

# ON THE LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTIONS' MANIFESTO

## SOBRE EL MANIFIESTO DE LAS REVOLUCIONES EN AMÉRICA LATINA

### **Christian Paúl Naranjo Navas**

Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo, Quito, Ecuador

paulnaranjo@outlook.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1532-203X>

### **Bryan Josué Naranjo Navas**

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

eldestinobryan@hotmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5848-5563>

Recibido: junio de 2019

Aceptado: julio de 2019

---

**Palabras clave:** Revolución, Filosofía, América Latina, Manifiesto, Discurso.

**Keywords:** Revolution, Philosophy, Latin America, Manifesto, Discourse.

---

**Resumen:** Las revoluciones en América Latina se han estructurado a través de un manifiesto inédito que toma las figuras del héroe, la víctima y el victimario dentro de ideas comunes que se desarrollaron alrededor del final de la historia. Este artículo presenta la realidad dentro de un discurso monopolizado, que juega con cierto vocabulario marxista, mientras evoca un mesías político, el salvador, el revolucionario. El objetivo principal de este escrito es comprender el manifiesto de las revoluciones latinoamericanas presentado en un discursivo común. Al final, señalamos el pequeño desarrollo regional de propuestas que intentan llenar el concepto de revolución con un nuevo pensamiento. Este escrito se basa en cuatro eventos históricos, a saber: la revolución mexicana, que comenzó en 1910; la revolución boliviana de abril de 1952; la revolución cubana, principios de 1959; y la revolución nicaragüense de finales de los años setenta.

---

**Abstract:** The revolutions in Latin America have been structured through an untold manifesto that takes the figures of the hero, victim and victimizer within common ideas that developed around the end of history. This article presents reality within a monopolized discourse, which plays with some Marxist vocabulary, while it evokes a political messiah, the savior, the revolutionist. The main objective of this writing is to understand the Latin America revolutions' manifesto presented in a common discursive. At the end, we point out the little regional development of proposals that try to fill the concept of revolution with new thought. This writing is based on four historical events, namely: the Mexican Revolution, which began in 1910; the Bolivian Revolution of April 1952; the Cuban Revolution, early 1959; and the Nicaraguan Revolution of the late 1970s.

## Introduction

Thinking about the idea of revolution becomes the main task of this article, not because it intends to redefine the concept of revolution, this has already been widely debated<sup>1</sup>, but because it tries to understand the idea of revolution within a discursive manifesto used in America Latina during the twentieth century. The structure of discursive thought is formalized in the use of a triad of ideas: messiah, people, demon. This triad, which serves as a discursive foundation that is embellished with a certain Marxist conceptualization of reality.

This article tries to understand the revolutionary as the messiah, chosen by destiny, by history, or by divinity, with a halo of messianism, turned into the only savior, the only one with the necessary wisdom to understand the way of the people towards the freedom, towards happiness, towards the end of history. But the idea of messiah cannot exist without the idea of the devil, bitter in the bourgeoisie, in the empire, in the press, or in private enterprise; a devil who has enriched himself while he has impoverished the people, an oppressor who has benefited few while he has exploited the proletariat. Finally, the idea of messiah and devil do not make sense without the existence of an agent that receives its influence, the people. The idea of the people is configured in those millions

---

1. Luis Villoro, in his article "Sobre el concepto de revolución" (1992, 277), makes a broad discussion about the concept of revolution, making it clear that revolution is framed in a reversal of history: rupture, a court that denies an era and initiates a new one. With this conceptual platform, José María Enríquez (2007), in his investigation includes the concept of revolution to understand the legal framework of the right to resistance.

who have been oppressed, who live in poverty, in misery, a people that has seen the need for the intervention of a savior, the political messiah, the revolutionary.

The discursive structure of the messiah, villain and people, has been used during the twentieth century to justify revolutionary movements: the idea of an oppressor justifies the existence of a revolutionary, the only one who can save the people from a cruel destiny. The triad behaves univocally and dynamically: the idea of messiah evokes the idea of people and devil, in the same way, the idea of people evokes the idea of messiah and devil. This discursive structure has borrowed the Marxist language to place it within a temporality of regional rebellion. The paper proposes that, taking into account the context of the Marxist language, the revolutionary exists as long as the bourgeoisie exists, and as long as the proletariat is oppressed. This is evident when the triad of the messiah, the people and the devil is used. The messiah will be the revolutionary, the people the proletariat, and the devil the bourgeoisie. In this way, making use of this discursive structure, the article tries to understand four revolutionary processes: the Mexican Revolution, the Bolivian Revolution, the Cuban Revolution, and the Sandinista Popular Revolution.

## 1. Revolutions in Latin America during the 20th century

In Latin America, revolutionary movements have been developed that have been built as a constant element during the 20th century. Carlos Rossi (1972), in his book *The Permanent Revolution in Latin*

America, collects a brief list of revolutionary movements in Latin America during the twentieth century. He analyzes the cases of Cuba, Mexico, and Bolivia as revolutions, and Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala and Peru as quasi-revolutions. In all cases, with a socialist discursive structure, and having in the context the revolution in stages.

In this context, it has become a complicated task to find revolutionary movements that base their discursive structure in contexts similar to the French Revolution (Berlin, 2017), or the American Revolution (García Portela, 2014). It has become impossible to find ideas of revolution that are built through discursive structures that focus on the individual, the freedom of enterprise, or in a context of freedoms. Gonzales Arana (González Arana 2008), studying the revolutions of Cuba, Mexico and Nicaragua, refers to the socialist context in which these events occurred, the ideas of revolution in Latin America are built around discourses that use a Marxist language.

The historical development of ideas of revolution leads us to think about what this idea means in the imaginary of Latin America, which has taken on a life of its own within ideological and political contexts conformed within social movements. The ideas of revolution have created strong foundations in the social and cultural movements of Latin America, which share conceptions that allow them to analyze and see reality from the perspective of the revolutionary (Pizarro, 2007), that is, from the perspective of the messiah, an idea that will be developed in the following epigraphs.

Thinking about revolution also leads us to think that its content has been monopolized towards a certain way of seeing reality, that is, it has been monopolized through a socialist

language. Visualizing and understanding the structure of discourse around the idea of revolution is the main objective of this paper, which ends up asking about the weak regional development of ideas that propose new contents to fill the concept of revolution. There are few approaches that raise new ideological arguments, new argumentative forms that glimpse the revolution from alternative, distant or disparate points of view. Points of view that take into account ignored elements such as the advancement of science and knowledge, or the profiles of generations little understood as the generation of the millennium, or generation Z<sup>2</sup>.

