing the Chilean armed forces. Since 1950, 4,000 troops had received US training in Panama. By the summer of 1973, more than half of the Latin American trainees had received “specialized” military were Chilean (MacEoin, 1974, 151). The last few months leading up to September: saw a failed coup attempt in June, followed by a purging of left-wing elements within the barracks. Navy recruits reported being tortured by Pinochet’s men until they named pro-Allende supporters, who subsequently, were found dead (Cockcroft 2000). A wave of reassignments in key posts followed, including on August 23 when the head of the armed forces, General Prats was replaced by General Augusto Pinochet (Boorstein 1977). On the morning of September 11, 1973, the presidential palace was bombed and invaded by troops, emerging soon after with the dead body of Salvador Allende.

**Che Guevara.** True to his adventurous spirit, Guevara would again set out from Cuba in March of 1965 to foment revolution in the African Congo. After a failed campaign, he sought his next opportunity for revolution and ended up in Bolivia. It
is not known whether the fatal decision to go to Bolivia was made by Guevara or urged by Castro (Anderson 1997). It is known, however, that this is where Guevara's final campaign would begin.

From the onset, Guevara clashed with his acquaintance and official of the Bolivian Communist Party, Mario Monje, about who would lead the guerilla unit. Monje, refusing to let foreigners lead the charge, stormed off from their New Year's Eve meeting of 1966, accused by Guevara's group as having "perpetuated...an act of 'conscious treason'" by breaking ties with the band afterwards and leaving them in the wilderness on their own (Anderson 1997, 672-73). There were also numerous problems with Guevara's army: broken communication devices, loss of contact with Castro, limited contact with the outside world, and scarce supplies. In addition, Guevara's army was discovered by the Bolivian Army, because their Bolivian government insider had her cover blown. After finding some abandoned photos and paperwork left by Guevara's band, the Bolivian President seized the opportunity to "create the appeal to xenophobia...in this intensely nationalistic country..." (Anderson 1997, 680) by painting the guerillas as communist invaders and pro-Castro Cubans. The capture and interrogation of Regis Debray, a longtime comrade of Guevara's confirmed Guevara's presence in Bolivia. The C.I.A. immediately sent over-trained cadres of counter-revolutionaries led by the infamous agent Felix Rodriguez, who was involved in the Bay of Pigs and later in Vietnam, the Contra War in Nicaragua and counter-insurrection activities in El Salvador (Spartacus, 2012).

Ironically, the last months leading up to Guevara's capture involved the C.I.A. and Bolivian military using the tactics himself had enumerated in his Guerilla Warfare. He noted how, upon entering small isolated villages, army forces had distributed "anti-guerilla propaganda...land titles to peasants...school supplies in rural areas...and had been actively ferreting out intelligence from the peasant communities for months" (Anderson 1997, 697-98). Turning the peasantry against the rebels enabled the Bolivian army to locate and ambush the remainder of Che's men. Guevara was captured on October 8th and briefly interrogated over the course of a day. According to C.I.A. agent Felix Rodriguez, Guevara was executed at 1:10 p.m. on October the 9th (Anderson 1997, 709).

**Could It Have Been Different?**

In examining how the ideals and philosophies of Guevara and Allende shaped their lives, I would also like to ask the question: what could they have done differently? In Allende's case, he became a victim of the human capacity for violence for three reasons: (1) that he believed violence/aggression was not the correct path to revolution, that (2) violent/hostile elements around him would keep themselves in check, and thus; (3) he did not act with a forceful hand. This is best exemplified by the assassination of the head of the armed forces, Rene Schneider, just before Allende's inauguration and the failed coup against his government on June 29, 1973,
which was just two months prior to the final coup. Additionally, Guevara had been captured and killed by the time of Allende’s presidency and numerous countries had fallen to U.S.-backed coups which he was well aware of, yet he seemed to have believed that his government would be an exception. There are some seeming inconsistencies in his approach however, as he would act forcefully at times when he should have maintained diplomacy. Nationalizing Chile’s resources was a forceful act that Allende surely knew would arouse resentment. Could he possibly have used the U.S.’s tactics of "divide and conquer" instead, offering Latin American elites the opportunity to own a percentage of the profits along with the lower class citizenry, thereby driving a wedge between them and their foreign allies at least long enough for the peasantry to gain solidarity and economic power? Reacting to violent threats against his regime, he was quoted at times stating “if the bourgeoisie resorted to violence, the UP (Popular Unity) would answer with violence,” (Boorstein 1977, 80) though he was known for urging calm amongst his followers at all times. And on September 11, an hour before the military began bombing the capital, he was given an order, and a chance, to surrender and leave the Presidential Palace. Why did he decide to entrench himself with a rifle in the only moment when he was guaranteed to not have a chance of winning an armed fight? And could there have been a chance for him to retake Chile had he been left alive? Perhaps his willingness to play with fire was an expression of his culturally inherited machismo, or tendency toward toughness in Latin American culture, or perhaps he had the intention all along of maintaining a non-confrontational stance, and believed it would be reciprocated by everyone else.

For Guevara, it would seem that there are three central factors that led to his young death as well: (1) he was headstrong in his convictions; (2) he believed that that successful of armed struggle in Cuba could be duplicated everywhere, thus; (3) his seeming unwillingness to consider there may have been other options. The root cause of failure in Bolivia seemed to stem from a lack of patience in building a better infrastructure among the peasantry and urban areas prior to his arrival. The divisions and resentment of his troops toward one another also exacerbated their chemistry as none had expected to be fighting in Bolivia with a group consisting of Bolivians, Peruvians, and Argentineans, with Cubans in charge of the operation, and none were aware, prior to his arrival, that they would be led by Che Guevara himself (Anderson 1997). Could Guevara likewise not have used the American tactics against it as the U.S. had done with Guevara's own Guerilla Warfare manual against him in Bolivia? Could he not have focused on a long-term solution and begun building a formidable covert organization similar to the C.I.A. to accomplish the overthrow of U.S.-backed regimes? He was, after all, in a very good position to do so being because Cuba was already under Soviet protection and had been training troops on a small scale to assist in revolutions in other Latin American countries. Perhaps Che could have focused, in a diplomatic sense even, on building a large coalition which consisted of men from every Latin American country, making the armed rebellion a true patriotic act for all of Latin America. It should also be noted that a large drawback to an armed revolution is the inability to institute democratic participation
in the aftermath, because in order for an anti-imperial regime to maintain itself, it must, at least in the short term, become authoritarian to repress any malignant forces loyal to the old government if it wishes to create order and stability. Thus Guevara's preference for force not only limited his options but also prevented further political development.

**Conclusion**

It has been said that dedicating oneself to the improvement of others' lives is the highest form of sacrifice, and for Guevara and Allende, that sacrifice was a birthright. Their methods differed between violence & non-violence, but their message was the same, justice for all. The rarity of such individuals is compounded by the fact that they always seem to be in opposition to a larger, more cohesive force, such as those of the Latin American elite and the U.S., and, more times than not, fell under the relentless pursuit of their opponents for an expansion of an already massive amount of wealth. Many of the injustices they struggled against such as poverty, unemployment, landlessness and exploitation by a global economy, led by the U.S., persist to this day. One might be tempted to say that their efforts were futile, but this is not true. Guevara and Allende have left foundations for future generations to build upon. Their conviction that all human beings deserve the opportunity to build a better tomorrow resonates until today.
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Divorce laws vary from country to country, and some of them are influenced by religious backgrounds and others are influenced by cultural values. These differences could stretch from one extreme end to another such as some regions prohibit divorce, and some regions allow non-fault divorce. I was surprised to find out that four countries, with different cultural and religious backgrounds, happened to share one common denominator: the movement towards modernity to protect women’s rights. These countries are Ireland, Japan, India and the United States particularly the state of California.

Ireland is a country of Roman Catholic faith, and divorce was therefore considered as a sin. When the United Kingdom colonized Ireland in the sixteenth century, the United Kingdom tried to impose Protestantism. Because of this, the Irish people firmly held onto Catholicism as an act of defiance since Ireland’s 1937 constitution prohibited divorce and the ban lasted for sixty years. Michelle Dillon, the author of Debating Divorce argues that gender inequality was strong, and women depended on marriage to achieve social status and financial security (1993, 71). Irish women, however, considered the equality obtained through divorce settlements as unable to resolve their financial and social inequality; trying to pass laws granting divorce was not their main concern.

In the past fifteen years, Irish divorce law has changed from being influenced by traditional Catholic belief to that of modern Western European values. The women’s liberation movement in the United States and Western Europe gradually influenced public opinions on divorce very slowly in Ireland. Previous efforts to remove the ban were unsuccessful, advocates tried again in 1986 to remove the ban and introduce no-fault divorce, but they also failed. Advocates of divorce were successful in 1997, when the law was passed despite strong opposition from Catholic churches (Irish Divorce and the EU 2005). That law allowed couples to file for divorce proceedings after four years of separation.

Over time, divorce procedures have become easier. After Ireland opted in to an EU regulation called Brussels II, Irish couples who resided in another EU country were able to demand a divorce under EU divorce law. In England, for example, only two years of separation is required to seek for divorce procedure which is two years shorter than Ireland. In addition, divorce in England allows
for a softer parental custody regime. Therefore, couples seek this type of foreign divorce because it is easier (Irish Divorce and the EU 2005).

In contrast, the divorce rate in Japan was traditionally high since the 1600s due to the practice of polygamy. According to Harald Fuess, “the men have as many women as they wish, although they usually regard one of them as their true and proper wife” (2004, 1). The divorce procedure at that time of history was extremely easy: the wife could simply write a divorce letter to her husband.

According to Fuess, Japan’s National Diet passed the Civil Code in 1898 to regulate the divorce procedures; in addition, the Japanese Imperial constitution of 1889 defined a marriage as an equal union between man and woman, which officially ended polygamy in Japan (2004, 1). Accordingly, the divorce rate gradually dropped. Nevertheless, divorce proceedings in Japan are still quite simple. Two types of divorces were permitted under the Civil Code: one is divorce by agreement and the other is divorce by judicial decision. The party who wants to pursue divorce is permitted to file for divorce based on a maximum of three grounds. Fumie Kumagai, Professor of Sociology at Kyorin University says that the common grounds filed by wives used to be adultery, financial problems, and incompatibility in personality. However, violence and abuse by husbands, adultery, and financial problems have become more common grounds due to the change in society (2006, 131). The shift in the status of females in their society can also be considered as a factor. Violence and abuse existed in the past, but Japanese wives did not feel strong enough to speak out.

The divorce rate among baby-boomers is growing in recent years, and it is called “Late-Life Divorce” which is divorce after over twenty years of marriage. In this scenario, the divorce is commonly sought by the wife rather than the husband. This type of divorce has become more common after the enactment of the reformed old-age pension division scheme which allows up to half of husband’s pension funds to be allocated to wife even after divorce (Kumagai 2006, 124). The baby-boomer Japanese wives gave up their careers after they got married to devote themselves to taking care of families. They were financially insecure due to their lack of job skills and experiences. Kumagai argues that this divorce requires judicial powers since the other party can object accordingly; the rate for a divorce by judicial power has been increasing whereas divorce by mutual consent is decreasing (2006, 129).

Unlike Japan’s monoculture society, India is a multicultural society. India was colonized by the British Empire in the eighteenth century, and the British legal system influenced India’s legal system. However, India’s unique multiculturalism granted each religious group to apply its own law. Four separate religious groups in India were permitted to govern their respective
divorce laws: Hindu, Muslim, Christian and Parsi. Nevertheless, all of their divorce laws share the same grounds for divorce which are adultery, cruelty, impotence, and chronic disease. Because of the dominance of Hindus in India, the legislature uses the Hindu divorce law code more frequently. Hindu marriage is considered as “eternal union” which lasts up to future lifetimes. Divorce was not legalized until the enactment of the Hindu Marriage Act of 1953 (Simon and Altstein 2003, 106).

India’s divorce laws evolved even further with the Marriage Laws Amendment Act of 1976. This law allowed fault-based and mutual consent divorce. In addition, the law enabled women to claim divorce because of their husband’s marital misconducts and acts of domestic violence. Additionally, India’s legislature adopted a philosophy of non-interference in the personal laws of its religious communities. This philosophy, however, conflicted with the rights guaranteed under the constitution: liberty, non-discrimination and freedom of religion. Non-interference allowed religious groups in India to practice inequality and discrimination (Simon and Altstein 2003, 103-104). In 2001, women in India finally were able to achieve the victory in their divorce rights which allowed them to attain modern divorce.