The discursive structure around the ideas of revolution has been constructed in Latin America through the Marxist language (González Arana, 2009), and making use of the discursive triad presented. However, neither the Marxist language nor the discursive triad take into account the generational changes, youth movements that make doubt their strongest argument weapon, and make technological media their preferred tool of protest.

This writing is based on the ideas of revolution built around four historical events in the region: the Mexican Revolution, begun in 1910; the Bolivian Revolution, April 1952; the Cuban Revolution, from the beginning of 1959; and, the Nicaraguan Revolution, at the end of the 1970s. Each one has brought

---

2. The Y generation or Millennials (born in 1981-1994) are composed of those young people who grew up simultaneously with the advancement of technology, to which they adapt quickly and are composed in an essential part of their lives. On the other hand, the generation Z or Centennials (born after 1995) see technology as part of their lives, they are self-taught, informed, more pragmatic than the Millennials.

its own ideology and, nevertheless, they share similar structures of thought: the triad of the idea of revolution is composed of the figure of the messiah; the idea of the internal or external enemy; and, the idea of a people that must be saved from the claws of the beast. This triad will be analyzed in detail in the following sections.

In the first place, the Mexican Revolution arose after the armed conflicts that began in November 1910. The conflicts begin during the "Porfiriato" (it refers to the military control exercised by Porfirio Díaz from 1876 to 1911), years in which, for Lomeli Vanegas (2012), at the end of 1876, Mexico grew economically and maintained a certain political stability, it was largely based on the reintegration of Mexico into the international economy, on the reduction of transportation costs and on the development of the financial system, which reduced the cost of credits (Lomeli Vanegas, 2012, p. 6).

During the first decade of the twentieth century, social unrest increased steadily despite the nation's economic growth. Rhetoric was built assuring that economic growth had only reached the bourgeois classes. The Mexican Revolution emerges as a response to the repression that occurred during the 'Porfiriato'. The political mobilizations are concentrated around Francisco Madero, who was arrested for subversion. Madero flees to the United States and, from there, organizes an armed rebellion. The pressure forced Porfirio Díaz to resign. In 1911, Madero won the presidential elections, however, he found the strong opposition of Emiliano Zapata. When Madero comes to power, the new revolutionary figures, Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa, organize the Ayala plan, through which the Madero government is unknown, and proposes the redistribution

of land among the peasants. Community armies of miners, pawns were organized. The result was the assassination of Madero in 1913 (Juárez, 2008). The tumult of political succession led to armed clashes that led to the death of Zapata in 1919, and of Pancho Villa in 1923.

The Mexican Revolution appears through an unusual self-generation of peasant armies proclaiming socialist ideas of revolution. Martín Juárez mentions Trotsky's visit to Mexico in 1937 to study the revolutionary process. Trotsky recognized the general idea of a socialist revolution in Mexico, however, believed that the historical backwardness of the Mexican Revolution, as in the case of the revolution of 1917, which explains the gigantic abortion that has been the Mexican Revolution despite of the excessive clamor of the "criollo" lackeys of the ruling classes (Juárez, 2008, p. 161). In this case, the idea of revolution was associated with the idea of socialism<sup>3</sup>. This conjunction involves the discursive triad proposed in the article: the existence of a revolutionary messiah; of a proletariat; and of a bitter enemy in the bourgeoisie or in the empire.

As a second case, the Bolivian Revolution was born in 1952 through the general discontent caused by the impact of the Great Depression and the Bolivian defeat in the Chaco War. The interwar period becomes a time of political and economic instability. A surviving economy through the industrial demand of tin for the manufacture of weapons. To save his government, La Rosca resorts to the war with Paraguay, the Chaco War, from 1932

3. In the writing, the terms socialism, Marxism and communism are used intercalary because the purpose of the article is not to make reference to their possible differences, but to the use of a similar language in the chosen cases

to 1935. The military failure serves as a way for the declining popular discontent. The Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR) was founded around its main icon, Víctor Paz Estenssoro in 1942. In 1951, the MNR won the elections, however, suddenly a Military Junta was formed that would prevent the rise of this revolutionary group power; this decision produces massive revolts. The popular demonstrations had the support of the Carabineros Corps and the police, who took several government institutions. The supporters of the MNR were part of the armed counterattack against the possession of the Military Junta de Gobierno. The army was defeated, with a balance of 490 dead. In 1952, Víctor Paz Estenssoro proclaimed himself president of Bolivia (Frontaura, 1974).

The period of the Bolivian Revolution, or National Revolution, emerges through a discourse of socialist revolution, however, it is considered as a reformist attempt framed in a historical stage that dates from April 9, 1952 until the coup d'état of the November 4, 1964. The revolution led a period of transformation that modernized the country in an important way, until 1952, Bolivia maintained the worst institutions and systems of the old Spanish colonialism, aggravated-against the people, by the way-by the criollismo as a caste and by liberalism as a system (Frontaura, 1974, p. 7). In practice, the Bolivian Revolution aimed to create a third way through: income redistributive policies; induction to a process of industrialization directed from the State; and restrictions on private property.

The reformist attempt of the Bolivian Revolution avoided both the socialist-state method of rapid capital accumulation (as in the Cuban model) and the accelerated development of a capitalism dependent,

to a certain extent, on the European and North American metropolises (as in the Brazilian case) (Mansilla, 1980, p. 117). Guillermo Lora, when trying to understand the Bolivian Revolution and the collapse of the first Communist Party, proposes that the theory that illuminates the way was not achieved, the documents emanated by Moscow could not be considered programmatic, they were not a balance of the revolutionary experiences lived in the country and less expressed the assembly of the vanguard with the class, nor were they the result of the formation of the party within the proletariat (Lora, 2011). The discourse of the revolution is framed in a socialist conception, referring to the class struggle, the bourgeoisie, and the evocation of nationalism.

As a third case, the Cuban Revolution of 1959 is the revolutionary movement with the greatest diffusion in Latin America due to the fact that it remained in power after almost six decades. The revolution formed a peasant guerrilla led by the Castro brothers, Ernesto Guevara and Camilo Cienfuegos. The armed incursion caused the fall of Fulgencio Batista and the coming to power of Fidel Castro (Silva León, 2003). Since 1960, the United States maintains an economic embargo on the island. This policy has been rejected on several occasions in international organizations, however, the embargo has been defended by considering the lack of freedoms that the Castro regime has imposed on the island (Barrera Tyszka, 2016).

The Cuban Revolution has been built as a transcendental milestone in the history of the Latin American left because the Castro government tried to spread the idea that socialism is a success on the island. The revolutionary process manifested itself as an upward Revolution, as an

expression of the optimal conjunction of revolutionary leadership and popular movement, something unparalleled in other revolutionary processes (González Arana, 2009, p. 269). Although, little by little, the image of the revolution was changing because of the reality that was being built on the island. Since 1959, Cuba has been characterized by constant attacks on civil liberties. Alcántara Sáez (2008) presents the case of liberties in Cuba: the island is at the bottom of the civil liberties index (Freedom House, 2007); and it is not considered as in the Democratic Development Index because of its undemocratic character. Also, Cuba has been characterized by an economy that never managed to break out, the main economic problem of Cuba after the extinction of the USSR has been the end of two centuries of specialization in producing sugar (Santamaría García, 2014).