The divorce rate has been steadily increasing in the big cities of India. “Lawyers say women more often file for divorce and typically have been married for less than five years; some have no children” (In Tradition-Bound India, Female, Divorce and Happy 2008). This is due to a change in women’s social status brought about by greater financial security through their careers. Indian women became more independent and able to decide whether or not they want to stay in a marriage.

Compared to other three countries, California is known as the leader of enacting liberal laws. One landmark laws is California’s Family Law Act of 1970 which allowed no-fault divorce. This was the result of a critical demand to protect women’s rights. The old law recognized the husband as head of a family granting him sole power to manage community property. A wife who did not have income had to ask the husband’s permission to make a financial decisions. In addition, marriage used to be indissoluble without marital fault (Kay 1987, 294). At the time, both marriage and divorce processes were in favor of men. “In 1966, approximately ninety-five percent of grounds for divorce were extreme cruelty” (Kay 1987, 297). It involved complicated court procedures. The majority of Californians supported reforms to the California family codes—to allow no-fault divorce. After several years, in 1970, the legislature passed the law to allow no-fault divorce (Kay 1987, 292). This was a historical breakthrough. This law grants divorce by simple mutual agreement. This lead to the federal code being changed to the marriage dissolution standard: the Uniformed State Marriage and Divorce Act. The most common
ground for divorce is irreconcilable differences. However, other grounds can be used: child custody, support and alimony.

California is one of the pioneers in adopting collaborative family law, which is a new approach to deal with marriage breakdown. It is a dispute resolution method introduced in the early 1990s. It has become common in the last decade. Collaborative family law procedure is a dispute resolution between a couple experiencing marriage breakdown with help of attorneys and professional coaching members (Collaborative law 2011). The goal is to try to amend the strained marriage. Getting divorced or continuing to stay married is not the primary goal in collaborative procedures. The child’s welfare is deemed most important.

As the world keeps evolving and changing so do divorce laws. I was surprised to discover that the four countries shared similar transition periods in their divorce laws. Fighting for women’s rights was a common goal for the proponents. Seeking for divorce used to be in favor of men discriminating against women’s rights; however, the divorce laws now provide equal protections to both parties. As California proves, obtaining the equal rights in divorce procedure is not necessarily the primary goal in divorce, but to maintain the best interest of the child’s welfare. It is interesting to observe if the rest of the world will follow California’s foot step in the future.
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The Tea Party: Right-Wing Populism Meets the Republican Party

by

Rebecca Patchen

The Tea Party first rose to prominence in 2009 and at that time, the movement was dismissed and marginalized by political elites both from the left and the right. However, in just a year, the movement had reached critical mass and their battle cry seemed to resonate across the United States. Similar movements sprang up from coast to coast. It has been estimated that more than 800 related groups were formed in 2010 alone (Skocpol 2012). According to pundits and scholars, the Tea Party was responsible for the sweeping Republican victory in the midterm elections: they won 63 seats in the House, six in the Senate, 700 seats in state legislatures, and six new governorships (Skocpol 2012; Langman 2011; Jacobson 2011).

Despite this victory, politicians from both sides of the aisle claim that the Tea Party has “hijacked” the Republican Party and is currently pushing it too far right. Moderate Republicans do not want a realignment of the GOP. Scholars have begun to call the Tea Party a rightist populist social movement. These competing labels notwithstanding, it is uncertain how the Tea Party Movement will continue to be relevant in politics and how long the movement will last. Many conservatives assert that the Tea Party will become a permanent fixture in the political scene. If this prediction comes to pass, the Republican Party will be forced to make choices. Will it be a conservative party that causes the Republican electoral base to shrink even more, which would signal a potential Democrat majority rule in Congress? Or will the GOP move toward the middle in trying to attract a larger electoral base? If the Tea Party is not going to last, how much longer will it influence the Republican Party, and what could be the reasons for the movement to disappear?

Although all these questions and issues dominate the American political landscape, there are two things the author asserts, first, the Tea Party is a right-wing populist social movement that has frequent interactions with the Republican Party; and second, this movement will only last a few more years.
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The Literature on Social Movements

The scholarly literature on social movements is particularly useful in analyzing the Tea Party. Some authors, in particular Stein (2009) and Soule (2012) examine how social movements are transformed into social movement organizations (SMO) and how, in that process, they interact with other entities such as think tanks. Stein (2009) analyzes how social movements use their website and assess whether they are using this new media’s full potential. She comes to the conclusion that social movements do not effectively use the world-wide web to reach a broader audience or seek coalitions with other like-minded groups because their objectives flawed and there is little resource sharing.

Soule (2012) takes a different tack and discusses how social movement literature focused on movements occurring outside of firms, markets, and organizations; but not the movements occurring within them—insurgency. She argues that organizations can influence the direction of social movements in two ways – SMOs could be co-opted or repressed by “firms” (Soule 2012). Looking at social movements as “processes”, Soule points out that SMOs possess a web of connections that lead to sharing of resources, ideas, and tactics, as well as larger or more frequent collaborations with other political groups and governmental entities. She concludes that in order for social movement literature to evolve, scholars need to evaluate the notions of power and resistance on social movement formation and structure.

Another strand of social movement literature looks at populism, specifically right-wing populism which is the most common form in the United States. Populism, in the simplest form, is the language used to get “the people” mobilized and involved as a political (or social) force, and usually, it is meant to battle against the elite ruling class (Berlet 2011). There have been such movements from both the political right and left. However, as previously stated, right wing populism is more common. The United States has experienced such movements since her birth.

In his articles “Taking the Tea Parties Seriously: Corporate Globalization, Populism, and Resentment” and “Collectivists Communists, Labor Bosses, and Treason: The Tea Parties as Right-Wing Populist Counter-Subversion Panic,” (Berlet) discusses the characteristics of contemporary populist movements. He states that the more recent right-wing populist movements have changed the way they frame racism: from outright White supremacy to placing race within certain issues such as immigration and social welfare (Berlet 2011 and 2012). This type of populism, according to Berlet, creates a strained political environment because they utilize tactics like “dualism, demonization, scapegoating, conspiracy theories, and apocalyptic aggression” (Berlet 2011). He also notes that scholars need to determine who benefits from these populist movements – those who are the working class or the elites? Berlet uses history.
in his analysis, but does not fully explain what the current social movements are drawing from past movements.

Social movements often interact with representative institutions, especially political parties. In “Interactions Between Social Movements and US Political Parties”, Mildred Schwartz discusses how social movements in the United States place political parties as high-profile targets on which they can “force” the movements’ agenda onto the political scene (Schwartz 2010). There are three main categories of interaction between social movements and political parties. First, there is coordinated interaction exemplified by alliances or mergers. Second, interactions can be invasive, which includes insurgency, displacement, and co-optation. Third, these interactions can be hostile and manifested as disruption, discrediting, and purges (Ibid.). Schwartz asserts that the most frequent form of interaction is the first. However, coordinated interaction leads to a trade-off with independence and flexibility on one side and constancy with faith on the other. Schwartz adds that in recent years and with the rise of new populist movements, the latter two types of interaction have also become more prominent. It remains to be seen how the Tea Party’s interaction with the Republican Party will develop.

Finally, Theda Skocpol and Vanessa Williamson (2012) attempt to define and understand the political/social movement known as the Tea Party. This sociological study (utilizing fieldwork, in-depth interviews and historical records) discusses the identity of the movement, their beliefs, the leadership and organization of the movement, as well as the media’s influence on the Tea Party. They then hypothesize that for the 2012 national elections, the Tea Party will cause the Republican Party to struggle with convincing moderates to vote in their favor. At the moment, the hard-right elites have combined their power and will likely continue to drive the policies of the GOP (Skocpol 2012). Skocpol and Williamson’s work allows their readers a look at real Tea Party individuals. This is quite helpful when it comes to analyzing who they are and how much influence this movement will have in American politics.
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History of Populist Movements in the United States

The United States has had many right-wing movements, and the Tea Party is just the newest model. Since the 1800s, the right has been afraid of communists/socialists. At that time, the key concern of the right was democratic populism, specifically spreading suffrage to more than just the elite class. One example is the Anti-Mason Party.

Running parallel to the Jacksonian Movement, the Anti-Mason Party was one of the more paranoid political movements during that period. Nevertheless, they were able to shake that image to become a popular and organized group against elite privilege. Unlike other movements, the Anti-Masons were the first third party to be elected to the House of Representatives (Courser, 2011).

Another populist movement arose in the 1890s when middle class farmers protested against a government which they thought did not represent their interests (Pollack, 1967). The movement had been portrayed as “irrational,” but according to Courser (2011), they had “well-founded” reasons to protest. The movement was a reaction to the change in money interests and was created by the agrarian economic crisis of the Midwest.

During the election of 1928, the key political issue was the government’s role in the stalled economy with ideas of equality and “social justice” being raised. The Democratic nominee, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was in favor of governmental interference while the incumbent Herbert Hoover stated that he believed in individualism. When Roosevelt won, he quickly put in place many programs to assist the American public. In response to his government programs, the right and its thinkers pushed back by handing out millions of pamphlets, fliers, and other forms of publicity to warn the American public of FDR's march toward socialism (Amenta, Caren, & Stobaugh, 2012). FDR dealt with right-wing “fear mongering” up until his death in 1945. Once World War II was over, the Cold War and the threat of Communism became the key issues around which right-wing movements would organize.

Following World War II, the right wing movement split into two forms of anticomununism – a generic form and an anti-Semitic form (Berlet, 2012). The generic form included groups like the Christian Freedom Foundation which was founded in 1950. This group created mass propaganda about the “true” nature of social security, the income tax, and labor unions. Roughly eight years later, the John Birch Society was established. Those who joined this group were former followers of Senator Joseph McCarthy (Wilentz, 2010).

The John Birch Society warned the American public about collectivism, and how this socialist theory was going to ruin the American economy. They also developed conspiracy theories that involved the more liberal politicians.
They claimed that Communists had taken over the American government and soon America would be a communist country. The founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, claimed that the Communists had taken over the United States even before the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Furthermore, the entire conspiracy began in ancient Sparta, then these conspirators overpowered the elites of the eighteenth century; and they passed their ideals down from generation to generation.

Anti-Semitic groups included the Liberty Lobby which used an anti-Semitic account of the “subversive conspiracy” but it was hidden in “coded” language (Berlet, 2012). This type of “populism often involves the use of a “producerist” narrative that portrays a noble middle class of hard-working productive citizens being squeezed by a conspiracy involving secret elites above and lazy, sinful, and subversive parasites below” (Berlet, 2011). They published many books that perpetuated their ideals. Their ideals were clothed in forms of demonization, conspiracies, and scapegoating.

The Tea Party as Social Movement

There have been several reactionary right-winged populist movements in US history, and the Tea Party is the latest movement to join the trend. The Tea Party was first organized by libertarians and Ron Paul supporters in 2009 (Berlet, 2012). According to Skocpol (2012) this movement consists primarily of older Caucasian citizens who are moderately educated and economically “comfortable” compared to the rest of America. Many of these older Americans are able to put in the time to actively participate in either monthly or weekly group meetings. As of summer 2011, it was estimated that there were around 1,000 active groups across the fifty states. Some parties had more than 1,000 registered members while others only had a dozen. Scholars roughly estimate that there was roughly one million Tea Partiers in 2011 (Skocpol 2012; Berlet 2011).
**Ideals and Issues.** These million people share some core ideals. In a poll conducted by the New York Times/CBS News in April 2010 (Zernike and Thee-Brenan 2010), Tea Partiers named three major concerns. First, they are unhappy about the passage of the “Obama Care” bill, or the universal healthcare bill. Second, the Tea Partiers are upset by the “massive” government spending. They desire to cut the “fat” from the federal budget. Third, the Tea Party feel like their opinions and concerns were not being represented in Washington. They sincerely believe that the “representative institutions” of the political arena have simply stopped representing their interests. This last point is significant as Tea Partiers feel hesitant to truly trust either the Republican or the Democratic party (Courser 2011).

The consensus on these “core values” should not hide the fact that Tea Partiers themselves disagree on other issues such as abortion, gay marriage, welfare reform, and gun rights. This has led to some vague messages from, and a fragmented image of, the Tea Party. These disagreements have caused the rest of the American public to be confused and even disillusioned with the Tea Party.

**Conspiracy Theories.** Just like past right-wing movements, the Tea Party is no stranger to the propagation of conspiracy theories. At first, the Tea Party was solely focused on government spending and revoking passage of the healthcare bill. However, as more groups and elites became involved, conspiracies began to permeate the party’s rhetoric.