The Cuban Revolution emerges as a relevant example of a socialist discourse that has been established over time. However, the 1959 process was not based on a Marxist program, nor was it led by a Marxist party, nor was it expressly moved by Marxist ideas. The hegemonic presence of Marxism is introduced, progressively though vertiginously, in the first four years following victory (Tejada, 2014). After the seizure of power, the discursive structure of the revolution emerges within the triad proposed in this article: the figure of the messiah incarcerated in Che Guevara, the enemy or demon configured through the bourgeoisie and the American empire; and the people seen as the proletarian force.

Finally, the Sandinista Popular Revolution, whose name comes from the mythical Augusto César Sandino. Beginning in 1912, the United States intervened militarily in Nicaragua with the objective

of establishing a certain political stability in the region, which would allow it to acquire the canal monopoly in the region; as Nicaragua offered the conditions for the only alternative route in the isthmus, the autonomy of the Nicaraguan State would have to be annulled in order to negotiate the construction of a canal through its territory (Walter, 1995, p. 166). In 1925, César Augusto Sandino organized and led the rejection of the US intervention. The army, organized by Sandino, was made up of peasants and workers. After several years of armed struggle, in 1933, the US Army decided to withdraw from Nicaragua, leaving as Head of the National Guard to Anastasio Somoza García who, years later, ordered the death of Sandino (Clark, 1992). In 1937, Anastasio Somoza García was declared president of the nation.

In the mid-1970s, leaders from different political parties came together against the government of Somoza Debayle. The main leader of the opposition was Pedro Joaquín Chamorro Cardenal. In January of 1978, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro is assassinated, unleashing a series of citizen uprisings (Mojica, 2014). From 1978 to 1979, the regime's infantry forces clashed with the Sandinista forces in a bloody war that killed civilians; Social pressure forced Anastasio Somoza Debayle to resign. The Government was in charge of the Junta de Gobierno de Reconstrucción Nacional, its coordinator was Daniel Ortega Saavedra. The revolutionary process in Nicaragua was built as an armed movement that could be replicated in other countries, in fact, Sandinismo aroused a new wave of armed revolutionary movements, mainly in El Salvador and Guatemala (González Arana, 2009, p. 271).

The Sandinista Popular Revolution is constructed through a reinterpretation

of the thought of Augusto Sandino, who embodies the class struggle from the prism of his deep anti-imperialism, from which later sprouted other of his main political ideas (Ramírez Soriano, 2016, p. 11). The foundations of the revolution are shaped by a Marxist tendency from the beginning, emphasizing the figure of the enemy, the figure of imperialism embodied in the Somoza dictatorship.

The reviews of the four cases described have allowed us to build a brief historical context, within which we will analyze the discursive structure of the idea of revolution. In addition, the reviews have also served to suggest the existence of a socialist context in all cases. The discursive structure of the ideas of revolution of the cases studied is configured in the existence of a hero, a victim and a villain. This discursive structure will be studied in the following epigraphs.

## 2. Hero, Victim and Villain

Latin America has written its contemporary history within the singularities that have emerged from revolutionary processes and discourses, all framed in world historical moments as in endogenous features. The contemporary ideas of revolution in Latin America have been drawn through feelings against impositions, interventions or regional doctrines decided and debated in territories foreign to the region. The ideas of revolution were strengthened when they intuitively found the appropriate rhetorical triad: on the one hand, the discourse that a people conceives in misery, poverty, or unemployment; on the other, the need to sacrifice those who are and those who seem guilty of the establishment of this situation; and, finally, the revolutionary, who

can become the expected messiah, who will take the responsibility of disappearing evil, or can become a false prophet, a revolutionary by name but with a long life as a bourgeois.

In the last decade, the use of the argumentative strategy that has been constant in the contemporary ideas of revolution in Latin America has been conceptualized. This discursive strategy has been used in the case studies. In every revolution, the argumentative structure is described below: in every story there is a hero, a crime, a victim, and a villain. In the history of self-defense, the hero and the villain are the same. The villain is inherently evil and irrational: the hero cannot reason with the villain; He has to fight and defeat him or kill him. In both cases, the victim must be innocent and surpass any reproach (Lakoff, 2004, p. 71). This discursive triad has been adapted to the Marxist language, showing the hero as the revolutionary, with a certain messianic halo, willing to walk the path of the historical determinism of materialism; the villain as the bourgeois or representative of the empire; and to the victim as to the people, the proletarian force. The triad does not try to understand the political and social processes of the cases studied, but to understand the discursive idea that denotes them.

The idea of revolution makes use of rhetorical tools in which the victim, the villain and the hero are an indispensable part of the discourse. These tools come by inheritance from an imaginary and discursive space that must be understood within the class struggle: a thought structure learned from the Marxist tradition, the class struggle requires a defined theoretical matrix. A triad constructed from rhetorical structures is proposed,

it has been contextualized within the discursive space of the class struggle: the hero, that is to say the revolutionary, representative of the proletariat, will lead the struggle against the villain, against the bourgeoisie, free enterprise, the empire. This structure of thought has served as a platform to construct ideological thoughts that approach Marxism and move away, inevitably, from liberalism. Through this conceptual structure we try to understand the revolutionary movements in Latin America. Thus, Lakoff's (2004) rhetorical structure makes sense in a context of rebellion that approaches a Latin American left, influenced by the Marxist thought structure, which has provided a philosophical point of view to at least a third part of the world population in the second half of the 20th century (Stumpf and Fieser, 2003, p. 363).

Although the writing does not intend to study the cases proposed within a specific current of Marxism, however, the Marxist theory of revolution (Schaff, 1973) has been taken as a frame of reference, which proposes two statements: the existing social and political system has to change through of a revolution; and, a social revolution must be identified with the overthrow of the existing social system through violence. These two statements have led to propose the discursive rhetoric of the ideas of revolution in Latin America: the revolutionary has the historical responsibility to liberate the proletariat from the influence of evil embodied in the bourgeoisie and the empire. Thus, the rhetorical model of the victim, hero and victimizer is painted with an adaptable left discourse. In practice, the argumentative model is drawn from Marxism, although some political practices differ from the discourse.

## 2.1 On the villain

The image of villain emerges in the ideology of the revolution in a sort of cause of the misery in which the people live, causing the wealth of a few to the detriment of the social masses. The villain emerges in the revolutionary discourse as the envoy of evil, represented in the bourgeoisie or the empire, a political or military character that is willing to favor the representatives of a liberal, imperialist or bourgeois government. The discursive structure of the revolution places the villains within a sphere called capitalism, individualism, liberalism.

In the Mexican Revolution, the villain is, without a doubt, Porfirio Díaz. There are three tendencies to understand the time of Porfirio Díaz in power. The 'porfirismo', which emphasizes the political stability of the regime while showing the image of an austere, benign leader, a kind of builder of the nation. The 'antiporphism', which sees Díaz as the reincarnation of evil, Díaz became the monster of evil, the father of cruelty, Díaz was portrayed as a ruthless tyrant, the most colossal of the criminals of our time (Garner, 2003); and, the 'neoporphism', which attempts to revise history by restoring a certain balance between the two interpretations.

The 'antiporphism' became the cog in the Mexican Revolution, which saw Díaz as the incarnation of evil, the murderer of the people. Díaz was compared to Caesar, the villain of Christian history, woe to him who was not deeply addicted to Caesar, and whose voice was not heard loud enough in the immense perennial chorus of praises! (Lara Pardo, 1912, p. 100). Although the governments of Porfirio Díaz were characterized by political and economic

stability (Serrano Álvarez, 2012), many workers sectors had a growing sense that wealth was in the hands of businessmen, bourgeois or politicians allied to power. The policies imposed by the dictator do not have the same effect on the industrial workers, the peons of the haciendas and the poor inhabitants of the rural areas of the country, who were in any way alien to the power of the community (Flores Torres, 1991, p. 259).

On the other hand, the government of Enrique Peñaranda, in Bolivia (1940-1943) would have to face a fragile economic situation embroiled in a galloping inflation, government policy was oriented, in the sense of the strictest orthodoxy, to the containment of the circulating (Gallego, 1987, p. 231). It was evident that public spending decreased to stop the inflationary process, the decrease in public spending caused the decrease in the purchasing power of the popular classes, who saw the contrast with the improvement of life in the mining sector. According to Gallego, only 0.4% received income to satisfy all needs, while 27.89% covered only their recommended dietary allowance and 72.7% did not reach this level (1987, p. 234). This context resulted in the explosion of several strikes at a national level, and the organization of union and political groups such as the Revolutionary Nationalist Movement, the Left Revolutionary Party, the Revolutionary Workers Party and the Bolivian Socialist Phalanx.

In an adverse economic context, the Bolivian Revolution is generated with the idea of a villain, Enrique Peñaranda. The government of Peñaranda allied itself to the United States during the Second World War, and since then its image stands as the perfect ally of the 'empire'. His image of villain took full form after the massacre in

Catavi in 1942, in which the Bolivian army attacked the tin mine camps in Catavi, department of Potosí. The government required raw materials, from the mines, to meet the needs of the allies during the Second World War. The claims for wage increases of the miners produced clashes that resulted in the death of around twenty miners, a barbarian regime made a crisis in the bloody struggle of the workers massacred by the army of the very Catholic government (*Reconstruir por el Socialismo y la Libertad*, 1949).

The Cuban Revolution develops the idea of the enemy in Fulgencio Batista, president from 1940 to 1944, and dictator from 1952 to 1959. The military coup of 1952 was contextualized within decisions that restricted certain civil liberties such as the right to strike (Guerra, 2012). Batista was openly supported by the American governments of Truman and Eisenhower (Schultz, 1998). The corruption in the Batista government was intermingled with the drug, prostitution and casinos businesses. Batista imposed a system of annulment of freedom of expression, while increasing the repression of communist movements, for Batista, the press functioned as an extension of his mandate. Thus, only six newspapers, out of a total of sixty on the island, were able to survive through subscriptions and publicity. The rest depended on the pamphlets of local politicians or direct payments from the dictator (Guerra, 2012, p. 40).

The Sandinista Popular Revolution focused the bifocals of the enemy on the Somoza family. In the 1930s, the United States formed a National Guard headed by Anastasio Somoza García. In 1934, the National Guard assassinated Augusto Sandino, the main icon of the Nicaraguan revolutionary movements, who had fought

against the US intervention. Somoza would have declared: "I did it for the good of my country" González Arana, 2009, p. 4). Somoza, through a military coup, becomes president of Nicaragua in 1936, giving way to decades of the dictatorship of a single family: his murder in 1956, gave way to his sons, Luis and Anastasio Somoza Debayle. The image of the family as an ally of the bourgeoisie and protected from the empire, was erected in a system in which American monopolies swarmed.

Although the villain can be embodied in a person, the revolution has also represented him through a country or a political system. In the mind of the revolutionary the empire was erected as the representation of evil; "our enemies: the dictatorship and imperialism, as well as bourgeois sectors [...] have seen frightened and full of counterrevolutionary panic [...] Scared have contemplated that the Sandino people return to their privileges, massively renewing themselves with the traditions of anti-imperialist struggle of the Army Defender of National Sovereignty and with the traditions of anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the continent" (Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional, 1979, p. 119). This idea was strengthened through the sense of the protectorate that emerged during the Cold War, when the foci of communism had to be extinguished in any way. The empire, which had defended the Latin American region of European authoritarianism, a few decades later, favored the idea of stability on the idea of democracy, good governance has generally meant stability, not democracy (Schoultz, 1998, p. 316).

Like a tautological game, the idea of a messiah also evokes the idea of the villain, you cannot think of a messiah without the existence of a demon, the messiah's

mission is irrelevant without a villain. The villain seen as the guilty of the misery, those who colonized the Latin American region, those who plundered it and impoverished it to the extreme. The culprits are directly related to the empire, that country that at one time considered us as their 'backyard'. The imaginary of this empire has been built within connotations of exploitation, barbarism and corruption: in the mind of the revolutionary, the misfortunes of Latin America are caused by colonialism and imperialism. The identification of the guilty, real or apparent, resorts to resentment, voracious and violent ally, addictive and, sometimes, unavoidable companion.

During the Cold War, the idea of stability became the veil that covered the hegemonic protectorate, implying the acceptance and support of dictatorships like: the Somoza in Nicaragua, Fulgencio Batista in Cuba, Jorge Rafael Videla in Argentina, Rafael Leónidas Trujillo in the Republic Dominicana, Augusto Pinochet in Chile, Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay, etc. This acceptance and support of the empire to various dictatorships of the continent helped in the reaffirmation and strengthening of the feelings against the imperialist imposition. The imposition of a Western modernity called for rebellion, and this feeling was, in many cases, violence. When considering the empire as the latent enemy, all attempts at rapprochement are, then, labeled as forms of neocolonialism and imperialism, for example: regional free trade agreements; cooperation against drug trafficking; the presence of international organizations and their financial institutions; private foreign company, etc.