At the time, Fox News Channel and talk radio show host Glenn Beck became very involved in organizing and “teaching” his viewers. Most of his viewers were Tea Party members or those who supported the Tea Party Movement. He began discussing theories put forth by the extremely right-wing group that was prominent in the late 1950s, the John Birch Society. Glenn Beck began to promote books written by Willard Skousen who was a chief architect of the John Birch Society. He claimed that these books – *The Naked Communist, The Naked Capitalist,* and *The 5,000 Year Leap* – explained how and why the United States was founded. Soon after Beck promoted these titles, these books flew off the shelves and became part of certain local Tea Party literature especially those of local branches of the Tea Party Patriots. The ideas from these books began to heavily saturate Tea Party beliefs. Conspiracy theories were becoming “facts” to certain groups. This has caused further fragmentation within the Tea Party since not all affiliated groups embraced the ideas within these books.

Along with the “old” conspiracy theories, there comes a new one: the cultural war against the Left. The notion of cultural war was developed by the Christian Right and used by cultural conservatives as a reason to protest. They
argued that secular humanism was taking over the United States, and that the United States needed to remain a Christian nation. Theologian Francis Schaeffer developed arguments for Christians to use against secular humanism; however, he did not make a conspiracy theory out of it. Other Christian Right elites, such as Tim LaHaye, took up that task. He wrote a series of books that played up the “war.” The cultural war became more mainstream in 1992 when Patrick Buchanan published *Culture Wars*. The book, according to Berlet (2012), claimed that the liberals were “conspiring” against God and country. The culture war could be used to support the right’s positions on the economy, gender roles, and white solidarity (Ibid.).

The Tea Party and the Republican Party. The Tea Partiers acknowledge that the GOP has values that are very similar to their own, and they are enamored with the idea of using the party as a means to get their voices heard. This has led some political pundits, such as Rush Limbaugh to assert that the Tea Party will force a realignment of the Republican Party. At first glance, there seems to be support for this argument. Tea Party members have always voted for the Republican Party and will never vote Democrat. So, the GOP does not necessarily have to worry about losing votes from the Democrats.

Another possible evidence is the perceived movement of the GOP to the right. In 2008, the Republican presidential candidate had a somewhat moderate platform while his running mate, Governor Sarah Palin, espoused conservative mantras heard on conservative talk radio. But the Republican Party lost control of both executive and legislative branches. But opposition to President Obama’s policies galvanized the Tea Party resulting in Republicans retaking control of the White House in 2010. Some political pundits say that the Republicans won because of the Tea Party.

Yet the above arguments can be challenged by the fact that Tea Partiers do not necessarily love the Republican Party, nor do all Tea Party members self-identify as Republicans. As a Tea Partier, Tom Johnson said in an interview, “I consider myself an independent. Both parties are screwed up, I don’t want my name associated with them. That being said, I am a conservative at heart” (Johnson 2013).

The Tea Party has also never been truly “organized”, especially around a political party, nor have they been truly involved in doing ground work for politicians they supported. They were more content watching from the sidelines. “Professional” organizations, such as the Tea Party Express and Freedom Works, were the ones which campaigned and gave donations to “Tea Party” candidates.
The 2010 win of the Republicans was not necessarily due to Tea Partiers. They did not give donations or even choose their candidate. The powerful conservative elites from the Republican Party chose these candidates and the conservative right responded with support. Moreover, the reason for the Republican win may have more to do with the midterm elections itself – i.e. people usually do not vote for the party of the incumbent President.

**The Tea Party and the Media.** These limitations notwithstanding, the Tea Party did gain strong media attention. It was the media’s love for, or hate for, the Tea Party which gave Republicans the advantage. Whether it was a quick news blurb or hour-long pieces on the movement, the Tea Party protests dominated the news. Both partisan and nonpartisan media outlets gave the Tea Party air time (or print space). Some tried to do it objectively, while others held blatant bias toward the movement.

The Fox News Channel (FNC), a right-wing news channel, and its pundits were heavily involved in getting the word out about the Tea Party. The FNC is probably the most successful cable news channel at the moment. It has over two million viewers during prime time (CNN and MSNBC viewers combined) (Skocpol and Williamson, 2012). Their viewership is primarily older Americans and those who have conservative leanings. The Tea Partiers watch this news channel more than any other. As Ken Vought, a Tea Party participant, stated, “We always watch Fox for at least two hours” (2013).

Although Fox played a valuable role in promoting the Tea Party rallies, those on the web and talk radio also played a crucial role in promoting the Tea Party. For example, when CNBC first aired Rich Santelli’s rant, it was immediately picked up by the Drudge Report (website), and then Michelle Malkin, a right wing pundit, posted it to Twitter (Skocpol and Williamson, 2013). It became so popular, that the very next day, the White House Press Secretary was questioned about it (Ibid.).

After the Tea Party gained support on the web and on both local and national talk radio, Fox News producers realized the movement as a major piece and began to promote it with all its force. FNC became so obsessed with this movement, that it began its coverage of Tax Day Tea Parties six weeks in advance. Furthermore, each primetime host planned to host their shows live at the Tea Parties come Tax Day. (In fact, some hosts like Glenn Beck, organized some of these protests themselves.) As Glenn Beck stated on April 6th, “This year, Americans across the country are holding tea parties to let the politicians know that we have had enough. Celebrate with Fox News. This is what we’re doing next Wednesday” (Ibid.). Coverage like this was drastically different from those of CNN’s. Although CNN gave the same amount of airtime to the Tea Party, Fox News had a different path to its coverage. The Fox News Channel
began to “anticipate” the movement, began to “build up” each event, and sustained coverage of the movement in between its events (Ibid.).

Among the FNC hosts, Glenn Beck has had the most influence on the Tea Party. He not only influenced the party with his book suggestions, but he also helped make the Tea Parties bigger than they were. He began to invite Tea Party “leaders” on his show to discuss upcoming events and to discuss the principles behind this groups protest. At one point, Glenn Beck began his own grassroots group, the 9/12 Project. The 9/12 was essentially a Tea Party group, but Beck made sure to give it some independence. His group worked closely with the Tea Party Express (owned by the Koch brothers) to organize events and collect donations, etc. Glenn Beck maintained his popularity and his movement’s “success” up until 2011. He decided to leave FNC to start on other projects such as the Glenn Beck University and the Glenn Beck Channel (Ibid.).

With Glenn Beck’s departure from primetime television, the 9/12 Project began to fizzle out and the Tea Party became even more disorganized. It was clear in 2012 that the Tea Party did not have the same alleged force. Out of the sixteen senatorial candidates they fielded, only four won in 2012. Other Tea Party candidates up for re-election struggled to maintain their seat, and some lost their seats to moderates (Gray 2012). For example, House Representative Michele Bachmann from Minnesota barely won her re-election and Representative Allen West from Florida lost his seat to a moderate candidate (Gray 2012).