The hegemonic interests of the so-called empire have contributed to the sedition, because, without warning, the region was

immersed in political doctrines of which never had participation, the empire had built the first doctrine that involved its backyard in the form of membership, the Monroe Doctrine. The new republics of the American continent became part of the American protectorate, however, the revolutionary thought was also given arguments: it had gone from Spanish colonialism to the American protectorate, leaving no room for perplexity, or doubt.

The protectorate did not admit external influences to the American continents, because of their free and independent condition, which they have assumed and maintained, henceforth they cannot be considered as subjects of future colonization by European powers (Root, 1914, p. 7). The Monroe Doctrine, promulgated in 1823, became a pact between empires, while Europe did not intervene in America, the United States would not intervene in the European colonies. This pact was not understood as protection to the new democracies of Latin America from European absolutism, but, rather, as a protectorate with a new empire (García Calderón, 2001).

## 2.2 On the messiah

The image of a villain inevitably evokes the messiah. The existence of the villain is impossible without the existence of the divine envoy, someone who comes from the proletariat. The messiah has been involved in a sort of endogenous spirituality, creating an immaculate sphere around everything that is called ancestral, and around the Cosmo visions of the indigenous peoples. He is a person with a trait of community spirituality who views with suspicion the Catholic tradition because it is configured

as the historical representation of colonial oppression. Despite this, he expects the church to adapt to the revolution, there is no other way. The Latin American revolutionary also views with suspicion the imperial cultural traditions because the empire is the source of evil, and the divine is everything considered as native, indigenous, millennial, in itself, everything conceived as ancestral wisdom.

The messiah of the revolution requires two essential elements. First, principles that highlight the idea of the people (proletariat) and the idea of the villain, of the common enemy. Second, it requires a short time of revolution, in which his image is praised by his sacrifice, his perseverance and his courage, ready to be killed, ready to offer his life. The revolutionaries become messiahs by seeing an early, tragic death, the death that happens in the heat of the struggle, at the top of their leadership. Those revolutionaries with long lives disappear in time, their image ceases to be divine to become a worldly image.

Although in principle the image of messiah was erected in Francisco I. Madero, his image ended up being built as a false prophet. The image of the messiah in the Mexican Revolution is wrapped around the image of Francisco "Pancho" Villa and Emiliano Zapata. Pancho Villa came from a poor family, from an early age he became a bandit, he was part of a band led by Ignacio Parra (McLynn, 2000). After his arrest for robbery in 1912, he was forced to join the Armed Forces. After fleeing, and having been imprisoned several times, he was appointed governor of Chihuahua. From 1913 to 1915, he confiscated land from large landowners to be distributed among the people. Villa had a clear objective, the redistribution of land, seizing land to favor its cause. He is assassinated in 1923,

after organizing military colonies. The murder of Villa catapults him as a national hero, considered one of the heroes of the Revolution and national hero, Francisco Villa died with the idea that education is essential for a people (Bautista et. al., 2017, p. 3).

On the other hand, Emiliano Zapata becomes a peasant leader, the impeccable symbol of the Mexican Revolution. He was in charge of the Liberation Army of the South against the oligarchy represented in Porfirio Díaz. The image of a martyr is indispensable to generate the aura around the revolutionary: the assassination of Zapata generated the image of the messiah who sought the revolution. In fact, in 1994, the neo-Zapatista movements declared: our heart is happy, because Emiliano Zapata arrived again, in his footsteps of you, to the Zócalo de México. We, small and forgotten, raise the image of Zapata in the other heart of the country: that of the mountains of the Mexican southeast (Santana, 2010, p. 69).

In the Bolivian Revolution, the messiah emerges in the figure of Ángel Víctor Paz Estenssoro, politician and founder of the Revolutionary Nationalist Movement. Although his figure as a messiah does not materialize in history because his image as a martyr never emerged in the social imaginary. During his first Government (1952-1956), he led the revolution based on the nationalization of factors of production, an inclusive agrarian reform, and universal voting. His presidential terms (four in total), were deviating from their original principles, to find a space with the market economy and state capitalism during his last government (1985-1989) (Grieco y Murillo, 2016). His image of messiah was erected during his first government, however, it was fading in time to become a false prophet. Those messiahs

who do not see their end within the dawn of a hero fallen in battle, gradually stand as a false revolutionary, false prophet. Thus, Estenssoro becomes the prophet who never became a messiah because his end did not happen in a context of struggle. The image of messiah requires a tragic end to be remembered as martyrs of superior ideals.

In the case of the Cuban Revolution, the messiah has the most publicized image of the continent, the image of “Che Guevara”. His life has been built around myths and realities, leaving aside his immense cruelty and his aberration to gender differences. Gender differences became a matter of public policy, in fact, homosexuals who engaged in improper conduct—title under which state policy repressed homosexuality—were confined to the Military Unity Camps of Aid to the Production, whose objective was sexual and social rehabilitation (Egea Casas, 2011, p. 67). The speeches that exalted the Cuban Revolution did so through the formation of a regional icon that emerged from the life and death of Ernesto Guevara. The perfect messiah of the revolution, with a rifle slung over his shoulder, a Cuban cigar between the corners of his mouth, and the five-pointed star of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in his beret. His murder in Bolivia on October 9, 1967 kicks off the image of the perfect revolutionary (Cupull y González, 2012).

Contrary to Che Guevara, the figure of Fidel Castro is built between contradictions, false promises and a life of luxury and riches. Their houses, bank accounts and yachts contradict their speech based on a state socialism (Sánchez and Gyldén, 2014). Through the monopoly of communication, an attempt has been made to build an image of Fidel inside the island, although

this is broken within the American continent: Juan Reinaldo Sánchez, ex-bodyguard of Fidel Castro, affirmed that in Cuba, nobody, or almost anyone, knows the existence of this yacht, whose port of mooring is hidden in an invisible cove and inaccessible to the common of mortals, on the eastern coast of the famous Bay of Pigs (Sánchez and Gyldén, 2014, p. 14). The enlightened one, the messiah, remains with the image of holiness, an immaculate image, if he has offered his life, but, if the messiah has not offered his life, as time goes by, his life begins to conjure around clouds of doubts, of questions. The death of Fidel Castro, on November 25, 2016, evoked the image of a revolutionary whose life brought too many contradictions to see it with a divine dawn. It does not remain in the imaginary of the revolution as a messiah, as it has been the case of Ernesto Guevara, whose image is used by the revolutionary discourse as a martyr, as an inviolable icon.

The name of the Sandinista Popular Revolution comes from Augusto César Sandino, that peasant who led the Nicaraguan resistance against the US occupation. The Revolution attributes the departure of US troops to Sandino's leadership. Despite the departure of the United States troops, Nicaragua was ruled by an ally, Anastasio Somoza. The murder of Sandino in the hands of the National Guard, became the image of the Nicaraguan Revolution, that revolutionary who loves justice and through it I go to sacrifice. Material treasures do not exercise any power in my person; the treasures that I long to possess are spiritual (Ramírez, 1981, p. 70).

On the other hand, after the overthrow of the government of Anastasio Somoza Debayle, Daniel Ortega Saavedra becomes

the leader of the Governing Board of National Reconstruction and, therefore, in the best-known image of the Sandinista Revolution. Since 2007, the Presidency of the Republic of Nicaragua, led by Ortega, has emerged within constant clouds of discrediting and electoral fraud. Thus, as the years go by, the image of Ortega Saavedra vanishes in the imaginary of a messiah while the image of an autocratic ruler is erected.

### 2.3 On the victim

The revolution sees the victim as a continuous incarnation of a homogenous people, without nuances, who has always suffered, who has always suffered. A people that has suffered the onslaught of crises caused by the bourgeoisie. The idea of town does not contemplate differences or discrepancies, the collectivity of thought surpasses individuality, all suffer, all cry, all are in search of a messiah. The idea of the people does not admit that within it there can be capitalists, bourgeois, individualists, lovers of wealth, etc. Homogeneity is a common factor. The idea of the people has strength in itself, the conception revives the idea of the proletariat, the idea of gentiles, the idea of social classes. The victim gains strength in subjects such as the people, and takes color in adjectives that carry historical stigmas such as: peasant struggle, indigenous movements, ancestral struggles.

This combination of modes of argumentation led the revolutionary movements to justify violence as one of the forces of history. In fact, for a long time, revolution has been thought of with a stereotypical image: a revolutionary dressed in civilian clothes, with a rifle that shines on the shoulder,

with a leafy beard and a cigarette between eaten that hangs from the corners of the mouth. This image went hand in hand with the idea of justice: the “justiciero” was a person of the people, with an unbreakable spirit and a moral system with only one principle: to eliminate the villain. The need to reach the confrontation of classes has traveled two paths: first, saving the weapons aimed directly at the culprits; second, through electoral processes. The first was a constant for the Latin American region in most of the 20th century; the second, an alternative chosen by few socialist movements, which make use of democratic instruments to later undermine and manipulate them.

To the rescue of this victim arrives with historical strength the expected messiah, that revolutionary who is willing to sacrifice life for an ideal, the welfare of the people, the welfare of the proletariat. For this, it is not essential to use democratic systems, because it can be done through the use of weapons, through the organization of guerrillas, and through the overthrow of governments. The idea of victim has value only in a context in which the victimizer, or villain, is fully identified, and in which the savior is incarnated in a person.

### 3. Revolutionary philosophy

In the previous sections, it has been proposed to understand the argumentative structure of the discourse of the revolution through the image of the messiah, the proletariat and the bourgeois or representative of the empire. This structure leaves aside the study of Marxist theories or the development of the revolution through the conjunction of social processes because it has been tried to

show the adaptation of the discursive triad of the hero, villain, and victim to the Marxist language to argue that the discourse is composed of a specific rhetorical structure, which takes on significance through language. Next, we try to build the context within which this discursive structure is mobilized. For this, several concepts common to the case studies will be taken into account. It has been decided to call this context, the philosophy of the revolution, which includes concepts such as the end of history, romanticism and freedom.

The philosophy of the revolution, that is, the context constructed through the end of history, romanticism and freedom, seems to create in a sort of collective consciousness that flows circularly and feeds on animosity against the guilty. In Nietzsche's words (Vidal, 2004), the idea that with infinite time and a finite number of events the events will be repeated again and again infinitely. It seems to apply to the philosophy of the revolution, a revolutionary context that appears from time to time in Latin America, that never extinguishes, but revives from time to time. The idea of eternal return arises through the discursive triad of the ideas of revolution, that is, as long as there is the bourgeoisie, the empire, the press, the businessmen, the rich class (villain), the existence of the revolutionary is indispensable (hero), that messiah who comes to save the people (victim) from social injustices.

The aroma of colonization served to fuel the resentment of the region, a concept engendered in the Latin American left. This region, specialized in losing from the remote times in which the Renaissance Europeans rushed through the sea and sank their teeth in the throat (Galeano, 2004). Revolutionary ideas in Latin America are

nourished by misery and desire. The idea of poverty is constructed through the search for the guilty, and through a discourse that tries to reread history from the imposition of Western modernity, taking into account that people did not have knowledge and that the knowledge of the expert had to be transplanted into the minds of people (Escobar, 2002, p. 13). The image of the imposition constitutes in itself the reflection of the villain.

In the philosophy of the revolution, the Church also plays a special role. The Church serves as an ally as long as it becomes a companion of the revolution, as long as it adapts to the needs of the messiah. There is no other way. Theology must conform and generate a conceptual platform with which the purposes of the revolution are justified. Only then, the Church becomes an indispensable ally. In this way, the revolution was the way to achieve a government that feeds the hungry, that sees the naked, that teaches the one who does not know, that complies with the works of charity, of love of neighbor not only in an occasional way and transitory, not only for a few, but for the majority of our neighbors (Berryman, 1989, p. 11). The theology of liberation takes up the influence of the Church in society, this time not from the spiritual sphere, but from the political transformation, making use of its influences, and supporting the social forces that think about the poor, the peoples, ours.

### 3.1 End of History

The end of the story will be achieved either by carrying a weapon or through electoral processes that provide a veil of democratic legitimacy. The ideas of revolution sowed

seeds in academics and politicians, in the words of Josué de Castro, a Brazilian sociologist and essayist: "I, who have received an international prize for peace, I think that, unfortunately, there is no other solution than violence for Latin America" (Galeano, 2004, p. 5). Throughout the twentieth century, it seemed that the easiest path of the revolution was violence, while the ghosts of the revolution were embodied in vehement speeches that add stories, fables, poems and songs dedicated to the second liberation of Latin America.

That the story reaches an end is not new, the real thing is how to get there. Although the idea was popularized by Marx, Hegel had proposed a phenomenology of the spirit to understand history: the logos of humanity, history, the idea, is fully realized in a sort of absolute Spirit (Stumpf y Fieser, 2003). In the case of Marx, the end of history entails material forces, developed in history, that will lead to the coalition of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, giving way to the dictatorship of the proletariat and, finally, to the communist society, "when Marx He argues that he has reversed Hegel's terms does not mean anything else, but that the dialectical process does not take place at the level of ideas but in that of reality. Marx believes that the motor of History is the class [...] he was convinced that under the dictatorship of the proletariat the classless society would be achieved" (Sanmartín Barros, 2013, p. 109).