These elections results reveal that the American public is no longer enchanted with the Tea Party. This slow descent is still taking place. Fox News has even stopped talking about the Tea Party. Events have stopped sprouting up. As Wanda Vought, married to Ken Vought and also a Tea Partier, stated, “We haven’t been to a rally in several months. The email newsletters have even slowed down” (Vought 2013). It could be that the Tea Party is on hiatus due to lack of political elections, however, one would expect with the current economic sequester taking place, that the Tea Party would be out in full force—protesting Obama’s fiscal measures and trying to convince the Republican Party to stick to its principles.

**Conclusion**

With the 2014 midterms and the 2016 presidential elections in the back of the Republican’s minds, the Tea Party becomes an immediate concern. The GOP leadership will have to make decisions about their policies and discern how far they are willing to lean to the right on major political issues. In order for the Republicans to take back a snug majority, they will have to appeal to
the independents and moderates from both parties. This means that they must still acknowledge that the Tea Party is a small fraction of the electorate. Furthermore, they have to gain back the demographics they lost around the country. Instead of catering to the South and rural Midwest, the GOP needs to begin to have dialogue with its former strongholds in Southern California and suburbs of the East Coast.

The Tea Party, itself, is losing power and steam. The social movement, in its fifth year, is no longer holding on to electoral power. The conservative elites, who used the party’s popularity to gain power, still have their power; however, it seems that their power hold will not last much longer. The movement has lost its motivation for protesting. The Republicans still maintain a majority in the House, and many Tea Partiers feel that they are once again being represented by their representatives. As Ken Vought commented, “I’m jealous of those states that were able to elect Senators like Marco Rubio to represent them. In California, I am stuck under the Democrat majority” (Vought, 2013). Ken Vought went on to explain that he still participates in online forums, plans on attending the town hall meetings, and votes Republican. He and his wife see the Democrats as traitors to the American way.

Tea Partiers know that their movement is dying, and many have come to accept it. Their call “to the people” has dulled. Many Americans simply became disinterested or too busy to participate. There are some local groups that will remain and continue to meet, but the Tea Party Express will no longer have a coalition with other groups. They will shift into a new think tank and conservative elites will be forced to find a new way to maintain their power (Skocpol, 2012). If such happens, it is doubtful that the Tea Party Express (and other large Tea Party think tanks) will remain a part an authentic populist social movement or merely a window dressing for a conservative elite agenda.
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CONSTRUCTIVISM’S MULTIPLE REFERENTS
by
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Constructivism is now a major school of thought in International Relations (IR) scholarship. Several IR scholars recognize that the major contestation within IR scholarship is between rationalism (both liberal and realist) and constructivism (Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 1998). In fact, Jeffrey Checkel states that there are now more authors who self-identify as constructivists (2004, 229). While other scholars may not consider constructivism as a “paradigm” like realism, liberalism or Marxism, Maliniak points out that the language most often used in the discipline describes constructivism as one of “the four major theoretical paradigms” (2011, 441). He adds: “The proportions of constructivist literature ... has risen over time, according to faculty respondents, who in 2008 believed that it comprised 17% of the literature” (Ibid. 443).

Given the significance of constructivism in current IR scholarship, it is imperative to understand this school of thought. This article analyzes the writings of several constructivist scholars to determine their common and disparate strands. The author finds that multiple referents exist for the term “constructivism,” i.e. authors employ different ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies in their research.

Constructivism’s Entry to IR Scholarship

Several scholars have attributed the rise of constructivism to the confluence of two trends – the end of the Cold War and the “cumulative dissatisfactions with rational choice theory and with Realist tenets” (Jacobsen 2003, 39). This academic debate was occurring before the end of the Cold War, but the events leading to the Soviet Union’s demise opened the doors for alternative approaches in IR. This was mainly because the supposed “Neo-Neo Synthesis” could not explain “the nonstructural change resulting from the demise of the Cold War” (Hynek and Teti 2010, 177). These mainstream IR theories were based on axioms of immutable systematic imperative and immutable national interests (Jacobsen 2003, 41) which did not seem to jibe with contemporary international politics.

Enter constructivist theories which ‘look to the humanities and sociology for insights into how “reality,” including the interests that partially constitute the identity of actors is socially constructed’ (Katzenstein 1998, 646). Even while there are debates about whether constructivist ideas are actually “new” to IR (see Reus-Smit 2005 and Jacobsen 2003), there is some consensus that
constructivism has brought renewed interest in the scholarship. In particular, it brought back “the social, historical and normative” to International Relations with its main “sociological task” as “understanding how moral community – locally, nationally and globally – expands and contracts” (Reus-Smit 2005, 205). This conceptualization of change was certainly different from mainstream IR theories at the time which stressed the unchanging nature of international relations. As one scholar stated, “Constructivism does indeed help contemporary IR advance a more complete picture of ‘what makes the world hang together’” (Checkel 2004, 230). For Reus-Smit, constructivism is an outgrowth of critical theory and “the sociological task of understanding how moral community – locally, nationally and globally – expands and contracts” is a prominent concern of the constructivist agenda (2005, 204).

Despite these positive assessments, constructivism itself is not a continuous or fully coherent research program, much less a paradigm: Hynek explains that there are several constructivisms namely constructivist empiricism, constructivist realism, and social constructivism (2010, 173). This has led some scholars to search for, and elucidate, threads which define constructivism. The three aspects this article looks at are ontology, epistemology and methodology.

Constructivism’s Ontologies

One of constructivism’s main criticisms of mainstream IR scholarship is the ontological bases of their theories. In the 1980s, constructivism tried to debunk objectivism (Hynek 2010, 177). They do not take identities and interests as givens (Wendt 1999, 33). Actors were not atomistic egoists whose interests are formed prior to social interaction and who enter social relations solely for strategic purposes. For constructivists, actors are “inherently social, that their identities and interests are socially constructed; the products of inter-subjective social structures” (Reus-Smit 2005, 193).

Constructivism contrasts with rationalism in three important ways. First, they treat agents as social rather than simply egoists. Second, constructivists see interests as endogenous to social interactions while rationalists see interests as exogenous to such interactions. Finally, constructivists see society as a constitutive realm unlike rationalists who view society as a strategic realm. Agents and structures are “mutually constituted” (Klotz 2006, 355). Thus constructivism, as Hopf states, offers alternative understandings of concepts that are central in IR – anarchy, balance of power, identity, interest power and change (1998).