The historical determinism of Marx leaves no room for the self-determination of peoples, leaves no room for freedom or individualism, because societies are determined to reach the end of history, the communist society. It is curious to think that determinism depends on the existence of the revolution, a determinism that is not deterministic. In the words of José Carlos

Mariátegui (2013), Marxist determinism was an interested exaggeration of the intellectuals, Marxism has never obeyed a passive and rigid determinism. However, Mariátegui falls into an error of obvious logic<sup>4</sup>: if determinism depends on voluntary and free actions, it is not determinism, although it can be filled with adjectives as active and flexible. In fact, these adjectives are contrary to the concept of determinism<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, it is curious to think that Marxist determinism depends on revolutionary movements. In any case, this determinism is not entirely clear in the case studies. Despite this, there is a common idea: after the revolution, society will live well, in harmony, without poverty, without bourgeoisie, in equality.

### 3.2 Romanticism and freedom

Romanticism is conjured with messianism in a sort of double edge or double face of the same entity. While romanticism portrays the possibility of a kind of justice, where the culprits are consummated, and where a system that eliminates poverty and misery is conjured, messianism draws the face of the savior, either with a rifle on his shoulder or through a democratic veil, whose electoral sustenance justifies the change of system. The revolutionary savior rises through arms or electoral

processes to found a new state covered by a general idea of socialism, from the distance of imperialism, and from policies that extol the feelings of sovereignty and nationalism.

Romanticism in the revolution contemplates the truth from the free expression of emotions, and evokes a messiah who takes them by the hand to the end of history, or at least to the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the messiah, man of the people who has suffered, lived and emerged from them, the call, or the anointed one, to rise as king of the oppressed, and to establish the kingdom of the people, while condemning capitalism and establishing the path to salvation: nothing and no one can stop the great South American, Latin American and Caribbean revolution, the world should support the revolution, because that revolution is the beginning of the road to the salvation of this planet threatened by capitalism, by wars, by the hunger, proclaimed Hugo Chávez at the XV International Conference of the United Nations on Climate Change in September 2009 (Chávez, 2009).

The messianic spirit has gone through Latin American history since the beginning of its republican life, and has been incarnated multiple times, in different times, in different processes, with a reduced range of protagonists: martyrs, life dictators, and other false prophets. In the idea of revolution, Che Guevara will always be the martyr, the one who gave his life for his ideals; On the other hand, the figure of Fidel Castro begins to fade between revolutionary and dictator for life; while Francisco Madero has been relegated to the figure of false revolutionary, a false prophet. All of them started with the same discourse: to save Latin America from the structure of the evil empire and its earthly representatives. The purpose

---

4. The Aristotelian logic of non-contradiction involves the exclusion of opposites: if I am alive, I cannot at the same time be dead. Thus, determinism and freedom are exclusive concepts, the one cannot exist in the same space and time as the other

5. Taking into account the previous note, the example that can help to visualize clearly the argument is: the thinking dead, or a boisterous dead. The noun and the adjective do not make grammatical errors, but logical errors.

is the same: to exterminate the structure of evil incarnated in capitalism, its earthly representatives, the hegemon and its allies.

The revival of the messiah is framed in the concomitance of hope and necessity: peoples who have believed in the sudden transformation of their critical situation through a person, a kind of divine anointed, who will change the critical conditions in which he leaves us the imperialism. This revival of an enlightened one has opened the possibility of understanding certain concepts from a revolutionary perspective. Terms with a strong historical tradition have taken on new flesh and new life, for example: freedom.

Although freedom for Marxism is framed in historical determinism, without delay and without deviations, its logic involves the imposition of collective possession and subjection to materialist logic, a state of affairs strong enough to subordinate the plans and objectives of life of all individuals to a collective plan and a set of collective objects (Walicki, 1998, p. 219). Thus, freedom within the ideas of revolution involves complete submission, an unbreakable loyalty to the ruler, the one who was chosen by the people as messiah. The ruler vehemently denounces that the terms in which the State stands are realities and not social contracts: it is proposed that we live in a social pact in which we had no voice, no vote and, therefore, the collective consciences of the peoples. They have given the Latin American revolutions of the twentieth century a new meaning.

## Conclusions

This article has tried to propose a discursive pattern through which the ideas of the revolutionary processes

studied have been erected. The discursive structure of the hero, victim and victimizer has been adapted to the Marxist language, that is, the messianic revolutionary, the bourgeois, and the proletarian. This discursive structure makes use of the Marxist language to locate the ideas of revolution within a regional rebellion. The triad exists as long as its elements exist, that is, the revolutionary exists as long as the bourgeoisie exists, and as long as the proletariat is oppressed. The messiah exists as long as there is also the idea of oppressor and the idea of the oppressed.

Although issues remain aside, this paper has tried to understand the ideas of revolution through the proposed discursive structure and through a context that has been called revolutionary philosophy. This context has taken into account common concepts such as the end of history, romanticism and freedom. Thus, it has been proposed to understand the dynamics of the ideas of revolution through a discursive triad which is mobilized within a revolutionary philosophy.

This writing has also led us to ask ourselves about the weak development of ideas that create new approaches, new ideological contexts, new ways of visualizing the reality of our continent. While Marxism has overwhelmingly influenced the revolutionary movements of the twentieth century, it is not surprising to find no remarkable attempts to fill the idea of revolution with new or different concepts and approaches.

The idea of revolution, as complex as it is broad, has nurtured the history of Latin America since its independence movements. The historical force behind this idea has led social movements to

adapt, from the use of weapons, to the use of democratic mechanisms, from the imposition of suffrage. However, the essence of the idea has not changed, the conception of the messiah, the villain, and the people remain the same. These ideas are framed in the end of history, romanticism and freedom.

## Bibliography

Alcántara Sáez, M. (2008). Luces y sombras de la calidad de la democracia en América Latina. *Quórum*, 22.

Barrera Tyszka, A. (2016). *Fidel Castro, mago del mercadeo político*. New York, EE.UU.: New York Times.

Bautista, S., Juárez, E., López, D., & Olin, H. (2014). *Dirección General de Incorporación y Revalidación de Estudios*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Recuperado el 05 de Junio de 2017, de Pancho Villa: la caída de un héroe: <http://vinculacion.dgire.unam.mx/Congreso-Trabajos-pagina/PDF/Congreso%20Estudiantil%202014/Proyectos%202014-%20Área/5.%20Áreas%20de%20Convergencia/1.11%20CIN2014A50145-%20Literatura.pdf>

Berlin, I. (2017). *El sentido de la realidad: sobre las ideas y su historia*. New York: Taurus.