All of these suggest that at one point in time, there was some coherence to constructivist ontology. By the 1990s, however, seemed to deteriorate in the
1990s when Alexander Wendt championed scientific realism an approach whose objective appeared to be to develop ontology more compatible with mainstream IR theories. “Conventional” constructivists attempt to build bridges with other theories in order to gain access to mainstream discourse. Hynek stats that for constructivism to be accepted by mainstream IR, the former’s structurationist ontology must be effectively neutralized, giving way to privileging the state ontologically or ceding a fixedness to the state by claiming that it behaves as if its identity was fixed (2010, 191). In the process, the issue of ontology was “bypassed ... virtually entirely” (Ibid.). A clear example of this shift and de-emphasis can be seen in Alexander Wendt’s shift from “Giddens’ ontology and its double hermeneutic implications” to the scientific realism of Bhaskar (Ibid.). Wendt’s emphasis on epistemology neglects ontological discontinuities between it and the mainstream thus setting up an unwarranted argument that constructivism can be easily and coherent conflated with incompatible mainstream ontologies (Ibid.). In a way, this bridge building could lead to the possibility of making generalizations.

However, other constructivists continue to resist such efforts. Reus-Smit, for example, says that ideas, norms and culture are variable: “There is simply no such thing as a universal, trans-historical, disembedded, culturally autonomous idea or identity” (2005, 201). This variability prohibits the forming of theoretical generalizations as such are impossibilities in the first place. Rather, constructivist generalizations are contingent and heavily qualified which has led some scholars to say that constructivism is not a theory but “an analytical framework” (Reus-Smit 2005, 201). Constructivists who subscribe to the mutability of this framework’s ontological elements must necessarily reject attempts at assimilation or partnership with mainstream IR theory which treats these elements as immutable assumptions.

**Constructivism’s’ Epistemologies**

Ontological commitments have consequences on epistemological decisions. Audie Klotz articulates the questions faced by epistemologists: “If meanings are malleable, for instance, is it acceptable to assume that social structures are stable enough for us to identify norms or rules? If identities are fluid and overlapping, are we ever justified in using national interest as a category of analysis? Should we treat language as action or as evidence of individual belief” (2006, 355)? At the same time, it would be a mistake to assume that constructivism is not epistemologically positivist and that it always has a normative agenda (Hynek and Teti 2010, 187). Like critical international theory, constructivism has both modernist and post-modernist epistemological strands (Reus-Smit 2005, 195). To highlight the varied epistemological forms that constructivism embraces, we can look at the arguments of two scholars – John Kurt Jacobsen and Alexander Wendt.
Jacobsen states that mainstream scholars use the tenets of positivism to deny the legitimacy of other approaches such as critical theory and Gramscian cultural studies. This denial is based on the interpretation of what counts as “scientific” even though Jacobsen states that positivism “holds no known patent on testable propositions” (2003, 39). Wendt, in contrast, states that “anti-realist” and post-positivist “epistemologies are being invoked to privilege or reject certain methods a priori” (1999, 48). These two authors highlight a rift within constructivism and within IR scholarship as well: what counts as sound, scientific knowledge?

Constructivists generally agree on the need to include interpretation in research, but they disagree over how interpretation should be done. Constructivists also agree that inter-subjectivity matters but they disagree whether inter-subjective knowledge can be treated as stable social facts or as unstable and influenced by the interpretations of the researcher. The positions taken often become categorized as representing “modern” versus “postmodern” or as denoting “positivist” versus “post-positivist” positions (Klotz 2006, 356).

Constructivists of a positivist epistemological bent form testable hypotheses and treat qualitative data as objective knowledge. Checkel (2004), a positivist or conventional constructivist, explains the world through causal mechanisms in which general theories can be constructed (Klotz 2006, 360). This understanding promotes process tracing a method which Checkel claims will lead “beyond unproductive “either/or” meta-theoretical debates to empirical applications in which both agents and structures matter as well as are explained and understood through both positivist and post-positivist epistemological-methodological lenses” (Klotz; Checkel 2004, 363). For these scholars, inter-subjective understandings are stable and not affected by the interpreter’s perspective. Further, these understandings may be generalized. In this case then, “culture and identity [are] isolated from other characteristics of social life and treated as variables” (Klotz 2006, 357).

Constructivists of a post-modernist or a post-positivist epistemological bent do not explain the world using objective knowledge, but rather accepts that meanings are unstable; i.e. “we work in a hermeneutical circle without any objective standpoint for analysis” (Ibid. 357). This aversion for generalizations leads to “how possible” questions rather than “why” questions. Post-modernist constructivists thus reject the vocabulary of “variable” in favor of tracing “historical conjunctures” (Ibid.).

This divergence has led to intra-constructivist criticisms. Jacobsen, for example, criticizes the analysis of “fringe frameworks” with criteria derived from mainstream IR theories. This is a form of domination and rejection which, in the case of fringe frameworks, are not necessarily rejected outright but
converted into positivist and measurable terms compatible with mainstream IR/IPE frameworks (2003, 39). Hynek and Teti (2010) supports this claim suggesting that conventional constructivism is the result of this re-contextualizing and annexing of fringe frameworks. Jacobsen even goes so far as to say that conventional constructivism is “a bowdlerized form of critical theory and Gramscian cultural studies” (2003, 39).

**Constructivisms’ Methodologies**

Constructivists use various research methodologies prompting some scholars to propose for a discussion of constructivist methods. Checkel says that an important development is the increasing practice of operationalizing claims which helps elucidate the intricacies of arguments (2004, 230). This attention to methodology might contribute to a discussion that “transcend[s] the positivist-interpretive epistemological divide” (Ibid. 229).

Klotz, however, is not sure about the direction of such a discussion. He says that disparate research methods can severely limit the ability of constructivists to communicate. Explaining the world through causal mechanisms employs terminology and epistemological concepts that are difficult, if not impossible, to use when communicating with scholars who use methods based on discursive practices (Klotz 2006, 355). For example, the use of historical methodology and the emphasis on change is incompatible with fundamental mainstream neo-utilitarianism which insists that history is already set in stone (Klotz 2006, 358; Reus-Smit 2005, 206). The historicizing of evidence contradicts mainstream IR methodologies and conventional constructivism which rely on trans-historical causal mechanisms.