Berryman, P. (1989). *Teología de la liberación: los hechos esenciales en torno al movimiento revolucionario en América Latina y otros lugares*. Buenos Aires: Siglo xxi.

Chávez, H. (2009). *Discurso completo del presidente Chávez en Copenhague*. Obtenido el 05 de Julio de 2017, de XV Conferencia internacional de la Organización de Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático: <https://www.aporrea.org/actualidad/n147198.html>

Clark, P. C. (1992). *The United States and Somoza, 1933-1956*. London: Praeger.

Cupull, A., & González, F. (2012). *El asesinato del Che en Bolivia. Revelaciones*. Editora Política.

Egea Casas, R. (Septiembre de 2011). Revolución Cubana: la Represión Castri-  
trista Vista a través de la Persecución y Encierro de Reinaldo Arenas en la Prisión de El Morro (1969-1976). *Philologica Urcitana Revista Semestral de Iniciación a la Investigación en Filología*, Vol. 5, 65-73.

Enríquez, J. M. (2007). Formas de inobediencia. Del derecho de resistencia a la resistencia constitucional. *Ph.D thesis*. Universidad de Salamanca.

Escobar, A. (2002). Globalización, desarrollo y modernidad. *Planeación, Participación y Desarrollo*, 9-32.

Flores Torres, O. (1991). *Burguesía, Militares y Movimiento Obrero en Monterrey, 1909- 1923*. Monterrey, México: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León.

Freedom House. (2007). *Freedom in the World 2007*. Recuperado el 25 de Junio de 2017: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2007>

Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional. (1979). Nicaragua: la lucha popular contra la dictadura. *Cuadernos Políticos*, 20.

Frontaura Argandoña, M. (1974). *La Revolución Boliviana*. (R. D. Medina, Ed.) La Paz, Bolivia.

Galeano, E. (2004). *Las venas abiertas de América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Siglo xxi.

Gallego, F. (1987). *notas sobre el gobierno de Enrique Penaranda en Bolivia (1940-1943)* (Vol. 13). Ibero-americanisches Archive.

García Calderón, F. (2001). *Las democracias latinas de América. La creación de un continente*. Lima: Fondo Editorial del Congreso del Perú.

- García Portela, L. (2014). La Revolución Americana: una revuelta desde y contra Inglaterra. Un ensayo sobre sus orígenes ideológicos. *Revista de Historia Autónoma*(5), 257-271.
- Garner, P. (30 de Septiembre de 2003). *Porfirio Díaz: ¿héroe o villano?* Recuperado el 09 de Junio de 2017: Letras Libres: <http://www.letraslibres.com/mexico-espana/porfirio-diaz-heroe-o-villano>
- González Arana, R. (2008). Las revoluciones latinoamericanas del siglo XX: tras las huellas del pasado. *Clío América*, 259-273.
- González Arana, R. (Julio de 2009). Nicaragua. Dictadura y Revolución. *Memorias Revista Digital de Historia y Arqueología desde el Caribe*, 6(10).
- Grieco, A., & Murillo, M. (2016). El doctor y sus biógrafos. Balance de medio siglo de vidas de Víctor Paz Estenssoro. *Ciencia y Cultura*, 36.
- Guerra, L. (2012). *Visions of Power in Cuba: Revolution, Redemption, and Resistance, 1959-1971*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Juárez, M. (2008). Apuntes para una interpretación de la Revolución Mexicana. *Estrategia Internacional*, 24, 245-270.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!* Vermont: White River Junction: Chelsea Green Pub. Co.
- Lara Pardo, L. (1912). *De Porfirio Díaz a Francisco Madero*. Nueva York: Polyglot Publishing & Comercio Co.
- Mansilla, H. (Septiembre de 1980). La Revolución de 1952 en Bolivia: un Intento Reformista de Modernización. *Revista de Estudios Políticos*(No. 17), 117-128.
- Mariátegui, J. C. (June de 2013). Determinismo Marxista. *Sol Rojo*.
- McLynn, F. (2000). *Villa and Zapata: a History of the Mexican Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mojica, O. (2014). *Nicaragua, 1979-1990: La Revolución Abortada*. (L. Socialista, Ed.) Managua.
- Pizarro, A. (2007). *América Latina palabra y cultura*. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Alberto Hurtado.
- Ramírez Soriano, P. (2016). *Nicaragua. Sandinismo, revolución y religión*. Managua: CEI International Affairs.
- Ramírez, S. (1981). *Augusto C. Sandino. El pensamiento vivo*. Managua, Nicaragua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.
- Reconstruir Por el Socialismo y la Libertad. (Julio de 1949). Reina la Reacción en Bolivia Después de la Matanza de Catavi. *Reconstruir Por el Socialismo y la Libertad*, IV(41).
- Root, E. (1914). The Real Monroe Doctrine. *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 8(No. 3), 6-22.
- Rossi, C. (1972). *La revolución permanente en América Latina*. Madrid, España: Amauta La Haine.
- Sánchez, J., & Gyldeén, A. (2014). *La Vida Oculta de Fidel Castro*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península.
- Sanmartín Barros, I. (Agosto de 2013). El fin de la historia en Hegel y Marx. *História da historiografia*, 100-118.
- Santamaría García, A. (Julio-Diciembre de 2014). La revolución cubana y la economía, 1959-2012. Los ciclos de política y el ciclo azucarero. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, Vol. 71(No. 2), 691-723.
- Santana, A. (Abril de 2010). Emiliano Zapata en el pensamiento latinoamericano. *Cuadernos Americanos*, 134, 53-72.
- Schaff, A. (1973). Marxist theory on revolution and violence. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 34(2).
- Schultz, L. (1998). *Beneath the United States; a history of US policy toward Latin*

*America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Serrano Álvarez, P. (2012). *Porfirio Díaz y el Porfiriato. Cronología (1830-1915)*. Ciudad de México: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de las revoluciones de México.

Silva León, A. (2003). *Breve historia de la Revolución Cubana*. Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.

Stumpf, S., & Fieser, J. (2003). *Philosophy History and Problems* (6 ed. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tejada, A. (2014). La revolución cubana y la economía, 1959-2012. Los ciclos de la política y el ciclo azucarero. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 71, 691-723.

Vidal, A. (2004). *Necesidad y eterno retorno en la filosofía de Nietzsche*. Barcelona: Ph.D. Thesis.

Villoro, L. (January-April de 1992). Sobre el concepto de revolución. *Revista del Centro de Estudios Constitucionales*.

Walicki, A. (1998). Karl Marx como filósofo de la libertad. *Crítica Review, a Journal of Books and Ideas*, 4.

Walter, K. (1995). Las problemáticas del estado nacional en Nicaragua. En A. Taracena, & J. Piel, *Identidades nacionales y Estado moderno en Centroamérica* (pág. 166). San José: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.