**Conclusion**

There is no one constructivism, but several constructivisms. The main versions of constructivism are conventional constructivism and post-modernist/post-positivist constructivism. The attempt to ‘modernize’ or ‘build bridges’ between constructivism and rationalism was one of the reasons for this divide: some would argue that this linkage is impossible while others claim that this is both necessary and beneficial. Checkel, who has participated in bridge building, sees this as an imperfect solution as (2004, 242). For example, operationalizing the concept of “socialization” has resulting in definitions that were not commonsensical. Thus, “methodological and epistemological agreement was purchased at the cost of (partial) theoretical closure” (Ibid. 243-44).
In contrast to Wendt and Checkel who support the idea of bridging constructivism and rationalism, Reus-Smit argues that this bridge building “propagate[s] an unnecessarily ‘thin form of constructivism’” (2005, 203). Moreover, Hynek and Teti (2010) argue that the irreconcilable nature of neo-utilitarian ontology and constructivism’s “fluid” ontology has led to the misinterpretation pragmatism as reinforcing the eschewing of ontology altogether in an effort to reconcile two research programs with incompatible ontologies. They add that on an epistemological level pragmatism has been used to legitimize incoherent ideas by setting very low standards for their acceptance (Ibid. 186).

Jacobson concurs and suggests that only paradigms that do not threaten the core status or dominant paradigms may gain access to mainstream discourse; thus, there can never truly be a productive discourse between rationalist IR theories and constructivism. In a sense, conventional constructivism has been “filtered” and altered to the point that it can no longer be considered similar to other constructivisms. But while it might be understandable why alternative frameworks may want access to dominant paradigms, the interesting question for Jacobsen is why and how mainstream IR theorists found it necessary to begin a dialogue with constructivism in the first place. Stated differently, how did mainstream IR theorists find it necessary to annex constructivist ontology, epistemology and methodology (Jacobsen 2003, 40; Kuhn 1996).

In the end, it is still an open question whether the acceptance of conventional constructivism is a “new barrier or a boon to alternative frameworks” in IR scholarship (Jacobsen 2003, 40). What is clear is that the multiplicity of constructivisms will persist; whether or not there will be a productive intra-constructivist dialogue is an open question.
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From the East Bay to Manila Bay
-- One Graduate’s Lessons about Politics and Journalism

by

Ryan Macasero

I studied international relations and minored in political science in Cal State East Bay and graduated in 2010. While working several jobs in the service and sales industries, I freelanced for several hyperlocal and Filipino community newspapers. During these writing stints, I realized that it is important to have a good grasp on government, policy, global and domestic social issues. Research skills I learned in the university were instrumental in working on these stories. At the same time, being able to provide analysis enhances a stories context and relevance to the reader.

Presently, I work with Rappler, a social news network based in Manila, Philippines. Rappler is an exciting experiment in online journalism. According to its website (http://www.rappler.com/), Rappler is a “social news network where stories inspire community engagement and digitally fueled actions for social change.” The name is a combination of “rap” (to discuss) and “ripple” (to make waves). Its mission is to harness the power of social media, crowdsourcing and collaboration with the community to provide the most uncompromised journalism “that - hopefully - inspires smart conversations and ignites a thirst for change.”

Rappler is led by veteran journalists trained in broadcast, print, and web disciplines. Among them are Newsbreak founders Marites Vitug, Glenda Gloria, and Chay Hofileña. Marites Vitug was the founding editor of Newsbreak, an investigative magazine, known for its independence is now a part of Rappler. Vitug is now Rappler’s editor-at-large.

Covering the 2013 Midterm Philippine Elections

When I arrived, the election season was already in full swing. I was thrown into the fire. If there was one word I would choose to describe Philippine elections, it would be “wild.” Political dynasties still abound in the Philippines and political violence, corruption and vote buying are more often the rule rather than the exception. There are two lessons I learned from covering the elections.
First lesson: There are no party lines. It quickly became clear that political parties here were not clearly delineated. Who were the conservatives? Who were the liberals? The parties are not as clearly demarcated as the Republicans or Democrats, or even as clear as the Tea Party or the Green Party. There are also party lists which is an attempt to diversify the voices in the legislature. But what makes the situation more confusing are the ad hoc coalitions formed to ensure electoral victory such as Team PNoy (the coalition of the president’s party) and the United Nationalist Alliance or UNA (led by the current vice president’s party). Philippine politics is very personal.

Second Lesson: There are a thousand ways to cheat. This might be hyperbole, but it sure felt like it while I was observing the elections. The social media team was briefed by PHvote editor Miriam Grace Go a few days prior to the elections. Some of the common techniques are busing in “flying” registrants, delisting opponents from voters’ lists, vote shaving, adding dead people to the voters list, among others.

The media and other electoral watchdogs spent much energy to protect votes, but unscrupulous politicians always managed to get around this scrutiny. Despite this disappointing development, many opinion leaders encouraged Filipinos to vote and for the media to provide honest reportage. “I’m not laying out on the table this ugly part of the registration to dishearten you,” Go said in her Rappler article Cheats are messing with the voters’ list. Go urged voters to be vigilant.

On the Cyber Front

The new battlefront for Philippine politicians is cyberspace. Latest estimates say that around 30 to 40 million Filipinos are online and around the same number are connected to social media. Most candidates had at least some presence online.

This is where we came in. The social media team fielded questions, engaged in community conversations, and monitored the situation across the Philippines. During the analysis program, Go, among other guests, agreed that presence on social media does not translate into votes. There were a few candidates who had a strong social media presence but did not make it to the top 12.

---

1 In the Philippines, the president and vice president are elected separately and thus can come from opposing political parties.
Rappler’s #rstream, #votewatch and #PCOSdelivery, were just some of the crowd sourcing tools we came up with for our netizens to use. We worried that all of these efforts would be in vain. But something “magical” happened.

On their own initiative, voters were reading senatorial profiles, election-related stories, and other content on PHvote that would help them make a better decision on Election Day. It was beautiful. We tried to optimize our crowd sourcing capabilities with several tools: #votewatch and our MovePH team, Rappler’s citizen journalism arm.

Even if change does not occur instantly, it was inspiring to see everyone especially the youth do his or her part to shape Philippine democracy.

My journey from the East Bay to Manila Bay has certainly been eye-opening: from studying political theories to covering elections on the ground, from writing academic papers to writing for information and social change. Graduation was definitely not the end, but rather the beginning of a different kind of education.
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